Department for Education

Evaluation of 2021 reformed national professional qualifications: technical annexe

November 2026

Authors: CFE Research and FFT Education Datalab

Government Social Research

Contents

List of tables 4
Glossary of terms 7
Chapter 1: Introduction 9
The 2021 reformed NPQs 9
Chapter 2: Methods selection 12
Chapter 3: Sampling 14
NPQ participant surveys 14
Colleague survey 15
Qualitative interviews 15
Chapter 4: Research instrument development and coverage 18
Online surveys 18
Depth interviews 22
Chapter 5: Fieldwork 24
Survey timings 24
Survey dissemination 26
Interview timings and recruitment 27
Chapter 6: Response rates and respondent profile 29
Online surveys 29
Depth interviews 33
Chapter 7: Analysis 38
Online surveys 38
Depth interviews 43
Chapter 8: Quality assurance 44
Chapter 9: Secondary data analysis approach to the impact analysis 46
Overview of the approach 46
Datasets used 47
Teacher level analysis 47
School level analysis 49
Limitations 50
Appendix 1: NPQ theory of change for the 2021 reformed NPQs 53

Appendix 2: Competencies measured in the SPB survey 54
NPQEL 54
NPQH 55
NPQSL 55
NPQEYL 56
NPQLT 57
NPQLTD 58
NPQLBC 58
NPQLL 58
NPQLPM 59
Appendix 3: Profile of NPQ participant survey respondents compared to the sample 60
SPA survey 60
SPB survey 65
SPC survey 69

List of tables

Table 1: Suite of NPQs covered in the evaluation including their purpose and launch date 10

Table 2: Cohort start and end dates for SNPQs and LNPQs 13

Table 3: Cohorts and NPQs included in the SPA, SPB and SPC surveys 14

Table 4: Topics covered in the NPQ participant surveys and any differences by NPQ 19

Table 5: Cohorts and NPQs included in the SPA, SPB and SPC surveys 24

Table 6: Fieldwork timings of the NPQ participant and colleague surveys 25

Table 7: Fieldwork timings of the NPQ process interviews 27

Table 8: Fieldwork timings of the NPQ impact interviews 28

Table 9: Number of survey completions at SPA by qualification 29

Table 10: Number of survey completions at SPB by qualification 30

Table 11: Number of survey completions at SPC by qualification 31

Table 12: Breakdown of Round 1 (start of NPQ) process learning interviews 34

Table 13: Breakdown of Round 2 (on completion of NPQ) process learning interviews 35

Table 14: Breakdown of SPB impact interviews 36

Table 15: Breakdown of SPC impact interviews 36

Table 16: Cohorts included in the NPQ impact analysis 47

Table 17: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample - NPQ 60

Table 18: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample - Cohort 60

Table 19: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample – Lead provider 61

Table 20: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample – Recipients of targeted support funding 61

Table 21: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample - Gender 62

Table 22: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample - Ethnicity 62

Table 23: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample – Working hours 62

Table 24: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample - Post 63

Table 25: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample – Setting phase 63

Table 26: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample – Setting type 64

Table 27: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample – Setting location 64

Table 28: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample - NPQ 65

Table 29: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample - Cohort 65

Table 30: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample – Lead provider 66

Table 31: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample – Recipients of targeted support funding 66

Table 32: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample - Gender 67

Table 33: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample - Ethnicity 67

Table 34: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample – Working hours 67

Table 35: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample - Post 68

Table 36: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample – Setting phase 68

Table 37: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample – Setting type 68

Table 38: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample – Setting location 69

Table 39: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample - NPQ 69

Table 40: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample - Cohort 70

Table 41: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample – Lead provider 70

Table 42: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample – Recipients of targeted support funding 71

Table 43: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample - Gender 71

Table 44: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample - Ethnicity 71

Table 45: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample – Working hours 72

Table 46: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample - Post 72

Table 47: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample – Setting phase 72

Table 48: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample – Setting type 73

Table 49: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample – Setting location.....73

Glossary of terms

ASO	Additional Support Offer (now known as EHCO)
AP	Alternative provision
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance statistical test
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
DfE	Department for Education
EAL	English as an Additional Language
EEF	Educational Endowment Foundation
FSM	Free school meals are government-funded lunches provided at school to children from low-income families or specific age groups
EHCO	Early Headship Coaching Offer
GIAS	Get Information About Schools dataset
GBP	Group-based provider of early years learning, development and care, including private, voluntary and independent settings and childminders
LNPQ	Leadership National Professional Qualification
MAT	Multi Academy Trust
MI	Management Information
NPQ	National Professional Qualification
NPQEL	NPQ for Executive Leadership
NPQEYL	NPQ for Early Years Leadership
NPQH	NPQ for Headship
NPQLBC	NPQ for Leading Behaviour and Culture
NPQLL	NPQ for Leading Literacy
NPQLPM	NPQ for Leading Primary Mathematics
NPQLT	NPQ for Leading Teaching
NPQLTD	NPQ for Leading Teacher Development

NPQSL	NPQ for Senior Leadership
PVI	Private Voluntary or Independent also known as Group Based Provider
PRU	Pupil Referral Unit
SBP	School-based provider of early years learning, development and care
SENCO	Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator
Setting	An educational setting which includes, schools, group and school-based early years settings. Used in the text to cover a range of settings. When appropriate, more specific types of settings are used to differentiate findings.
SNPQ	Specialist National Professional Qualification
SPA	Sampling Point A - a survey completed when an individual starts their qualification
SPB	Sampling Point B – a survey undertaken when an individual has completed their qualification
SPC	Sampling Point C – a survey undertaken 12 months after an individual has completed their qualification
SWC	School Workforce Census
TLR	Teaching and learning responsibility payments
TRN	Teacher Reference Number

Chapter 1: Introduction

The Department for Education (DfE) commissioned CFE Research to deliver a process and impact evaluation of the 2021 reformed National Professional Qualifications (NPQs).

The main part of the evaluation focused solely on participants who received full scholarship funding, which is available for teachers and leaders who work in state-funded settings across England.[1] This evaluation included NPQ cohorts between autumn 2021 and spring 2024. The aim was to understand how these latest reforms were implemented and what the effects of undertaking the NPQs were on the development of participants' leadership skills, teacher retention and progression, participants' school colleagues, and school attainment. As part of this wider evaluation, CFE Research sub-contracted FFT Education Datalab to carry out a quasi-experimental impact evaluation based on administrative data for cohorts 1 - 4.

This is the Technical Annexe for the evaluation. There are 2 other outputs from this evaluation. The evaluation findings can be found in the Evaluation of 2021 Reformed National Professional Qualifications: Final Report. The full details and findings from the Impact Analysis is also available.

The 2021 reformed NPQs

The 2021 reformed NPQs were part of a wider set of teacher development reforms implemented by a previous government. A new suite of six qualifications was first delivered in autumn 2021, replacing the previous 2017 NPQ courses and new qualifications were added in 2022 and 2024. Together the reforms created a Continuing Professional Development (CPD) offer based on high-quality evidence underpinning the support, training and development available through the entirety of a teacher's career.

The full suite of qualifications evaluated as part of this study are listed in Table 1.[2] The reformed Leadership NPQs (LNPQ) courses were typically delivered over 18 months, while the study of Specialist NPQs (SNPQ) typically lasted for 12 months. Each qualification was underpinned by a content framework that sets out what participants should know, and know how to do, after completing an NPQ.

[1] The impact analysis included all NPQ participants in cohorts 1 – 4 regardless of funding.
[2] NPQ for SENCOs began delivery in autumn 2024. It does not form part of this evaluation as it is being evaluated separately.

Table 1: Suite of NPQs covered in the evaluation including their purpose and launch date

Type	Name	Purpose	Date launched
LNPQ	Executive Leadership (NPQEL)	Develop the expertise needed to become an outstanding executive leader, leading change and establishing supportive networks to drive improvement across a group of schools or multi-academy trusts	Autumn 2021
LNPQ	Headship (NPQH)	Develop the knowledge that underpins expert school leadership and apply it to become outstanding headteachers	Autumn 2021
LNPQ	Senior Leadership (NPQSL)	Develop their leadership knowledge and expertise to improve outcomes for teachers and pupils in their school	Autumn 2021
LNPQ	Early Years Leadership (NPQEYL)	Develop their leadership knowledge and skills to improve delivery of high-quality early education and care as well as staff development, while also implementing improvements in their setting	Autumn 2022
SNPQ	Leading Teaching (NPQLT)	Learn how to lead the teaching and learning of a subject, year group or phase	Autumn 2021
SNPQ	Leading Behaviour and Culture (NPQLBC)	Learn how to create a culture of good behaviour and high expectations in which staff and pupils can thrive	Autumn 2021
SNPQ	Leading Teacher Development (NPQLTD)	Learn how to become a teacher educator and successfully support teachers in their school to expand their skills	Autumn 2021
SNPQ	Leading Literacy (NPQLL)	Learn how to develop literacy across their school and recognise the importance of literacy for pupils' academic achievement, well-being and success in life	Autumn 2022
SNPQ	Leading Primary Mathematics (NPQLPM)	Learn how to embed mastery approaches to teaching maths and how to lead their school to teach maths effectively, working collaboratively with senior leaders and teachers	Spring 2024[3]

Alongside the NPQH the Department also introduced in 2021 a support offer specifically aimed at new headteachers. This offer was based on the NPQH framework, enabling headteachers to apply the best evidence, knowledge and skills in their own context. For those starting their course in the academic year 2021/22, this offer was branded as the Additional Support Offer (ASO) and was available to headteachers who had been in the role for less than two years. In April 2022, the offer was rebranded as the Early Headship Coaching Offer (EHCO), and eligibility was expanded from the first two years to the first five years in headship.

The Department originally contracted nine lead providers to deliver the reformed NPQs in different regions across the country to ensure that professionals at all levels could access the qualifications regardless of their location. An additional provider was contracted to offer NPQs, resulting in ten providers for Cohort 3.[4] Not all providers delivered all NPQs that were evaluated as part of this contract. Between autumn 2021 and spring 2024, providers delivered two cohorts of courses during each academic year, namely in autumn and spring. NPQ providers were subject to a quality assurance mechanism through an Ofsted inspection to ensure that they offered the best support and development for participants and their settings.

Since autumn 2021, fully funded scholarships were available to NPQ participants working in state-funded educational settings. Scholarships between the academic years 2021/22 and 2023/24 were funded through the government's education recovery programme. Since 2024/25, scholarship funding for NPQs has been targeted towards teachers and leaders in the most disadvantaged schools and 16-19 institutions, in line with the department's strategic priorities.

The reformed NPQs were designed to achieve a range of benefits for both participants and schools as outlined in the reformed NPQ Theory of Change (see appendix 1). Intended outcomes for participants included enhanced career progression, improved confidence, competence, knowledge and skills, and increased job satisfaction. Intended outcomes for settings included increased staff retention and pupil attainment along with improvements in culture.

A review of the NPQ suite was announced in January 2025. The review is due to conclude in 2027.

[3] Participants from Cohort 6 NPQLPM only included in the evaluation.

[4] For Cohorts 1 and 2 there were nine providers, which increased to ten for Cohort 3. From Cohort 4 onwards, one of the providers ceased to operate and their future delivery was subsumed by the newest provider, meaning that there was a return to nine lead providers delivering the NPQ frameworks during the evaluation.

Chapter 2: Methods selection

CFE implemented a mixed-methods approach for the process and impact evaluation. The approach was designed to explore participants' motivations and experiences of applying for and undertaking an NPQ, as well as assessing any impact. The outcomes and impacts summarised in the Theory of Change (ToC) (see Appendix 1: NPQ Theory of Change for the 2021 reformed NPQs) guided the design of the evaluation and research instruments.

The process evaluation aimed to explore what worked well to support improvement in delivery and development of future qualifications.

The impact evaluation aimed to understand whether NPQs improve the confidence and competences of participants and the retention and career progression of participants. Impact was considered in two ways:

1) through participants' self-reported evidence collected from interviews and surveys with NPQ participants

2) through analysis of administrative data

The evaluation included the following methods:

- participant surveys at three sampling points - Sampling Point A (SPA), (when participants first started their NPQ), SPB (when participants successfully completed their NPQ) and SPC (12 months after completing their NPQ[5,6])
- a setting survey with colleagues of NPQ participants
- 416 depth interviews (process and impact) with a range of stakeholders including participants, colleagues and providers
- 24 comparator depth interviews with schools not undertaking NPQs
- analysis of administrative data to understand the impact of the programme utilising quasi-experimental methods. Matched comparison groups were created using nearest neighbour matching based on propensity scores and regression models were used to compare the outcomes of the intervention and comparison groups

For the purpose of this evaluation and reporting, reference is made to 'cohorts'. Cohorts refer to the groups of participants and when they started their qualification (Table 2).

[5] Due to the timings of the evaluation, the SPC Cohort 4 survey for LNPQ participants was disseminated earlier at 8 months.
[6] Cohort 6 NPQLPM participants did not receive the SPC survey due to the fieldwork timings.

