

Staff Development through Creative Co-Mentoring Partnerships

Simon Purcell, GTCL, LTCL, PGCE

Dalya Crispin, BMus, MMus, CRD (GSMD)

September 2001

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements and Methodology.....	3
Introduction and Context.....	4
<i>National Context</i>	
<i>The Guildhall School of Music & Drama and The Legacy of QAA</i>	
<i>Mentoring, Origins and Structuring Devices</i>	
<i>Personnel</i>	
Research basis of co-mentoring as teacher research.....	10
<i>Core questions</i>	
<i>Historical Background and Teacher Research:</i>	
Why Co-Mentoring?.....	12
<i>Rationale</i>	
<i>Pairing issues</i>	
<i>Types of meeting: pairs/threes/group</i>	
<i>Time</i>	
<i>Ownership by Department Heads and Directors</i>	
Reportage and Interpretation.....	15
<i>Overview</i>	
Teaching	17
<i>Learning Agreements, External Models and Evaluation</i>	
Monitoring and evaluation of the scheme.....	20
Staff development, The Curriculum.....	21
The future.....	22
Recommendations.....	24
<i>Short-term</i>	
<i>Medium Term</i>	
<i>Long Term</i>	
Bibliography.....	25
Appendices.....	27

Acknowledgements

Our first debt of gratitude is to the participants of the Co-Mentoring initiative: Graham Dinnage, Katy Gainham, Helena Gaunt, Sean Gregory, Stephen Knight, Julian Philips, Laura Roberts, Jonathan Williams, Brinley Yare and David York. We are also indebted to the Research Centre in Teaching and Learning of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama, for its support of this work, and specifically, to Peter Renshaw, the recently retired Head of Research and Development, George Odam, the Research Fellow, and Sarah Hoskyns, Head of Music Therapy, for their guidance through this often uncharted territory. We also acknowledge the contribution of Liz Staddon, Professor Danny Saunders, of the Educational Development Unit of the University of Glamorgan, and Louise Gibbs, of the Royal College of Music.

A note on Methodology:

Quoted remarks from feedback questionnaires returned by the participants are indicated in italics.

Staff Development through Creative Co-Mentoring Partnerships

Introduction and Context

Given the current controversies surrounding education, it is easy to forget the ancient and authentic vocation of teachers. While institutions struggle to address a plethora of governmental edicts demanding quality and accountability, teachers in schools have grappled with the politicisation of the curriculum for two decades, and lecturers in further and higher education are compelled to fall in line.

As artists, we may be uncomfortable with the regularisation of teaching and learning, and as practitioners first, may not readily possess the time or skills to fulfil such an exercise. However, generations of teachers and philosophers have investigated their work in attempts to provide a more real and lasting learning experience, as well as perceiving education as vital in the generation of a healthy society. Perhaps it is particularly urgent that the art of teaching should inform the development of schools, curricula and those who teach and learn within them. The peculiarities of the conservatoire may even contribute to the ongoing development of education as a deepening and broadening pursuit, nurturing the range of human experience that does not fit comfortably within rigidly defined categories and numerical performance indicators. Perhaps artists are uniquely qualified to assist educational thinkers in confronting the myriad of challenges that faces us today.

Sustainability is central to the longevity of any institution, whether in business, public service, art or education. Each sector is required to serve its constituency in stewarding, utilising and developing their resources for the common good.

For the conservatoires, the challenge is new and considerable. Faced with government prescriptions regarding accountability and formal educational practice, these institutions are challenged to maintain their essential and historic nature, managing not only the material resources of change but the psychology of transition within bodies, themselves considered by many to be fixed in the nineteenth century.

The perception of, and response to change will determine its effectiveness. It would be vital to the success of such a venture that the participants felt ownership of the process. This would be an exercise in change as development and evolution as distinct to training or imposed prescriptive practice. This concern was an driving force in the planning and implementation of this initiative, as we chose to model our work upon staff development practice employed in some universities where....

....Staff Development is defined, and implemented, in the broadest terms as activity that contributes to the continuing professional development of faculty; and which is directly linked to curriculum development, to

research activity and to the managerial and administrative components of faculty's work.

Staff Development is reactive in terms of needs expressed by individuals and groups and proactive in the sense of using resources to generate involvement and commitment to the University's mission and policies.

Staff development is based on identified needs; it is interactive and collaborative, rather than hierarchical and centrally determined. Staff development is concerned more with processes than systems; and aims to provide assistance, resources and support to Schools, Subject Groups and individuals as an integral part of their work, not as a bolt on extra, nor as a remedial supplement. In practice staff development focuses less on a menu of courses for faculty to attend in addition to their normal duties and more on providing support 'in situ'.¹

The current regulatory climate in further and higher education suggests that it is only a matter of time before all institutions will require formal teaching qualifications of their staff, or provide the opportunity to acquire them. Just as government prescribes accountability and fee paying students increasingly demand value for money, so this shift in the management of education awakens the responsibility of all involved in teaching and learning, the responsibility to serve the best interests of those receiving and delivering education. Potential developers and managers will need to recognise that teachers need safety, security and an environment that recognises and develops their special skills, arguably even more so in a conservatoire peopled with a uniquely talented workforce and student body. This is a blank canvas, an opportunity for positive development, and a chance to identify, develop and disseminate good practice rather than detecting and shaming bad practice within a fear-ridden atmosphere.

National Context

A number of conservatoires and university music departments are already responding to the challenge to adopt standard educational practice in terms of accountability, staff development and training. Since September 2000, FE colleges have required new staff to possess teaching qualifications. At present, university music departments tend to offer staff development via separate departments within the wider parent university. For example, music faculty members at Sussex University have access to a Staff Development Unit that is part of the university's Staffing Services Division. A similar situation exists at City University and Middlesex University. A visit to most university websites will reveal a thoroughly defined and wide ranging programme of staff development opportunities which might include: induction, teaching and learning

¹ <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/Units/staffing/staffdev/policies/acadev.html>

courses, workshops (which may, or may not, be subject specific), mentoring schemes and so on.

Conservatoires offer a range of opportunities for staff development. This may take the form of research initiatives, funding for attending conferences or for educational development. Leeds College of Music and Birmingham Conservatoire offer staff development through their relationships with universities, the former already requiring all new academic staff to gain teaching qualifications in line with FEFC requirements.

From September 2001, Trinity College of Music will require all contracted staff on 50 percent contracts and above to participate in 'declared professional development'. This applies to instrumental professors as well as academic staff and offers a wide range of opportunities for staff development from research to educational development. While there are no plans to offer in-house, specific teacher training, staff may apply to take a course via the ILT or the LitMus at the Royal College of Music (RCM). In fact, with the exception of the RCM, no conservatoires currently offer in-house provision for staff development in teaching and learning.

More recently, the RCM has established an