Table 2: Cohort start and end dates for SNPQs and LNPQs

Cohort	NPQ start date	SNPQ end date	LNPQ end date
Cohort 1 (C1)	November 2021	February 2023	August 2023
Cohort 2 (C2)	February 2022	May 2023	November 2023
Cohort 3 (C3)	October 2022	January 2024	July 2024
Cohort 4 (C4)	February 2023	May 2024	November 2024
Cohort 5 (C5)	September 2023	December 2024	June 2025
Cohort 6 (C6)[7]	February 2024	April 2025	N/A[8]

[7] NPQLPM was the only Cohort 6 NPQ included in this evaluation.
[8] LNPQs were available to Cohort 6 participants but were not included in this evaluation.

Chapter 3: Sampling

This chapter describes the sampling approach for the evaluation. Information about how and when the fieldwork was undertaken as well as the response numbers for the surveys and interviews are covered in later sections.

NPQ participant surveys

The participant surveys were sent to all eligible participants who took part in the NPQs (within selected cohorts). Table 3 outlines which cohorts and NPQs were included in the evaluation across SPA, SPB and SPC. The SPC survey could not be disseminated to NPQLPM within the timeframe for the evaluation.

Table 3: Cohorts and NPQs included in the SPA, SPB and SPC surveys

Cohort	NPQ	
	LNPQ	SNPQ
2	EL, H, SL	LT, LTD, LBC
3	EL, H, SL, EYL	LT, LTD, LBC, LL
4	EL, H, EYL	LT, LTD, LBC, LL
6 (SPA and SPB only)	N/A	LPM

A census approach to sampling was undertaken to ensure a large sample of participants could be surveyed in a cost-effective manner. Previous NPQ evaluations CFE have undertaken demonstrated that large, statistically robust samples can be achieved from online census methods.

The samples for the NPQ participant surveys were taken from data in the Teachers' CPD Service platform with a focus on DfE-funded participants only. All records held a direct email address for participants.

The SPA survey was emailed to all those undertaking selected NPQs in Cohorts 2, 3, 4 and 6 (this was to balance research burden with gaining a large enough sample for analysis). The original design was based on surveying all SNPQ participants at Cohort 2, 3 and 4 – this was to reflect them being new qualifications and to explore how these were experienced across different academic years by different groups of participants. For LNPQ participants undertaking the qualifications that were based on the 2017 reformed NPQs (NPQEL, NPQH and NPQSL) the original design was to survey them in Cohort 2 and 3 only. Due to the lower number of participants than anticipated undertaking NPQEL and NPQH this was expanded to Cohort 4. NPQEYL and NPQLL launched later than the other qualifications so both were included in Cohort 4 and 5. In addition, NPQLPM launched in Cohort 6. As the evaluation was due to end as planned, only one cohort

could be surveyed. See Table 1 for more details about the NPQs included in this evaluation.

The SPB survey was emailed to all those who had been registered by providers in the Teachers' CPD Service platform as 'completed' for the same selected NPQs in Cohorts 2, 3, 4 and 6.

The SPC survey was emailed 12 months after completion to the same sample as the SPB survey (with the exception of Cohort 6 as that could not be undertaken in the timescales of the evaluation).

The sample of NPQ participants who responded to the three surveys was self-selecting and could be biased towards those with more positive (or negative) experiences of taking part in the NPQs. Therefore, caution should be applied when interpreting the findings.

Colleague survey

A sample frame was created from those NPQ participants who agreed in their response to the SPB survey to forward their colleagues an online survey link. This was a self-selecting sample of NPQ participants who agreed to forward the survey and their respective colleagues who agreed to answer it. Therefore, it could be biased towards NPQ participants who had more positive (or negative) experiences of taking part in the NPQs and colleagues who had more positive (or negative) perceptions of the impact of the NPQs on their setting.

Qualitative interviews

The qualitative interviews aimed to capture a depth of understanding and were not designed to be statistically representative.

Process interviews

Over the course of the evaluation, in-depth interviews were conducted with NPQ participants in Cohorts 1, 3, 5 and 6[9] and wider stakeholders. The sample frame for Cohort 3 and Cohort 6 NPQ participant interviews comprised participants who responded to the SPA or SPB survey and indicated they were willing to participate in a follow-up interview. Cohort 1 and Cohort 5 interviewees (for whom there were no NPQ participant surveys) were recruited directly via the Teachers' CPD Service platform data which lists all NPQ participants who have started their NPQ (for Round 1 interviews) and completed their NPQ (for Round 2 interviews).

[9] Cohorts 2 and 4 were not included in the interviews to make the best use of the target number of interviews and to see if changes had been implemented between qualification launch and later cohorts.

For the six NPQs that launched in November 2021, process learning interviews took place with Cohort 1 and Cohort 3 participants. This allowed one year between the interviews to enable the findings from Cohort 1 to be shared with DfE and providers and for any changes to the delivery of NPQs to be implemented before participants from the same qualifications were interviewed in Cohort 3. This approach also enabled DfE to identify the effect of any changes. The same approach was taken for the two qualifications that launched in Cohort 3 (NPQEYL and NPQLL). Due to limited time available in the evaluation NPQLPM participants were only interviewed at Cohort 6.

Individuals were randomly selected within quotas to ensure a spread of NPQ participants. Quotas were set for:

- Cohort: interviews were spread across Cohort 1, 3, 5 and 6: to examine if there were differences as the qualifications progressed
- NPQ: all NPQs were covered to ensure a spread across the whole suite of qualifications. A higher number of interviews were undertaken with NPQEYL participants split by school-based provider (SBP) and group-based provider (GBP) to explore any differences by those two groups of participants
- Phase: a mix of phases were included to examine how the qualification was experienced by those in different settings
- Provider: participants from all providers were included to ensure findings were not skewed by only including those from certain providers

Process interviews also took place with 30 representatives of settings (e.g. headteachers and senior leaders). These representatives were recruited via NPQ participant surveys, participant interviews or via participants in the Teachers' CPD Service platform data. In all these instances NPQ participants were asked if they were willing to share an invite email with their colleagues. In addition, a recall question was added into the colleague survey where they were asked if they were willing to take part in an interview. Quotas were set for cohort and setting phase for the reasons outlined above. Setting interviews covered multiple NPQs and providers but no quotas were set.

Process interviews were also conducted with wider stakeholders. These included:

- lead NPQ providers – all ten were included in the sample and were all invited to participate
- Ofsted and DfE representatives – the sample was based on contacts proposed by DfE
- ten EHCO coaches - (recruited directly via the providers. EHCO coaches were able to comment on their experience of supporting multiple participants and the interviews covered impact questions as well as process questions

The timings of the process learning interviews are outlined in Table 7 and the breakdown of them by type, cohort and NPQ are shown in Table 12 (round 1) and Table 13 (round 2).

Impact interviews

The sample frame for impact interviews comprised NPQ participants who responded to the SPB or SPC surveys and indicated they were willing to participate in a follow-up interview. Individuals were randomly selected within certain quotas to ensure a spread of NPQ participants.

Quotas were set for: NPQ undertaken, setting phase and provider (as above). In addition, quotas were set for cohort: for SNPQ and NPQEYL participants these were spread across Cohorts 2, 3, 4 and 6 (as applicable – again to reflect the new nature of the qualifications and the expectation that these may change in the early stages of delivery) whereas the remaining LNPQ participants were interviewed at Cohort 2 only due to these being existing qualifications.

Impact interviews were also conducted with 37 representatives from settings. The sample frame for these was developed in the same way as the process interviews.

The timings of the impact interviews are outlined in Table 8 and the breakdown of them by type, cohort and NPQ are shown in Table 14 (SPB), and Table 15 (SPC).

Comparator interviews

Almost 4,500 schools[10] with no current NPQ participants and where no one had undertaken a 2017 reformed NPQ were emailed and invited to participate in a comparator interview. Schools were then randomly selected from the list within certain categories to try to obtain a spread of geographical regions of England and school size. For each school selected, a telephone number was sourced from publicly available data so the school could be approached to arrange the interview.

Recruiting schools and teachers to participate in the comparator interviews was challenging particularly because the recruitment was undertaken during the summer term when schools have busy schedules. Extensive recruitment by both email and phone was necessary to achieve the total interviews conducted.

[10] Only schools were included in the comparator survey. It proved impossible from the MI data available to identify private, voluntary or independent settings where none of the staff were undertaking a NPQ, hence these settings could not be included in a sample frame.

Chapter 4: Research instrument development and coverage

This chapter outlines how the survey questionnaires and discussion guides were developed and the topics covered. The timing and dissemination of the different fieldwork elements is covered in chapter 5.

Online surveys

Online surveys were used in the evaluation to understand awareness of the NPQ reforms, decision making around choosing and applying for an NPQ, experience of delivery, and perceptions of impact.

The questionnaires were initially developed in collaboration with relevant teams at DfE. and built on previous cognitively tested surveys from earlier evaluations of the NPQs. The 2021 evaluation questionnaires were then refined in response to feedback from DfE before going live.

All the surveys mainly consisted of pre-coded questions, including dichotomous, multiple choice and Likert scales, and were routed to ensure that respondents were only asked relevant questions and/or questions related to their previous responses. The advantage of this approach is that only one survey needed to be designed for each sampling point.

Where necessary, the order of the question response options were randomised to account for response bias including leading-question, primacy and recency effects. Open response questions were kept to a minimum to reduce the length of the surveys; however, ‘other’ options were available to allow respondents to specify a response when a suitable pre-coded answer to a single or multiple response question was not provided.

NPQ participant surveys

Table 4 summarises the topics covered in each of the NPQ participant surveys and any variations in the questions covered for each NPQ.

Table 4: Topics covered in the NPQ participant surveys and any differences by NPQ

Topic	SPA	SPB	SPC
Current role and role undertaken before starting NPQ	Yes	Yes	Yes
Current setting type and setting type before starting NPQ	No	NPQEYL only	NPQEYL only
Mastery for maths experience	NPQLPM only	No	No
Future intentions for those not in role for the NPQ they studied	No	No	Yes
Motivations for undertaking NPQ	Yes	No	No
Experience of selecting NPQ and provider	Yes	No	No
Experience of applying for NPQ	Yes	No	No
Views about NPQ funding	Yes	No	No
Experience of NPQ	No	Yes	Yes
Experience of enhanced headship coaching offer (EHCO)	NPQH only	NPQH only	NPQH only
Views about readiness for the role for which they studied	No	Yes	Yes
Development of skills	No	Yes	Yes
Impact of NPQ on setting related to competency framework	No	No	Yes
Wider impacts	No	Yes	Yes
Views about CPD and progression	Yes	Yes	Yes
Willingness to participate in an interview about their experience	Yes	Yes	Yes
Willingness to invite colleagues to provide their views about NPQ and participant's impact on setting via survey or interview	No	Yes	Yes

The following changes were made to the questionnaires between sampling points or cohorts:

- the list of roles for participants to select from was shortened in the SPB and SPC questionnaires to make the surveys easier to complete
- a number of specific questions were added to the Cohort 3 and 4 SPA surveys for NPQEYL participants after this NPQ was added to the scope of the evaluation. Questions about Targeted Support Funding[11] were also added
- for the Cohort 3 and Cohort 4 SPB survey additional response options were added to the question on any additional responsibilities that participants had taken on since completing their NPQ[12]
- EHCO coaching eligibility changed during the evaluation and so the routing criteria for this question was amended to reflect this change in the Cohort 3 and Cohort 4 SPB survey
- a number of specific questions were added to the Cohort 6 SPA and SPB questionnaire for NPQLPM participants after this NPQ was added to the scope of the evaluation

Those who studied NPQEYL were asked to comment on their 'early years setting' rather than their school, reflecting the diverse nature of their workplaces. Throughout the main report the term 'setting' is used collectively across all NPQs; however, those undertaking non-NPQEYL qualifications were asked about the school in which they worked.

In the SPB and SPC questionnaires participants were asked to rate themselves against various competencies. In the main report the descriptions have been shortened. The full list of competencies with exact wording as used in the SPB and SPC questionnaires is listed in Appendix 2: Competencies measured in the SPB survey. The statements in the questionnaires were adapted from the published NPQ competency frameworks[13].

NPQ participants were surveyed at the baseline (Sampling Point A (SPA), when participants first started their NPQ), and at two subsequent sampling points: SPB (when participants successfully completed their NPQ) and SPC (12 months after completing their NPQ[14]). These surveys produced self-reported measures of impact from the view of the participant.

[11] Extra financial grants available to smaller schools and 16-to-19 settings in the 2022 to 2023 and 2023 to 2024 academic years (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/targeted-support-funding-for-national-professional-qualifications).
[12] Survey question: What additional responsibilities have you assumed? Additional options were: 'Mentoring or coaching of early career teachers', 'Mentoring or coaching of colleagues in your school (excluding early career teachers) {if NPQ Code=4 school should read school or early years setting}', 'Leading staff wellbeing', 'Head of year', 'Key stage/phase leadership', and 'Room leader in an early years setting'.
[13] National professional qualifications frameworks - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk).
[14] Due to the timings of the evaluation, the SPC Cohort 4 survey for LNPQ participants was disseminated earlier at 8 months.

The questionnaires included a number of outcome and impact measures. For the measures focused on confidence and skills development, participants were asked paired statements in the SPB survey only where they rated themselves when completing the qualification and retrospectively on starting the qualification. These questions were not asked in the SPA survey, as previous evaluations of the NPQs (and wider research studies) indicate that individuals often overestimate their skills and abilities before taking part in continuing professional development (CPD). People assess their own skill levels by comparing themselves to others – the 'others' often being those who make up their peer group.[15] Individuals therefore commonly overestimate their abilities. Following exposure to different individuals, CPD and training, and/or a new work environment, they may realise they are less competent at something than they originally thought (response shift bias). This can lead to individuals reporting lower skill levels than previously, as their awareness and understanding of a task has increased. Although retrospective test measures help to overcome this, they are reliant on participants' recalling their skills and abilities before the intervention – in this instance, the NPQ (recall bias). Therefore, the findings from these questions provide an indication on perceived changes in confidence and skills but are subject to limitations associated with retrospective self-reported measures.

For outcome and impact measures which rely on an individual accurately recalling how they would rate something at the time (e.g. job satisfaction, intentions to stay in the teaching profession) or those based on their knowledge at that time point (e.g. knowledge of career pathways), the question is asked in the SPA and SPB survey. Analysis was then only undertaken on a longitudinal dataset where individuals responded to both surveys. Within the main report this analysis is highlighted as 'longitudinal'.

Colleague survey

The online colleague survey was designed to capture the views of NPQ participants' colleagues, including their line manager, senior colleagues, peers and line reports. The survey provided an important mechanism to triangulate findings about participants' self-reported outcomes on their own development and in their setting (as outlined in the Theory of Change).

The colleague questionnaire included a detailed set of questions for line managers and senior colleagues to reflect on participants' knowledge, skills and competencies following their completion of the NPQ, as well as teachers' motivations for undertaking NPQs and support provided at the setting level. Other staff were asked to respond to a narrower set of sub-questions about their perceptions of the impact on their setting of their colleagues undertaking the NPQ.

[15] Alicke, Mark D.; Olesya Govorun (2005). "The Better-Than-Average Effect". In Mark D. Alicke, David A. Dunning, Joachim I. Krueger. *The Self in Social Judgment. Studies in Self and Identity*. Psychology Press. pp.85–106.

Depth interviews

Depth interviews were undertaken to explore the different experiences of the 2021 NPQs from the perspectives of participants, providers, DfE, Ofsted, settings, colleagues, and ECHO coaches. For each type of interview, topic guides were developed based on the Theory of Change and (where applicable) responses to the relevant surveys. The topic guides were reviewed by DfE and adapted in response to the feedback received.

Process learning interviews

The process learning interviews with participants took place at two stages for each cohort.[16] The first took place in the first few months of participants starting their NPQ in order to focus on their motivations for pursuing an NPQ, the application process, and any early experiences. Upon completing their NPQ, participants were asked about their experiences of the qualification and the assessment process.[17]

The purpose of the process interviews with wider stakeholders (at two stages like the participant interviews) was to triangulate the findings from the surveys and interviews with participants. The interviews with EHCO coaches did not align to a specific cohort and covered both process learning and impact questions.

The timings of the process learning interviews are outlined in Table 7 and the breakdown of them by type, cohort and NPQ are shown in Table 12 (round 1) and Table 13 (round 2).

Impact interviews

Targeted impact interviews with 72 NPQ participant survey respondents were conducted following either the SPB (n=40) and SPC surveys (n=32). These interviews added qualitative depth to the survey data by exploring the self-reported outcomes and impacts perceived to be achieved as a result of the NPQs, and how participants have applied their learning in practice.

Impact interviews were also undertaken with 37 line managers/colleagues of participants (21 at the SPB stage and 16 at the SPC stage) and ten EHCO coaches (as described above)[18] to triangulate the findings from participants.

The timings of the impact interviews are outlined in Table 8 and the breakdown of them by type, cohort and NPQ are shown in Table 14 (SPB), and Table 15 (SPC).

[16] Cohorts 1, 3, 5 and 6
[17] Interviews were conducted at these intervals to identify any changes implemented in the delivery of NPQs between their launch and later in the evaluation.
[18] The same EHCO coaches with which process interviews were undertaken.

Comparator interviews

Depth interviews were undertaken with 24 teachers or senior leaders who were currently employed in schools[19] where no-one was undertaking an NPQ or had not undertaken a 2017 reformed NPQ. These interviews sought to understand interviewees' awareness of NPQs and reasons for not undertaking them as well as explore the continuous professional development (CPD) opportunities available and the impacts of these on individuals' confidence, leadership and teaching. These were designed to enable comparison to the NPQ impact interviews to assess differences in short-term outcomes and impacts not explored through the secondary data analysis.

[19] Only schools were included in the comparator survey. It proved impossible from the MI data available to identify private, voluntary or independent settings where none of the staff were undertaking a NPQ, hence these settings could not be included in a sample frame.

Chapter 5: Fieldwork

This chapter describes when and how the surveys were distributed and the timing and recruitment for the qualitative interviews. Detailed response numbers are covered in Chapter 6.

Survey timings

Table 5 outlines which cohorts and NPQs were included in the evaluation across the SPA, SPB and SPC surveys. Due to the timings for the evaluation the SPC survey could not be disseminated to NPQLPM. Details of how the surveys were disseminated are in the following section.

Table 5: Cohorts and NPQs included in the SPA, SPB and SPC surveys

Cohort	NPQ	
	LNPQ	**SNPQ**
2	EL, H, SL	LT, LTD, LBC
3	EL, H, SL, EYL	LT, LTD, LBC, LL
4	EL, H, EYL	LT, LTD, LBC, LL
6 (SPA and SPB only)[20]	LPM	LPM

The fieldwork timings for the NPQ participant surveys are outlined in Table 6.

[20] NPQLPM was the only Cohort 6 NPQ included in this evaluation.

Table 6: Fieldwork timings of the NPQ participant and colleague surveys

Cohort	NPQ type	Participant survey SPA	Participant survey SPB	Participant survey SPC	Colleague survey
Cohort 2	SNPQ	26th May to 17th June 2022	30th June to 29th September 2023	20th September to 8th November 2024*	14th September to 20th October 2023
Cohort 2	LNPQ	26th May to 17th June 2022	1st March to 28th May 2024	15th January to 7th March 2025	19th April to 21st May 2024
Cohort 3	SNPQ	11th January to 10th March 2023	10th July to 27th September 2024*	25th February to 28th March 2025	18th November to 20th December 2024
Cohort 3	LNPQ	11th January to 10th March 2023	14th October to 22nd November 2024	16th September to 17th October 2025	3rd December to 20th December 2024
Cohort 4	SNPQ	25th April to 28th July 2023	18th September to 8th November 2024	4th June to 19th September 2025	18th November to 20th December 2024
Cohort 4	LNPQ	25th April to 28th July 2023	11th March to 9th May 2025	16th September to 17th October 2025*	14th May to 30th June 2025
Cohort 6 [21]	NPQLPM only	10th May to 27th September 2024*	16th June to 19th September 2025	N/A	N/A

* The launch of this survey was delayed in accordance with pre-election rules due to the general election on 4th July 2024 which prohibited the dissemination of the survey as originally planned.

[21] NPQLPM was the only Cohort 6 NPQ included in this evaluation.

Survey dissemination

SPA survey

Within the first few months of the relevant NPQ programmes starting, this survey was emailed to eligible participants identified through Teachers' CPD Service platform data as having undertaken an NPQ in the selected cohorts. All participants had a direct email address in the data. Up to three reminder emails were sent to participants during the fieldwork period.[22]

SPB survey

This survey was emailed to participants identified through Teachers' CPD Service platform data approximately two months after they had completed[23] their NPQ. In addition to emailing these participants at the address listed on the Teachers' CPD Service platform, participants were also contacted via:

- a personal (non-school/setting) email address if provided at the end of the SPA survey. This meant the follow-up surveys could be received even if participants had moved to a different employer and changed their work email address. This helped increase the number of longitudinal responses received
- text message if they had provided a mobile number in the SPA survey

Up to five reminder emails were sent to participants during the fieldwork period.[21]

SPC survey

The survey was emailed to the same sample (excluding NPQLPM participants due to the evaluation's timeframe[24]) using the same methods as the SPB survey around 12 months[25] after participants successfully completed their NPQ. Up to five reminder emails were sent to participants during the fieldwork period.[21]

Colleague survey

The survey link and supporting invitation email text was emailed to NPQ participants who indicated in their response to the SPB survey that they would be willing to forward the

[22] The number of reminders sent depended on the response rates achieved and timing of the surveys around school holidays.
[23] As registered by providers in the Teachers' CPD Service platform as 'completed'.
[24] The 12-month period following completion of the Cohort 6 NPQLPM was outside the evaluation fieldwork period.
[25] Due to the timings of the evaluation, the SPC Cohort 4 survey for LNPQ participants was disseminated earlier at 8 months.

survey to their colleagues. One reminder was sent to NPQ participants regarding this survey.

Interview timings and recruitment

The timings of the interviews conducted and how interviewees were recruited are outlined in this section. Interviews were conducted via Teams or telephone depending on interviewees' preference. The interviews were recorded (where interviewees agreed) and transcribed for analysis.[26]

Process learning and impact interviews

Up to three email invitations were sent to contacts for the interviews.[27] Table 7 and Table 8 outline the time periods in which the interviews were conducted. The profile of these interviewees is outlined in the next section. While individual interviews were conducted with participants and representatives from their settings, the interviews with Ofsted, DfE and providers were typically conducted with two (or in some cases three) representatives, forming a paired or triad interview.

Table 7: Fieldwork timings of the NPQ process interviews

Cohort	NPQ type	Process learning interviews Round 1	Process learning interviews Round 2
Cohort 1	SNPQ	May to July 2022	March to June 2023
Cohort 1	LNPQ	May to July 2022	October to November 2023
Cohort 3	SNPQ	December to March 2023	April to October 2024*
Cohort 3	LNPQ	December to March 2023	October to November 2024
Cohort 5	SNPQ	January to February 2024	March to April 2025
Cohort 5	LNPQ	January to February 2024	September to October 2025
Cohort 6[28]	NPQLPM only	May to July 2024*	June to July 2025

* These interviews were delayed as in accordance with pre-election rules due to the general election on 4th July 2024 which prohibited recruitment when it was originally anticipated.

[26] Where interviewees declined to be recorded, the interviewer took notes during the interview for analysis purposes.
[27] The number of invitations sent depended on the response rates achieved and timing of the interviews around school holidays.
[28] NPQLPM was the only Cohort 6 NPQ included in this evaluation.

Table 8: Fieldwork timings of the NPQ impact interviews

Cohort	NPQ type	Participants at SPB	Colleagues at SPB	Participants at SPC	Colleagues at SPC
Cohort 2	SNPQ	July 2023	December 2023	September to November 2024*	October to December 2024*
Cohort 2	LNPQ	February to March 2024	March to April 2024	February to March 2025	March to April 2025
Cohort 3	SNPQ	September to October 2024*	October 2024*	April to May 2025	April to May 2025
Cohort 3	LNPQ	October to November 2024	November 2024	September to October 2025	October to November 2025
Cohort 4	SNPQ	October to November 2024*	November to December 2024	June to July 2025	July to October 2025
Cohort 4	LNPQ	March to April 2025	April to May 2025	September to October 2025**	September to October 2025**
Cohort 6 [29]	NPQLPM only	June to July 2025	June to July 2025	N/A***	N/A***

* These interviews were delayed as in accordance with pre-election rules due to the general election on 4th July 2024 which prohibited recruitment when it was originally anticipated

** Timing of interviews brought forward so they could be included in the evaluation.

*** These interviews were not included in the scope of the evaluation.

Comparator interviews

Depth interviews were undertaken in June and July 2023 with teachers and senior leaders who were currently employed in schools[30] where no-one was undertaking an NPQ or had not undertaken a 2017 reformed NPQ.

[29] NPQLPM was the only Cohort 6 NPQ included in this evaluation.

[30] Only schools were included in the comparator survey. It proved impossible from the MI data available to identify private, voluntary or independent settings where none of the staff were undertaking a NPQ, hence these settings could not be included in a sample frame.

Chapter 6: Response rates and respondent profile

Online surveys

A total of 9,068 responses to the SPA survey were received, which represents a response rate of 21% (Table 9).

Table 9: Number of survey completions at SPA by qualification

Qualification name	Number of participants SPA survey sent to	Number of SPA completions	SPA survey response rate
NPQ for Executive Leadership	1,655	368	22%
NPQ for Headship	5,577	1,104	20%
NPQ for Senior Leadership	9,047	1,919	21%
NPQ for Early Years Leadership	2,852	668	23%
NPQ for Leading Teaching	10,115	2,004	20%
NPQ for Leading Teacher Development	4,611	1,101	24%
NPQ for Leading Behaviour and Culture	5,460	1,058	19%
NPQ for Leading Literacy	2,848	635	22%
NPQ for Leading Primary Maths	1,209	211	17%
Total	43,374	9,068	21%

Source: SPA participant survey.

A total of 4,385 responses to the SPB survey were received, which represents a response rate of 13% (Table 10). In total 2,314 respondents completed both the SPA and SPB survey, forming a longitudinal sample with a response rate of 7%.

Table 10: Number of survey completions at SPB by qualification

Qualification name	Number of participants SPB survey sent to	Number of SPB completions	SPB survey response rate	Number of longitudinal survey completions	SPB longitudinal response rate of total sample
NPQ for Executive Leadership	1,055	190	18%	94	9%
NPQ for Headship	4,448	577	13%	292	7%
NPQ for Senior Leadership	6,767	959	14%	499	7%
NPQ for Early Years Leadership	2,211	312	14%	177	8%
NPQ for Leading Teaching	8,367	896	11%	474	6%
NPQ for Leading Teacher Development	3,756	556	15%	318	8%
NPQ for Leading Behaviour and Culture	4,223	445	11%	222	5%
NPQ for Leading Literacy	2,413	304	13%	169	7%
NPQ for Leading Primary Maths	989	146	15%	69	7%
Total	34,229	4,385	13%	2,314	7%

Source: SPB participant survey.

A total of 2,188 responses to the SPC survey were received, which represents a response rate of 7% (Table 11). In total 1,115 respondents completed both the SPA and SPC survey, forming a longitudinal sample with a response rate of 3%.

Table 11: Number of survey completions at SPC by qualification

Qualification name	Number of participants SPC survey sent to	Number of SPC completions	SPC survey response rate	Number of longitudinal survey completions	SPC longitudinal response rate of total sample
NPQ for Executive Leadership	1,055	117	11%	49	5%
NPQ for Headship	4,448	372	8%	174	4%
NPQ for Senior Leadership	6,767	466	7%	227	3%
NPQ for Early Years Leadership	2,211	207	9%	111	5%
NPQ for Leading Teaching	8,367	388	5%	209	2%
NPQ for Leading Teacher Development	3,756	259	7%	151	4%
NPQ for Leading Behaviour and Culture	4,223	211	5%	97	2%
NPQ for Leading Literacy	2,413	168	7%	97	4%
Total	33,240	2,188	7%	1,115	3%

Source: SPC participant survey.

Participant survey representativeness

At SPA, SPB and SPC the survey responses were generally representative of the wider population across key demographic and setting characteristics and weighting was not applied. A breakdown of participant survey responses compared with the survey samples for key characteristics is included in Appendix 3: Profile of NPQ participant survey respondents compared to the sample. There were a few minor differences between the survey samples and the wider population, but these were not large enough to raise any concerns about the analysis:

- at SPB a better response rate was achieved at Cohort 2[31] than Cohorts 3 and 4, which means the former cohort was slightly over-represented in the sample[32]
- at SPB and SPC a slightly higher proportion of senior leaders than classroom teachers or those in other roles responded to the surveys.[33] However, this could be explained by these survey categories not matching exactly with those in the SWC[34]

Although survey responses at all three sampling points were broadly representative of the wider population, caution should be applied when interpreting the results as the achieved samples may not fully reflect all participants that undertook an NPQ. The relatively low response rates[35] mean that non-response bias remains a potential concern. In particular, it is not possible to determine whether those who chose to respond differ systematically from those who did not on unobserved characteristics that may be relevant to the outcomes being examined.

A sub-set of the survey questions at SPB and SPC were posed to NPQH participants eligible for EHCO. Only 133 respondents were routed to these questions at SPB and 110 at SPC. Caution should be applied when reviewing these results as it is unlikely that these will be representative of all participants eligible for EHCO.

[31] It should be noted that NPQ delivery for Cohort 2 began during the final COVID-19 lockdown. However, it was not possible to determine whether any differences in responses from this cohort were attributable to the pandemic or to other factors.
[32] C2 participants represented 29% of the SPB sample but 38% of the survey responses whereas C3 participants represented 47% of the sample and 42% of the responses and C4 participants represented 21% of the sample and 17% of the responses.
[33] Senior leaders represented 16% of the SPB sample but 23% of survey responses and 16% of the SPC sample but 25% of survey responses; classroom teachers and those in other roles represented 79% of the SPB sample but 70% of the survey responses and 78% of the SPC sample but 67% of the survey responses.
[34] The categories of ‘deputy headteacher/principal’ and ‘assistant headteacher/principal’ categories in the School Workforce Census (SWC) were combined in the ‘senior leader’ category to reflect the SPB and SPC questions. The ‘other’ category included any roles other than ‘senior leader’, ‘headteacher/principal’, and ‘executive headteacher/CEO’.
[35] Responses to the SPC survey reflected less than 10% of the sample and the longitudinal SPB sample represented 7% of the population, and the SPC sample represented 3%.

Colleague survey

The colleague survey link was sent to 466 NPQ survey respondents across Cohort 2, 3 and 4 to pass onto their colleagues. In total, 200respondents completed the colleague survey[36] which linked to 107 individual NPQ participants (23% of NPQ participants to which the survey link was sent for sharing with their colleagues). The responses will not be representative of all line managers or colleagues of participants as the approach relied on NPQ survey participants forwarding this survey to their colleagues and colleagues self-selecting whether to answer the survey. Colleagues who did respond may have had a more positive experience of the NPQ. Therefore, there is potential for bias, so the findings should be considered as indicative and treated with caution.

Of the total colleague survey responses, 86 were line managers or senior colleagues of participants. Given this low sample size, findings relating to questions only posed to line managers or senior colleagues are reported as counts and not percentages.

Depth interviews

For interviews with NPQ participants and their colleagues or representatives from their setting, there was a target per NPQ covered in the interviews for each cohort to ensure a variety of perspectives regarding each were explored (see sampling for more detail on the quotas).

All the quotas were met. The number of interviews conducted with participants, their colleagues, and representatives of settings enabled the key interview topics to be covered extensively.

For the interviews with stakeholders, the aim was to interview all active NPQ providers[37] and DfE and Ofsted contacts provided by DfE and this was achieved.

In addition, ten interviews covering process and impact questions with EHCO coaches were undertaken. The views of these interviewees were relatively consistent.

Process learning interviews

The following tables list the numbers of process learning interviews[38] that have been completed:

[36] In addition, two responses were received where the participant is not identified. These responses have been included in the results.
[37] For Cohorts 1 and 2 there were nine providers, which increased to ten for Cohort 3. From Cohort 4 onwards, there were nine providers.
[38] For provider, Ofsted and DfE interviews, these were typically conducted with two (or in some cases three) representatives, forming a paired interview.

Table 12: Breakdown of Round 1 (start of NPQ) process learning interviews

		Cohort 1	Cohort 3	Cohort 5	Cohort 6[39]
Participants	NPQEL	3	6	N/A	N/A
	NPQH	4	3[40]	N/A	N/A
	NPQSL	1	6	N/A	N/A
	NPQEYL	N/A	14	14	N/A
	NPQLT	8	5	N/A	N/A
	NPQLTD	7	5	N/A	N/A
	NPQLBC	7	4	N/A	N/A
	NPQLL	N/A	7	7	N/A
	NPQLPM	N/A	N/A	N/A	7
	TOTAL	**30**	**50**	**21**	**7**
Representatives from settings	Primary	0	4	1	N/A
	Secondary	4	4	0	N/A
	Early Years setting (school)	N/A	0	1	N/A
	Post-16	1	0	**0**	N/A
	Multi Academy Trust leader[41]	1	0	**0**	N/A
	TOTAL	**6**	**8**	**2**	N/A
Stakeholders	Providers	9	9	N/A	N/A
	DfE	1	1	N/A	N/A

[39] NPQLPM was the only Cohort 6 NPQ included in this evaluation.
[40] Two of these interviewees were also enrolled on EHCO.
[41] The interview was with a leader of a Multi Academy Trust (MAT) with responsibility for multiple schools, both primary and secondary.

Table 13: Breakdown of Round 2 (on completion of NPQ) process learning interviews

		Cohort 1	Cohort 3	Cohort 5	Cohort 6[42]
Participants	NPQEL	5	5	N/A	N/A
	NPQH	5	5	N/A	N/A
	NPQSL	4	5	N/A	N/A
	NPQEYL	N/A	14[43]	14	N/A
	NPQLT	5	5	N/A	N/A
	NPQLTD	6	5	N/A	N/A
	NPQLBC	5	5	N/A	N/A
	NPQLL	N/A	6	7	N/A
	NPQLPM	N/A	N/A	N/A	7
	TOTAL	**30**	**50**	**21**	**7**
Representatives from settings	Primary	1	3	0	N/A
	Secondary	4	3	0	N/A
	All through school	1	1	0	N/A
	Post-16	0	0	1	N/A
	TOTAL	**6**	**7**	**1**	N/A
Stakeholders	Providers	9	8	8	N/A
	DfE	2	1	1	N/A
	Ofsted	1	1	N/A	N/A

Impact interviews

The following tables list the numbers of impact interviews that have been completed. In addition to these, ten interviews were conducted with EHCO coaches[44].

[42] NPQLPM was the only Cohort 6 NPQ included in this evaluation.
[43] NPQEYL interviews were split equally between participants that worked in school-based early years settings (n=7) and group-based provision (n=7).
[44] These interviews did not align to a specific cohort and covered both process learning and impact questions.

Table 14: Breakdown of SPB impact interviews

		Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4	Cohort 6[45]
Participants	NPQEL	4	N/A	N/A	N/A
	NPQH[46]	4	N/A	N/A	N/A
	NPQSL	4	N/A	N/A	N/A
	NPQEYL	N/A	3	3	N/A
	NPQLT	1	2	1	N/A
	NPQLTD	2	1	1	N/A
	NPQLBC	1	1	2	N/A
	NPQLL	N/A	1	1	N/A
	NPQLPM	N/A	N/A	N/A	8
	TOTAL	**16**	**8**	**8**	**8**
Representatives from settings/ colleagues	Primary	2	5	0	3
	Secondary	3	3	0	N/A
	Post-16	2	0	0	N/A
	Pupil Referral Unit (PRU)	0	0	1	N/A
	Special	1	0	1	N/A
	TOTAL	**8**	**8**	**2**	**3**

Table 15: Breakdown of SPC impact interviews

		Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4
Participants	NPQEL	4	N/A	N/A
	NPQH[47]	4	N/A	N/A
	NPQSL	4	N/A	N/A
	NPQEYL	N/A	3	3

[45] NPQLPM was the only Cohort 6 NPQ included in this evaluation.
[46] One interview at NPQH was undertaken with someone who had also accessed EHCO.
[47] One interview at NPQH was undertaken with someone who had also accessed EHCO.

		Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4
	NPQLT	2	1	1
	NPQLTD	1	1	2
	NPQLBC	1	2	1
	NPQLL	N/A	1	1
	TOTAL	**16**	**8**	**8**
Representatives from settings/ colleagues	Primary	2	2	N/A
	Secondary	4	2	1
	Early Years setting (Group-based provider (GBP))	1	1	0
	Early Years setting (School)	N/A	1	0
	Pupil Referral Unit (PRU)	1	0	0
	Special	0	0	1
	TOTAL	**8**	**6**	**2**

Comparator interviews

In total, 24 interviews with 15 headteachers, 5 senior leaders, and 4 teachers were conducted. The majority of these schools (n=20) were primary schools, with the remainder being colleges or alternative provision providers. Secondary schools were not selected for interview as none of them met the sampling criteria (as all had one or more members of staff either undertaking a reformed NPQ or a 2017 NPQ). Therefore, the perspective from staff in secondary schools is not reflected in the comparator findings.

Chapter 7: Analysis

This section outlines the data processing and analysis of the online surveys and depth interviews. The secondary data analysis is described later in this annexe – see Chapter 9: Secondary data analysis approach to the impact analysis.

Online surveys

Participant and colleague survey data processing

The survey data processing included the following steps:

- cleaning the data in the following ways:
    - checking routing had worked as anticipated shortly after surveys were launched
    - undertaking logic checks – e.g. that the number of years someone had worked in the teaching profession was feasible
    - adding a flag to SPB and SPC survey datasets to identify if respondents had previously responded to the SPA and/or SPB surveys in order to identify the longitudinal samples
    - back-coding any 'other' responses which align with existing response options and coding multiple instances of those which do not into new categories
    - coding open response questions into categories
- matching the NPQ participant survey responses to SWC data to merge in data about the participant (to reduce survey length and research burden). The data about participants was accessed by DfE matching the NPQ participants' Teacher Reference Number (TRN) to SWC. The TRN had been provided for all NPQ participants in the MI data DfE shared with CFE from the Teachers' CPD Service platform data.

  The SWC variables used were year of census data, gender, ethnicity, age, and whether they worked full-time or part-time. NPQ participant survey responses at SPA were matched against the SWC return for up to 3 years prior to the starting year of their NPQ for variables which were more likely to change e.g. working full-time or part-time (including returns from: 2019/20, 2020/21, 2021/22, 2022/23, and 2023/24) but earlier returns back to 2010/11 were used for demographic characteristics which were less likely to change e.g. ethnicity. NPQ participants who did not complete the SPA survey but did complete the SPB and/or SPC surveys were matched against SWC returns for the same years. Match rates

against at least one of the SWC variables was achieved for 93% of SPA respondents, 85% of SPB respondents and 91% of SPC respondents.

Survey respondents were not matched where the TRN provided in the Teachers' CPD Service platform data differed to that in the SWC. This could result from the individual not being recorded in the SWC due to leaving their role in the English state school system or being in an institution not covered by the SWC (i.e. a nursery, independent school, overseas school, or they are centrally employed by a trust/ LA) or because the TRN had changed.

- matching the NPQ participant survey responses to Get Information About Schools (GIAS)[48] to link data about the schools' profile. The school-level data was accessed via the school's Unique Reference Number (URN). The URN had been provided for all NPQ participants in the MI data DfE shared with CFE from the Teachers' CPD Service platform data. The GIAS variables used were school type (academy or local authority-maintained), school phase (primary, secondary or nursery), number of pupils, and whether located in an urban or rural area. These variables were downloaded for SPA respondents in the year in which they started their NPQ and for SPB and SPC respondents in the year in which they completed the respective survey. Match rates against at least one of the GIAS variables was achieved for 97% of SPA respondents, 97% of SPB respondents and 96% of SPC respondents. Survey respondents could not be matched where the URN was missing in the Teachers' CPD Service platform data.
- merging selected variables from the SPA and SPB dataset into the SPB and SPC dataset based on a participants TRN to facilitate longitudinal analysis
- deriving several new variables by combining responses from multiple survey variables (e.g. NPQ participants' roles and responsibilities before starting their NPQ and at the time of answering the survey), which were quality assured by an independent researcher. These variables enabled further descriptive and bivariate analysis about the profile of NPQ participants

Participant and colleague survey data analysis

Differences in the survey findings by setting and respondent characteristics are explored in the report. Each subgroup was tested separately – these are descriptive differences and no regression analysis was undertaken – the differences are not causal and there may be multiple factors and characteristics contributing to any observed difference.

For scale survey questions, the overall mean scores and proportion of respondents which selected 5, 6 or 7 out of 7 are reported in the main report. In these cases, only the

[48] Get Information about Schools https://get-information-schools.service.gov.uk/ (Accessed: 21 September 2026)

significant differences by subgroup based on the mean score are provided. This is to maintain consistency in the presentation of findings.

Findings were tested for differences by cohort, NPQ studied, whether undertaking an LNPQ or SNPQ, role in setting, whether in the role for relevant to the NPQ on starting, length of time in teaching, for EYL whether a Group-based provider (GBP) or school-based provider (SBP) setting, gender, ethnicity, full-time or part-time worker, setting phase, setting type, setting size, setting location (urban versus rural). In addition, for EYL, whether a GBP or SBP setting. Due to the large samples, a vast number of statistically significant differences were found. Only those which met a threshold (e.g. a mean difference of 0.2 or more or a difference of 2 percentage points or more) and were meaningful to the patterns identified in the survey analysis were reported. All differences have been tested for statistical significance and only those that are statistically significant at the 5% level[49] are reported in the commentary of the main report. The tests used vary based on the type of question, but include:

- column proportion tests (z-test)
- paired samples t-test
- independent samples t-test
- analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with post hoc testing

The cross-sectional impact analysis (i.e. where SPB and SPC survey findings were compared) was also tested for significance at the 5% level.

Bases sizes and non-responses

The number of participants who responded to each survey question varied. This was either due to a question only being asked of a sub-group of participants (either based on their response to a previous question or the NPQ they were studying) or because respondents chose not to answer a question. A limited number of survey questions were mandatory for all respondents or respondents routed to specific questions to answer.

The number of non-responses per survey question were extremely limited and the survey respondents fairly representative of the population to which they were sent, non-responses have not been imputed and have been treated as missing. In addition, ‘not applicable’ and ‘don’t know’ responses have been excluded from mean average calculations. As a result, the base sizes for questions, and specific options within questions, differ from the total number of responses to a survey. Where this is the case, this is noted in the report. Base sizes are noted in each of the figures and tables in the main report. Where figure proportions do not equal 100%, this is due to rounding.

[49] Bonferroni corrections were used for the column proportion tests to adjust for the large number of tests being run and ANOVAs.

Where fewer than 100 responses were received for a question, the findings have been reported as a number rather than a percentage – within the main report these finding are caveated with a footnote.

Reporting conventions

All survey questions reported should be considered single code unless they are identified as multiple response in the relevant chart, table or footnote.

Throughout the main report the following categories are used when referring to the survey findings:

- very few: 0%-10%
- a small minority: 11%-32%
- a minority: 33%-47%
- about half: 48%-52%
- the majority: 53%-66%
- a large majority: 67%-89%
- almost all: 90%-100%

Derived variables

In addition, various groups of participants are referred to in the main report. Please see below a list of how these were defined and what data source they came from:

- **Role (unless otherwise stated this was their role on joining their NPQ).** This was collected in the SPA and SPB survey and was self-reported. These are not standard categories for some early years settings, but early years roles have been incorporated into the following categories:
    - **Senior leaders**: This group includes executive headteachers; headteachers; deputy or assistant headteachers; other senior leader positions; leaders of a private, voluntary or independent nursery, school-based or maintained nursery; childminders with leadership responsibilities; and those with other EYL leadership responsibilities (e.g. deputy nursery manager or children and family centre manager).
    - **Middle leaders**: This group includes key stage leaders, curriculum area leaders, pastoral services leaders, subject leaders, special educational needs coordinators (SENCO[50]), heads of departments and other middle leadership positions.

[50] This was a single response question where respondents classified themselves. If a SENCO was a senior leader, they were asked to select senior leader as their main role.

    - **Teachers**: This group includes classroom teachers and other teaching roles, including teachers/practitioners in an early years setting

- **Group-based providers (GBP) and School-based providers (SBP):** This was collected in the SPA and SPB survey and is self-reported. All participants undertaking the NPQEYL were categorised as either group-based providers (GBP) or school-based providers (SBP)

  The GBP category includes: private, voluntary or independent nurseries, childminder registered with a childminder agency, childminder not registered with a childminder agency, and a small number of 'other' private settings

  The SBP category includes: school-based nursery, maintained nursery school and any other school-based role in a maintained setting (e.g. in a primary school)

- **Phase:** Nursery was collected through a question in the SPB survey and is self-reported. Participants in school-based or maintained nurseries were classified as 'nursery' rather than the phase allocated to the school within which they were based. Primary and secondary schools were classified as per Get Information About School (GIAS) (excluding those classed as nursery). All other phases and any settings where phase was classed as 'not applicable' were all reclassified as 'other'

- **Setting type:** This variable has been derived from GIAS data only using the existing categories.

Due to small sample sizes, a number of ethnicity categories[51] were collapsed into one to enable subgroup analysis to be undertaken. There are some limitations associated with this analysis as the aggregated ethnic group is likely to hide differences between the constituent groups and could mask differences between the categories. The two ethnic groups used were:

- white British;
- all other ethnic minority groups (Asian or Asian British; Black, Black British, Caribbean or African; mixed or multiple ethnic groups; white (non-British); and other ethnic minorities)

Cross-sectional approach

The participant surveys were designed to measure outcomes and impacts at both SPB and then again at SPC. The impact findings are mostly based on cross-sectional analysis where the responses of NPQ respondents to the SPB survey on completion of their qualification were compared with those who responded to the SPC survey one year after completing their NPQ to explore how these have changed, if at all. This cross-sectional approach provided the largest base sizes available for analysis (despite the SPC sample

[51] Ethnicity data was sourced from the School Workforce Census and linked to SPA and SPB survey responses using a participant's Teacher Reference Number (TRN).

being smaller) but it means the samples are not identical and any observed change could result from differences in the unobserved characteristics of the samples. This has been checked, as far as possible, by undertaking the same analysis on the longitudinal sample. In the main report, the extent to which the longitudinal findings (based on a smaller sample of respondents who answered the relevant questions in both the SPB and SPC surveys) were consistent with the cross-sectional findings or not are reported.

Depth interviews

Interviews produced a significant volume of qualitative data. For this study, all interview data was coded thematically i.e. labels were used to organise responses to questions in order to identify key themes. The themes identified differed according to the questions posed and responses provided. For the process and impact interviews, where similar questions were posed these were analysed together, but where distinct questions were asked these were analysed separately. The comparator interviews were analysed as a separate dataset.

Due to the semi-structured nature of the interviews, no inference can be drawn about the scale or frequency of attitudes or opinions therefore the qualitative findings have not been quantified. This is not the intended purpose of qualitative research.

For many of the areas explored through the research thematic saturation was reached. In addition, while only ten EHCO coaches were interviewed their views were relatively consistent.

To aid the reader, where possible, an assessment of the proportion of interviewees who commented under a given theme is provided in the main report. However, please note that other interviewees may also have held this opinion or undertaken these activities, but did not describe them during the interview. The categories used were:

- almost all – used when nearly all interviewees reported a theme
- most – used where there was a majority of interviewees who reported a theme
- some – used where there was an opinion expressed by multiple interviewees but not a majority
- a minority – used where there was only a small proportion of interviewees reporting a theme, but more than a couple

Throughout the main report, findings from interviews are presented alongside survey findings and are indicated by referring to ‘participants who were interviewed’ or ‘interviewed participants.’ It is important to note that those who chose to take part in an interview may not be representative of the overall population and caution should be taken when reviewing these findings.

Chapter 8: Quality assurance

Multi-stage quality assurance processes were embedded across the evaluation to ensure the reliability, consistency and accuracy of the data collected and reported. These included:

- Surveys:
    - checking survey scripting for the first 100 responses to each survey to confirm that routing operated as intended
    - quality assuring data merging to confirm that records were matched correctly across survey responses and secondary data sources, with checks undertaken to identify and resolve duplicate, unmatched or inconsistent records
    - independent review of derived variables by an independent researcher against the agreed analysis specifications to ensure that recoding, grouping and calculations were applied consistently
- Interviews
    - reviewing interview quality throughout fieldwork to ensure that topic guides were being followed appropriately, interviews were conducted consistently, and sufficient depth was achieved across different respondent groups
    - quality assuring interview coding through the development and review of a coding framework, checks on a minimum of 10% of coded transcripts and discussion of emerging themes within the research team
- Impact analysis
    - specifying for the impact analysis the analytical approach in advance through a feasibility study
    - checking SWC records for the impact analysis to identify implausible values and applying documented rules to correct or exclude them
    - assessing the quality of every matched comparison group for the impact analysis using standardised mean differences and not reporting estimates where sample sizes were too small to be reliable
    - testing whether findings for the impact analysis held up under alternative matching methods, a pre-entry test for unobserved selection effects, and an alternative definition of promotion
- Reporting
    - re-running data analysis in draft outputs for publication to identify and correct any errors

- proofreading draft outputs before finalisation to identify typographical errors, inconsistencies, formatting issues and any inaccuracies in tables, figures or narrative reporting

Together, these processes provided a structured approach to quality assurance, supporting the robustness and credibility of the evaluation findings.

Chapter 9: Secondary data analysis approach to the impact analysis

As part of the evaluation of the 2021 reformed NPQs, CFE Research sub-contracted FFT Education Datalab to carry out a quasi-experimental impact evaluation based on administrative data. The aim of this impact evaluation was to understand the impact of participation in 2021 NPQs on teachers and schools, focusing on participants from Cohorts 1-4, moving beyond self-reported impacts collected in the participant surveys and interviews. This section summarises the methodology of this analysis and its limitations. The full impact analysis report, including detail on the analysis undertaken, is available here: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-of-2021-national-professional-qualifications

Overview of the approach

The methodology for this impact evaluation was determined based on a feasibility study[52] completed in January 2026. The aim of the impact evaluation was to understand the impact of participation in 2021 NPQs on teachers and schools, focusing on participants from Cohorts 1 to 4[53]. The analysis evaluates the impact of the NPQs on three teacher level outcomes: promotion, retention in the teaching workforce, retention in the same school. The outcomes of participating teachers were compared to those of teachers from a matched comparison group. One school level outcome was also evaluated: the percentage of teachers retained in the same school. The outcomes of 'low dosage' schools were compared to those of 'high dosage' schools from a matched comparison group. Dosage was based on the proportion of teachers in a school who had entered a 2021 NPQ (see School level analysis below for details).

For both teacher and school level outcomes, matched comparison groups were created using nearest neighbour matching based on propensity scores. Regression models were then used to compare the outcomes of the matched comparison group to participants. The analysis was based on SWC data combined with publicly available school level data and management information on NPQ participants from the Teachers' CPD Service platform data.

The cohorts included in the impact analysis are outlined in Table 16.

[52] The feasibility study is an internal document and has not been published.
[53] The impact analysis data includes all participants, not just the fully DfE funded participants as in the rest of the evaluation.

Table 16: Cohorts included in the NPQ impact analysis

Cohort	NPQs	NPQ start date	LNPQ end date	SNPQ end date
Cohort 1	NPQEL, NPQH, NPQSL, NPQLBC, NPQLTD, NPQLT	November 2021	February 2023	August 2023
Cohort 2	NPQEL, NPQH, NPQSL, NPQLBC, NPQLTD, NPQLT	February 2022	May 2023	November 2023
Cohort 3	NPQEL, NPQH, NPQSL, NPQEYL. NPQLBC, NPQLTD, NPQLT, NPQLL	October 2022	January 2024	July 2024
Cohort 4	NPQEL, NPQH, NPQSL, NPQEYL, NPQLBC, NPQLTD, NPQLT NPQLL	February 2023	May 2024	November 2024

Datasets used

The impact analysis was mainly based on analysis of the SWC data which was combined with publicly available school level data and management information on NPQ participants (including data from the Teachers' CPD Service platform, GIAS and Ofsted), supplied by DfE.

The SWC is an administrative dataset owned by DfE and made available to researchers on application. It provides a rich set of information on school staff, including demographics, employment, absence, qualification and curriculum data on teachers working in state schools in England. The SWC covers all state schools in England. However, in some cases data is missing where schools' submissions were incomplete or where the census was not returned in a particular year. Throughout the analysis, it is noted where teachers or schools have been excluded due to missing data, although this affects a relatively small number of units.

Teacher level analysis

For each school phase and qualification group, NPQ participants were matched to similar individuals who did not participate in an NPQ, then regression models were used to compare the outcomes of participants to those in the matched comparison group. Comparison groups were drawn from the pool of teachers who were not part of any

cohort of 2021 participants, or any NPQ from 2017 onwards. Any differences are assumed to be due to participation in NPQs.

Matching was completed using 1:1 nearest neighbour matching based on propensity scores, and matched on the following variables:

- school level characteristics (region, phase, % of free school meal (FSM) pupils, % of English as an additional language (EAL) pupils, historical levels of retention and promotions)
- teacher level characteristics (age, sex, role)
- indicators of career trajectory (promotion in last three years, salary, years in role, years in school)

The matches were assessed based on standardised mean difference. In almost every case, very good matches were created. However, some of the breakdowns by phase were less well-matched, particularly secondary school teachers who took the two newer qualifications, NPQEYL (Cohort 3) and NPQLL (Cohort 4). The poorer matches for these groups may reflect higher within-group variability and/or relatively small sample sizes compared to other groups.

A sensitivity analysis was also completed for Cohort 1 participants using a different matching method (coarsened exact matching). The results obtained from coarsened exact matching were similar to those obtained using propensity score matching, suggesting that this analysis was not overly sensitive to the matching method used.

The outcomes assessed were:

- promotion
- retention in the state-funded teacher workforce
- retention in the same school

Promotion was defined as either a change to a higher-level role and/or an increase in Teaching and Learning Responsibility (TLR) payments of at least 20%, provided the total TLR payment after the increase was greater than the annual maximum amount payable as a TLR3 payment in the relevant year.[54] The level of a role was based on six bands:

- Band 1: Executive Head Teacher, Headteacher
- Band 2: Deputy Head
- Band 3: Assistant Head

[54] These amounts are based on the 2022 guidance document from School teachers' pay and conditions - GOV.UK. Note that the requirements applied did not exclude all increases due to a TLR3: in cases where a teacher was already receiving a TLR1 or TLR2, it was not possible to determine if an increase came from their TLR1 or TLR2 payment increasing, or because they had a TLR3 payment added.

- Band 4: Advanced Skills Teacher, Excellent Teacher, Leading Practitioner
- Band 5: Classroom Teacher, Advisory Teacher
- Band 6: Apprentice Teacher

Note that apprentice teachers (band 6) were excluded from this evaluation.

Entrants were deemed to be retained in the state-funded teacher workforce if they were recorded in any teaching or leadership role in the SWC in the outcome year. They were deemed to be retained in the same school if they were recorded as being in any teaching or management role in the same school (or a successor school) as they were in the last SWC before starting their NPQ.

The impact on each of these outcomes was assessed one and two years after entry to an NPQ. That is, in 2022 and 2023 for Cohort 1 and 2 entrants, and 2023 and 2024 for Cohort 3 and 4 entrants.

School level analysis

The usual approach for a school level evaluation of this type would be similar to that used for the evaluation of teacher level outcomes: that is, creating a comparison group of schools which are similar to schools with NPQs entrants, then comparing the outcomes using regression models. However, in this case, a very substantial proportion of schools had NPQ entrants, especially secondary schools. This posed problems with creating a suitable comparison group; the pool of schools for matching would be very small. Therefore, a different approach was taken, based around ‘dosage’, that is, the proportion of teachers in a school who entered an NPQ. The outcomes of high dosage schools (those in which a high proportion of teachers entered an NPQ) were compared to the outcomes of low dosage schools (those in which a low proportion of teachers entered an NPQ).

High and low dosage for each cohort was defined separately. Schools were grouped so as to meet the following criteria:

- the low dosage group included schools in which the percentage of teachers entered for NPQs was below the median for the relevant phase, and the high dosage group was above the median
- the percentage of teachers entered for NPQs was at least twice as high in the high dosage group as in the low dosage group
- the low dosage group contained at least 1.5 times more schools than the high dosage group, to ensure there were reasonable numbers for matching purposes
- where there were several options that meet the above criteria, the option with the highest number of high dosage schools were selected

In addition, all schools with fewer than 10 teachers were removed from the evaluation to avoid extreme dosage values.

Limitations

Unobserved selection effects

This evaluation uses a quasi-experimental design, which relies on creating matched comparison groups based on data from the SWC and publicly available school level data. This means that it is not possible to control for factors not recorded in these datasets. In particular, it is not possible to control for teachers' level of ambition, motivation to progress and commitment to teaching as a career, or for levels of satisfaction with their current school. These issues were noted in the evaluation of the 2017 NPQs[55], and it was possible to mitigate them to some extent by creating a comparison group that accounts for a teacher's career trajectory before entering an NPQ. However, this mitigation is not perfect, and if, for example, teachers who enter NPQs have higher levels of motivation and commitment to their teaching careers than teachers in the matched comparison group, this may lead to overestimation of the impact.

A selection effects sensitivity test was used to try to get a sense of the extent to which this is the case. This test involved repeating the teacher level evaluation of Cohort 1 participants based on data from before NPQ participants entered their NPQ. The analysis found that NPQ participants were more likely to receive a promotion in the period before entering an NPQ than matched comparison teachers, but they were not more likely to be retained in the same school. The effects observed on promotion were less strong than those observed after NPQ entry. This suggests that, while unobserved differences affecting promotions may exist, they are unlikely to account for all the impact observed in this evaluation, and that unobserved differences affecting retention in the same school may not be impacting results.

Definition of promotion

This evaluation defines promotion as either a change to a higher-level role (based on six bands) and/or an increase in Teaching and Learning Responsibility (TLR) payments of at least 20%, provided the total TLR payment after the increase was greater than the annual maximum amount payable as a TLR3 payment in the relevant year. However, as it is not possible to distinguish between TLR payments of different types in the SWC data, some teachers may be identified as having been promoted when in fact they received an additional, temporary, TLR3 payment. If future evaluations have the data on

[55] This evaluation is available at https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-of-the-2017-national-professional-qualifications.

the different TLR payments available then excluding TLR3 payments altogether would be a useful approach.

There was also an issue with measuring the impact on promotion for entrants to the NPQEL. The majority of participants entering the qualification were already in the highest band when they entered the qualification, meaning that promotion was not possible under our definition. Future evaluations could consider adding another top-level band if sample size allows; aggregating across cohorts may make this more practical.

Sample size issues

Due to relatively small sample sizes, results for teachers based in alternative provision (AP) could not be presented, or any results broken down by qualification for teachers based in the special phase. Although raw differences in outcomes are presented, these do not control for differences in school and teacher characteristics and career trajectory.

Some qualifications, particularly NPQEL and the newer qualifications, NPQEYL and NPQLL, had relatively low entry numbers, which may have contributed to wider confidence intervals particularly in breakdowns by phase.

Future evaluations could consider aggregating results across cohorts to increase sample sizes or reducing the matching and modelling criteria, although caution would need to be used if directly comparing results from this evaluation to those obtained using a different methodology. Aggregating across cohorts would be a strong option as relatively small differences between cohorts were observed as part of this evaluation.

Definition of high and low dosage

For the school level evaluation, there were considerable difficulties in creating a suitable comparison group because of the small number of schools with no entrants to NPQs. Rather than comparing the effect of participants to non-participants, an alternative method was used of comparing the impact of low and high dosage schools. This approach relies on defining high and low dosage. As dosage groups were defined separately for each cohort, direct comparison between cohorts should be approached with caution, and there may be issues with following a similar approach in future evaluations if, for example, the distribution of entrants across schools changes.

Measuring school level outcomes

Due to the difficulties described above, the school level evaluation was limited to one outcome. School level attainment was of particular interest, but was not selected for a number of reasons:

- data on historic school level attainment from 2020 or 2021 was not available due to the cancellation of public exams during the pandemic. This means that schools

could not be matched based on historical values for attainment within parts of the analytical timeframe.

- as NPQs are qualifications for teachers rather than direct interventions aimed at pupils, it is also expected that impact on attainment would be observed over a long period, which may not be captured robustly within the time series and/or cohorts available for the evaluation at this stage

Timeframe of evaluation

As noted above, the timeframe of this evaluation was relatively short, looking at outcomes one and two years after entering an NPQ. It is therefore not possible to capture longer term impact. This is perhaps particularly relevant for the school level evaluation. Future evaluations could look at longer term impacts and, if doing so, could consider including additional outcomes at the school level.

Appendix 1: NPQ theory of change for the 2021 reformed NPQs

<table>
<tr><td>Aims</td><td colspan="4">The NPQ Programme Vision is ‘to deliver an excellent teaching profession at all stages (including early years practitioners) through a high-quality, evidence-based CPD for teachers and leaders, leading to improved quality and retention and, in turn, pupil/child outcomes’. The programme also seeks to address the gap in the Early Years sector of high-quality leadership.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Inputs and activities</td><td>Outputs</td><td>Outcomes</td><td>Impacts</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Inputs
Project resources including:
– DfE staff
– EEF and other stakeholders
– Government funding
– Delivery providers and partners
– Ofsted
– Quality Assurance agency for moderation

Activities
– New qualifications designed
– New content frameworks developed
– NPQ content designed
– Promotion by delivery providers
– DFE communications campaign, with continuous stakeholder and sector engagement
– Delivery of content and assessment framework through various methods, including online and face-to-face
– Completion of assessment task (case study)
– Support from delivery providers and partners for participants
– Support from school for participants
– Delivery of the Early Headship Coaching Offer
– Delivery providers and partners respond to feedback and revise provision</td><td>Data collected by DfE as of July 2025 (Release home - Teacher and leader development: ECF and NPQs - Explore education statistics – GOV.UK) given in brackets below. This data is the most recent data collected by the DfE and includes information on the number of teachers and leaders who have undertaken an NPQ in the 5 academic years from 2021/22. The cohorts included in the evaluation (1–5 and NPQLPM in cohort 6) took place in the academic years 2021/22–2023/24.
– Number of participants engaged in NPQs (29,526 unique participants started in 2024/25; a total of 143,266 unique participants between 2021 and 2025)
– Number of participants accessing the Early Headship Coaching Offer (1,006 starts between 2021 and 2025)
– Number of qualifications funded (130,907 unique participants on a funded NPQ between 2021 and 2025)
– Number of schools engaged with NPQs (By 2024/25, the cumulative number of participating schools increased to 20,611, representing 88.4% of all state schools)
– Number of schools that receive the targeted support for small schools (9,409 in 2023 and 11,318 in 2024 from [Withdrawn] Targeted support funding for national professional qualifications – GOV.UK)
– Number of participants who pass the qualification within the specified timeframe
2021/22, 29,892 funded NPQ courses were started by teachers and leaders – 84.3% have been completed to date, with a pass rate of 98.7%.
2022/23, 36,620 funded NPQ courses were started; 81.4% have been completed so far, with a pass rate of 96.8%.</td><td>NPQ participants:
– Have improved leadership skills reflecting the content and assessment framework
– [SNPQs] Have improved specialist skills reflecting the content and assessment framework
– Are confident they fully understand the knowledge/evidence base needed for the role for which they are studying
– Are confident to be a leader/specialist and make changes in their school
– Feel prepared for their current leadership/specialist role
– Feel prepared for future leadership/specialist roles
– Have increased knowledge of career progression pathways
– Have increased satisfaction with the career progression pathways available to them
– Have increased aspiration for career progression
– Have increased job satisfaction
– Make positive changes within their school through the qualification tasks</td><td>– Improved school leadership
– Improved school culture in relation to specialist areas
– Improved pupil and school outcomes (e.g. leadership (Ofsted) and pupil outcomes (Key Stage 2/4 attainment, pupil behaviour, attendance)
– Transfer of leadership/specialist skills learnt through the NPQ to colleagues (as reported by participants and colleagues)
– NPQ participants’ progress within their career development pathways
– Improved retention of NPQ teachers/leaders compared to non-participants
– Improved leadership/school culture increases retention among the wider workforce
– Participants value and make evidence-informed decisions to improve school outcomes
– The quality of CPD delivered in schools improves</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assumptions</td><td colspan="4">• Delivery of the NPQs across all providers and delivery partners is of high quality and meets the expected standards set out by the DfE.
• Providers can recruit the expected number of participants onto NPQs and recruit participants from a wide-ranging pool (i.e. across phases/regions/characteristics)
• Schools provide support for participants while undertaking the qualifications.
• The qualification frameworks have no/few gaps in content and meet the needs and expectations of participants and schools.
• Participants successfully undertake and complete their NPQ.
• The COVID-19 pandemic (or other moderating factors) does not impede the ability of participants or schools to complete their NPQ and enact change.
• NPQs complement other CPD opportunities.
• Access to high-quality CPD opportunities leads to an increase in job satisfaction and retention.
• As a result of participants undertaking their NPQ, they will support other staff in their school to develop specialist/leadership skills based on what they have learnt.
• There is a sufficient number of roles available for those seeking promotion following the completion of their NPQ.</td></tr>
</table>

Appendix 2: Competencies measured in the SPB survey

NPQEL

Establishing and sustaining a strategic direction, with those responsible for governance, across the schools I am responsible for
Establishing and sustaining an effective culture in the schools I am responsible for
Establishing and sustaining effective, high-quality teaching across the schools I am responsible for
Supporting colleagues across the schools I am responsible for to design a carefully sequenced, broad and coherent curriculum with high-quality feedback and assessment processes
Ensuring that the schools I am responsible for have effective policies and procedures that manage pupil behaviour, respond to and prevent bullying, and promote a predictable and safe environment for pupils
Ensuring that staff within the schools I am responsible for have the appropriate skills and resources to deliver a curriculum that is inclusive of pupils with additional and special educational needs, and disabilities
Ensuring all staff are supported to engage in effective professional development that is aligned to the wider improvement priorities across all schools I am responsible for
Being able to prioritise, allocate and manage resources (financial, human and educational) appropriately, effectively and efficiently to ensure sustainability across all the schools I am responsible for
Being able to use information from a range of sources to identify, prioritise and implement school improvement projects that will make the most impact on the schools I am responsible for
Ensuring that the schools I am responsible for work in partnership with parents and carers, the wider community and other schools to maximise pupil outcomes
Appropriately participating in governance and fulfilling obligations to give account, be challenged, and accepting responsibility across the schools I am responsible for
Ensuring that the schools I am responsible for fulfil their obligations to external organisations including the Department for Education, Ofsted, the Education and Skills Funding Agency, and the Local Authority

NPQH

Establishing and sustaining a strategic direction, with those responsible for governance, within my school
Establishing and sustaining an effective culture within my school
Establishing and sustaining effective, high-quality teaching within my school
Overseeing the design and ensuring the implementation of a carefully sequenced, broad and coherent curriculum with high-quality feedback and assessment processes within my school
Establishing and sustaining effective policies and procedures within my school that manage pupil behaviour, respond to and prevent bullying, and promote a predictable and safe environment for pupils
Ensuring staff within my school have the appropriate skills and resources to deliver a curriculum that is inclusive of pupils with additional and special educational needs, and disabilities
Ensuring all staff in my school are supported to engage in effective professional development that is aligned to my school's improvement priorities
Being able to prioritise, allocate and manage resources (financial, human and educational) appropriately, effectively and efficiently to ensure sustainability within my school
Being able to use information from a range of sources to identify, prioritise and implement school improvement projects that will make the most impact on my school
Ensuring that my school works in partnership with parents and carers, the wider community and other schools to maximise pupil outcomes
Appropriately participating in governance and fulfilling obligations to give account, be challenged, and accepting responsibility within my school
Ensuring that my school fulfils its obligations to external organisations including the Department for Education, Ofsted, the Education and Skills Funding Agency, and the Local Authority

NPQSL

Contributing to establishing and sustaining a strategic direction, with those responsible for governance, within my school
Contributing to establishing and sustaining an effective culture within my school
Establishing and sustaining effective, high-quality teaching within my school
Supporting colleagues within my school to design a carefully sequenced, broad and coherent curriculum with high-quality feedback and assessment processes

Supporting the development of effective policies and procedures within my school that manage pupil behaviour, respond to and prevent bullying, and promote a predictable and safe environment for pupils
Supporting staff within my school to deliver a curriculum that is inclusive of pupils with additional and special educational needs, and disabilities
Supporting staff within my school to engage in effective professional development that is aligned to my school's improvement priorities
Contributing to prioritising, allocating and managing resources (financial, human and educational) to ensure sustainability within my school
Being able to use information from a range of sources to identify, prioritise and implement school improvement projects that will make the most impact on my school
Offering practical support to ensure that my school works in partnership with parents and carers, and contributing towards working in partnership with the wider community and other schools
Beginning to participate in governance and fulfil obligations to give account, be challenged, and accepting responsibility within my school
Beginning to participate in activities to ensure that my school fulfils its obligations to external organisations including the Department for Education, Ofsted, the Education and Skills Funding Agency, and the Local Authority

NPQEYL

Establishing and sustaining a strategic direction within my early years setting
Establishing and sustaining an effective culture within my early years setting
Planning and delivering a high-quality curriculum and care to support child development within my early years setting
Establishing and sustaining communication, language and literature approaches to support children's learning
Effectively managing children's behaviour within my early years setting
Effectively supporting children's personal, social and emotional development within my early years setting
Ensuring the protection and safety of children and colleagues within my early years setting
Establishing and overseeing effective systems, processes and policies for managing admissions, exclusions, appeals within my early years setting
Ensuring staff within my early years setting are supported and have the appropriate skills and resources to deliver a curriculum that is inclusive of pupils with additional and special educational needs, and disabilities

Recruiting, developing, supporting and appropriately managing colleagues to lead and conduct regular expert-led conversations (which could be referred to as mentoring or coaching) about all aspects of their roles within my early years setting
Ensuring that staff in my early years setting engage in effective professional development which is aligned to our improvement priorities
Being able to prioritise, allocate and manage resources (financial, human and educational) appropriately, effectively and efficiently to ensure sustainability within my early years setting
Being able to use information from a range of sources to identify, prioritise and implement improvement projects that will make the most impact in my early years setting
Ensuring my early years setting works in partnership with parents and carers, other early years settings, agencies and services.

NPQLT

Contributing to the creation of a culture of professional learning and continuous improvement for colleagues within my school
Supporting colleagues within my school to understand learning theories and helping them to implement them to improve pupil learning
Supporting colleagues within my school to design a carefully sequenced, broad and coherent curriculum
Supporting colleagues within my school to plan effective lessons that stimulate pupil thinking
Supporting colleagues within my school to adapt their teaching to different pupils' needs
Contributing to the design of school assessment systems within my school
Encouraging colleagues within my school to use high quality, reliable assessment methods
Contributing to planning and conducting effective professional development within my school that is linked to teaching, curriculum and assessment
Being able to use information from a range of sources to identify, prioritise and implement school improvement projects that will make the most impact on my school

NPQLTD

Using evidence-based approaches to select and design effective professional development that aligns to my school's improvement priorities as well as meeting the needs of colleagues within my school
Delivering effective professional development for colleagues within my school
Supporting colleagues within my school to undertake regular, expert-led, continuing professional development that develops their classroom practice
Playing a formal role in supporting trainee and early career teachers within my school
Being able to use information from a range of sources to identify, prioritise and implement school improvement projects that will make the most impact on my school

NPQLBC

Contributing to the creation of a culture of professional learning and continuous improvement for colleagues within my school
Supporting the development of a positive, predictable and safe environment for pupils within my school
Encouraging colleagues within my school to motivate pupils by helping them to understand how their success in school and participation in extra-curricular activities is linked to their long-term goals
Working with parents and carers to support pupils' learning
Supporting pupils within my school who need more intensive support with their behaviour
Preventing and responding to bullying within my school
Contributing to planning and conducting effective professional development within my school that is linked to behaviour and culture
Being able to use information from a range of sources to identify, prioritise and implement school improvement projects that will make the most impact on my school

NPQLL

Supporting colleagues within my school to develop their understanding of language and how to develop all pupils' language capability
Supporting colleagues within my school to develop pupils' reading skills
Supporting colleagues within my school to develop pupils' writing skills
Contributing to planning and conducting effective professional development within my school that is linked to teaching, curriculum and assessment

Being able to use information from a range of sources to identify, prioritise and implement school improvement projects that will make the most impact on my school

NPQLPM

Supporting colleagues within my school to develop pupils' automaticity of facts and procedures, select and make effective use of representations, and understand the need for precise mathematical language
Supporting colleagues within my school to develop pupils' logical thinking and reasoning as well as problem-solving skills
Contributing to the development of a culture in my school where teachers and pupils have a positive attitude towards mathematics
Supporting colleagues within my school to ensure pupils develop a secure foundation in mathematics
Contributing to the creation of a culture of professional learning and continuous improvement for colleagues within my school
Supporting colleagues within my school to understand learning theories and helping them to implement them to improve pupil learning
Supporting colleagues within my school to design a carefully sequenced, broad and coherent curriculum
Supporting colleagues within my school to plan effective lessons that stimulate pupil thinking
Supporting colleagues within my school to adapt their teaching to different pupils' needs
Contributing to the design of school assessment systems within my school
Encouraging colleagues within my school to use high quality, reliable assessment methods

Appendix 3: Profile of NPQ participant survey respondents compared to the sample

The following should be noted regarding the tables included in this appendix:

- the survey response numbers may differ to the bases reported earlier in this document where data was not available in the matched datasets or a participant did not provide an answer
- some percentages may be rounded to 0 due to small base sizes

SPA survey

Table 17: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample - NPQ

NPQ	Survey sample SPA: Frequency	Survey sample SPA: Percent	Survey responses SPA: Frequency	Survey responses SPA: Percent
NPQEL	1,655	4%	368	4%
NPQH	5,577	13%	1,104	12%
NPQSL	9,047	21%	1,919	21%
NPQEYL	2,852	7%	668	7%
NPQLT	10,115	23%	2,004	22%
NPQLTD	4,611	11%	1,101	12%
NPQLBC	5,460	13%	1,058	12%
NPQLL	2,848	7%	635	7%
NPQLPM	1,209	3%	211	2%
Total	43,374	100%	9,068	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data and SPA survey

Table 18: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample - Cohort

Cohort	Survey sample SPA: Frequency	Survey sample SPA: Percent	Survey responses SPA: Frequency	Survey responses SPA: Percent
Cohort 2 (Spring 2022)	13,901	32%	3,250	36%
Cohort 3 (Autumn 2022)	18,881	44%	3,850	42%
Cohort 4 (Spring 2023)	9,383	22%	1,757	19%
Cohort 6 (Spring 2024)	1,209	3%	211	2%
Total	43,374	100%	9,068	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data and SPA survey

Table 19: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample – Lead provider

Lead provider	Survey sample SPA: Frequency	Survey sample SPA: Percent	Survey responses SPA: Frequency	Survey responses SPA: Percent
Ambition Institute	12,625	29%	2,451	27%
Best Practice Network	8,594	20%	1,422	16%
Church of England	2,936	7%	696	8%
Education Development Trust	3,061	7%	740	8%
Leadership Learning South East	1,753	4%	394	4%
School-Led Network	1,359	3%	294	3%
Teach First	4,916	11%	1,200	13%
Teacher Development Trust	2,732	6%	700	8%
UCL Institute of Education	4,454	10%	957	11%
National Institute of Teaching (NIOT)	943	2%	211	2%
Total	43,373	100%	9,065*	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data and SPA survey
*3 missing cases in the 9,068 SPA survey respondents

Table 20: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample – Recipients of targeted support funding

Recipients of targeted support funding*	Survey sample SPA: Frequency	Survey sample SPA: Percent	Survey responses SPA: Frequency	Survey responses SPA: Percent
Yes	16,009	54%	3,201	55%
No	13,464	46%	2,617	45%
Total	29,473	100%	5,818	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data and SPA survey
*Excludes Cohort 2

Table 21: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample - Gender

Gender**	Survey sample SPA: Frequency	Survey sample SPA: Percent	Survey responses SPA: Frequency	Survey responses SPA: Percent
Female	28,395	73%	6,596	78%
Male	10,428	27%	1,814	22%
Total	38,823	100%	8,410	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, SWC and SPA survey
**Excludes Private, Voluntary or Independent (PVI) providers of early years' provision

Table 22: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample - Ethnicity

Ethnicity**	Survey sample SPA: Frequency	Survey sample SPA: Percent	Survey responses SPA: Frequency	Survey responses SPA: Percent
White	32,093	91%	6,944	90%
Asian or Asian British, Black or Black British, any other mixed background or any other ethnic group	3,317	9%	737	10%
Total	35,410	100%	7,681	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, SWC and SPA survey
**Excludes PVI

Table 23: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample – Working hours

Working hours**	Survey sample SPA: Frequency	Survey sample SPA: Percent	Survey responses SPA: Frequency	Survey responses SPA: Percent
Full-time	34,119	88%	7,166	87%
Part-time	4,760	12%	1,107	13%
Total	38,879	100%	8,273	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, SWC and SPA survey
**Excludes PVI

Table 24: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample - Post

Post**	Survey sample SPA: Frequency	Survey sample SPA: Percent	Survey responses SPA: Frequency	Survey responses SPA: Percent
Executive headteacher/CEO	142	0%	90	1%
Headteacher/principal	2,229	6%	432	5%
Deputy headteacher/principal	2,471	6%	578	7%
Assistant headteacher/principal	3,817	10%	851	10%
Other	30,220	78%	6,925	78%
Total	38,879	100%	8,876	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, SWC and SPA survey
**Excludes PVI

Table 25: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample – Setting phase

Setting phase**	Survey sample SPA: Frequency	Survey sample SPA: Percent	Survey responses SPA: Frequency	Survey responses SPA: Percent
Primary	19,966	51%	4,345	54%
Secondary	16,502	42%	3,439	42%
Nursery	87	0%	24	0%
Other	2,324	6%	303	4%
Total	38,879	100%	8,111	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, GIAS and SPA survey
**Excludes PVI

Table 26: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample – Setting type

Setting type**	Survey sample SPA: Frequency	Survey sample SPA: Percent	Survey responses SPA: Frequency	Survey responses SPA: Percent
Academies	22,136	57%	4,901	56%
Free Schools	1,492	4%	312	4%
Local authority-maintained schools	14,067	36%	3,146	36%
Other types	140	0%	98	1%
Special schools	1,044	3%	371	4%
Total	38,879	100%	8,828	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, GIAS and SPA survey
**Excludes PVI

Table 27: SPA survey respondents compared with the sample – Setting location

Setting location**	Survey sample SPA: Frequency	Survey sample SPA: Percent	Survey responses SPA: Frequency	Survey responses SPA: Percent
Rural	5,418	14%	1,427	16%
Urban	33,431	86%	7,401	84%
Total	38,849	100%	8,828	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, GIAS and SPA survey
**Excludes PVI

SPB survey

Table 28: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample - NPQ

NPQ	Survey sample SPB: Frequency	Survey sample SPB: Percent	Survey responses SPB: Frequency	Survey responses SPB: Percent
NPQEL	1,055	3%	190	4%
NPQH	4,448	13%	577	13%
NPQSL	6,767	20%	959	22%
NPQEYL	2,211	6%	312	7%
NPQLT	8,367	24%	896	20%
NPQLTD	3,756	11%	556	13%
NPQLBC	4,223	12%	445	10%
NPQLL	2,413	7%	304	7%
NPQLPM	989	3%	146	3%
Total	34,229	100%	4,385	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data and SPB survey

Table 29: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample - Cohort

Cohort	Survey sample SPB: Frequency	Survey sample SPB: Percent	Survey responses SPB: Frequency	Survey responses SPB: Percent
Cohort 2 (Spring 2022)	9,957	29%	1,652	38%
Cohort 3 (Autumn 2022)	16,206	47%	1,838	42%
Cohort 4 (Spring 2023)	7,077	21%	749	17%
Cohort 6 (Spring 2024)	989	3%	146	3%
Total	34,229	100%	4,385	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data and SPB survey

Table 30: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample – Lead provider

Lead provider	Survey sample SPB: Frequency	Survey sample SPB: Percent	Survey responses SPB: Frequency	Survey responses SPB: Percent
Ambition Institute	10,566	31%	1,339	31%
Best Practice Network	6,137	18%	653	15%
Church of England	2,105	6%	274	6%
Education Development Trust	2,598	8%	415	9%
Leadership Learning South East	1,347	4%	174	4%
School-Led Network	1,006	3%	135	3%
Teach First	4,250	12%	571	13%
Teacher Development Trust	2,103	6%	301	7%
UCL Institute of Education	3,429	10%	450	10%
National Institute of Teaching (NIOT)	685	2%	73	2%
Total	34,226	100%	4,385	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data and SPB survey

Table 31: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample – Recipients of targeted support funding

Recipients of targeted support funding*	Survey sample SPB: Frequency	Survey sample SPB: Percent	Survey responses SPB: Frequency	Survey responses SPB: Percent
Yes	13,340	55%	1,571	57%
No	10,932	45%	1,162	42%
Total	24,272	100%	2,733	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data and SPB survey

*Excludes Cohort 2

Table 32: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample - Gender

Gender**	Survey sample SPB: Frequency	Survey sample SPB: Percent	Survey responses SPB: Frequency	Survey responses SPB: Percent
Female	22,848	74%	2,873	78%
Male	8,167	26%	825	22%
Total	31,015	100%	3,698	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, SWC and SPB survey
**Excludes PVI

Table 33: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample - Ethnicity

Ethnicity**	Survey sample SPB: Frequency	Survey sample SPB: Percent	Survey responses SPB: Frequency	Survey responses SPB: Percent
White	25,702	91%	3,075	91%
Asian or Asian British, Black or Black British, any other mixed background or any other ethnic group	2,558	9%	305	9%
Total	28,260	100%	3,380	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, SWC and SPB survey
**Excludes PVI

Table 34: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample – Working hours

Working hours**	Survey sample SPB: Frequency	Survey sample SPB: Percent	Survey responses SPB: Frequency	Survey responses SPB: Percent
Full-time	27,182	88%	3,120	86%
Part-time	3,881	12%	504	14%
Total	31,063	100%	3,624	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, SWC and SPB survey
**Excludes PVI

Table 35: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample - Post

Post**	Survey sample SPB: Frequency	Survey sample SPB: Percent	Survey responses SPB: Frequency	Survey responses SPB: Percent
Executive headteacher/CEO	84	0%	48	1%
Headteacher/principal	1,521	5%	243	6%
Senior leadership position	4,983	16%	992	23%
Other	24,475	79%	3,012	70%
Total	31,063	100%	4,295	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, SWC and SPB survey
**Excludes PVI

Table 36: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample – Setting phase

Setting phase**	Survey sample SPB: Frequency	Survey sample SPB: Percent	Survey responses SPB: Frequency	Survey responses SPB: Percent
Primary	16,080	52%	2,139	55%
Secondary	13,153	42%	1,589	41%
Nursery	67	0%	13	0%
Other	1,763	6%	150	4%
Total	31,063	100%	3,891	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, GIAS and SPB survey
**Excludes PVI

Table 37: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample – Setting type

Setting type**	Survey sample SPB: Frequency	Survey sample SPB: Percent	Survey responses SPB: Frequency	Survey responses SPB: Percent
Academies	17,762	57%	2,304	54%
Free Schools	1,117	4%	127	3%
Local authority-maintained schools	11,269	36%	1,580	37%
Other types	105	0%	49	1%
Special schools	810	3%	204	5%
Total	31,063	100%	4,264	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, GIAS and SPB survey
**Excludes PVI

Table 38: SPB survey respondents compared with the sample – Setting location

Setting location**	Survey sample SPB: Frequency	Survey sample SPB: Percent	Survey responses SPB: Frequency	Survey responses SPB: Percent
Rural	4,322	14%	678	16%
Urban	26,720	86%	3,586	84%
Total	31,042	100%	4,264	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, GIAS and SPB survey
**Excludes PVI

SPC survey

Table 39: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample - NPQ

NPQ	Survey sample SPC: Frequency	Survey sample SPC: Percent	Survey responses SPC: Frequency	Survey responses SPC: Percent
NPQEL	1,055	3%	117	5%
NPQH	4,448	13%	372	17%
NPQSL	6,767	20%	466	21%
NPQEYL	2,211	7%	207	9%
NPQLT	8,367	25%	388	18%
NPQLTD	3,756	11%	259	12%
NPQLBC	4,223	13%	211	10%
NPQLL	2,413	7%	168	8%
Total	33,240	100%	2,188	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data and SPC survey
* Cohort 6 is excluded as NPQLPM participants did not receive the SPC survey

Table 40: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample - Cohort

Cohort	Survey sample SPC: Frequency	Survey sample SPC: Percent	Survey responses SPC: Frequency	Survey responses SPC: Percent
Cohort 2 (Spring 2022)	9,957	30%	644	29%
Cohort 3 (Autumn 2022)	16,206	49%	999	46%
Cohort 4 (Spring 2023)	7,077	21%	545	25%
Total	33,240	100%	2,188	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data and SPC survey

* Cohort 6 is excluded as NPQLPM participants did not receive the SPC survey

Table 41: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample – Lead provider

Lead provider	Survey sample SPC: Frequency	Survey sample SPC: Percent	Survey responses SPC: Frequency	Survey responses SPC: Percent
Ambition Institute	10,210	31%	698	32%
Best Practice Network	6,123	18%	332	15%
Church of England	1,952	6%	122	6%
Education Development Trust	2,516	8%	200	9%
Leadership Learning South East	1,335	4%	94	4%
School-Led Network	1,006	3%	51	2%
Teach First	4,108	12%	282	13%
Teacher Development Trust	2,100	6%	151	7%
UCL Institute of Education	3,309	10%	220	10%
National Institute of Teaching (NIOT)	578	2%	38	2%
Total	33,237	100%	2,188	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data and SPC survey

* Cohort 6 is excluded as NPQLPM participants did not receive the SPC survey

Table 42: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample – Recipients of targeted support funding

Recipients of targeted support funding**	Survey sample SPC: Frequency	Survey sample SPC: Percent	Survey responses SPC: Frequency	Survey responses SPC: Percent
Yes	12,370	53%	816	53%
No	10,913	47%	728	47%
Total	23,283	100%	1,544	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data and SPC survey

* Cohort 6 is excluded as NPQLPM participants did not receive the SPC survey. ** Excludes Cohort 2

Table 43: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample - Gender

Gender**	Survey sample SPC: Frequency	Survey sample SPC: Percent	Survey responses SPC: Frequency	Survey responses SPC: Percent
Female	22,120	74%	1,511	76%
Male	7,955	26%	480	24%
Total	30,075	100%	1,991	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, SWC and SPC survey

* Cohort 6 is excluded as NPQLPM participants did not receive the SPC survey

** Excludes PVI

Table 44: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample - Ethnicity

Ethnicity**	Survey sample SPC: Frequency	Survey sample SPC: Percent	Survey responses SPC: Frequency	Survey responses SPC: Percent
White	24,917	91%	1,657	91%
Asian or Asian British, Black or Black British, any other mixed background or any other ethnic group	2,477	9%	157	9%
Total	27,394	100%	1,814	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, SWC and SPC survey

* Cohort 6 is excluded as NPQLPM participants did not receive the SPC survey. ** Excludes PVI

Table 45: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample – Working hours

Working hours**	Survey sample SPC: Frequency	Survey sample SPC: Percent	Survey responses SPC: Frequency	Survey responses SPC: Percent
Full-time	26,414	88%	1,708	88%
Part-time	3,709	12%	243	12%
Total	30,123	100%	1,951	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, SWC and SPC survey

* Cohort 6 is excluded as NPQLPM participants did not receive the SPC survey. ** Excludes PVI

Table 46: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample - Post

Post**	Survey sample SPC: Frequency	Survey sample SPC: Percent	Survey responses SPC: Frequency	Survey responses SPC: Percent
Executive headteacher/CEO	84	0%	35	2%
Headteacher/principal	1,510	5%	141	7%
Senior leadership position	4,907	16%	522	25%
Other	23,622	78%	1,411	67%
Total	30,123	100%	2,109	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, SWC and SPC survey

* Cohort 6 is excluded as NPQLPM participants did not receive the SPC survey. ** Excludes PVI

Table 47: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample – Setting phase

Setting phase**	Survey sample SPC: Frequency	Survey sample SPC: Percent	Survey responses SPC: Frequency	Survey responses SPC: Percent
Primary	15,177	50%	1,034	54%
Secondary	13,133	44%	795	42%
Nursery	67	0%	13	1%
Other	1,746	6%	71	4%
Total	30,123	100%	1,913	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, GIAS and SPC survey

* Cohort 6 is excluded as NPQLPM participants did not receive the SPC survey. ** Excludes PVI

Table 48: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample – Setting type

Setting type**	Survey sample SPC: Frequency	Survey sample SPC: Percent	Survey responses SPC: Frequency	Survey responses SPC: Percent
Academies	17,323	58%	1,120	53%
Free Schools	1,099	4%	64	3%
Local authority-maintained schools	10,793	36%	797	38%
Other types	105	0%	27	1%
Special schools	803	3%	86	4%
Total	30,123	100%	2,094	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, GIAS and SPC survey

* Cohort 6 is excluded as NPQLPM participants did not receive the SPC survey. ** Excludes PVI

Table 49: SPC survey respondents* compared with the sample – Setting location

Setting location**	Survey sample SPC: Frequency	Survey sample SPC: Percent	Survey responses SPC: Frequency	Survey responses SPC: Percent
Rural	4,125	14%	341	16%
Urban	25,977	86%	1,753	84%
Total	30,102	100%	2,094	100%

Source: DfE's Teachers' CPD Service platform data, GIAS and SPC survey

* Cohort 6 is excluded as NPQLPM participants did not receive the SPC survey. ** Excludes PVI

Department for Education

© Department for Education copyright 2026

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0, except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3.

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.
Reference: R1679/2
ISBN: 978-1-83870-874-0

For any enquiries regarding this publication, contact www.gov.uk/contact-dfe

This document is available for download at www.gov.uk/government/publications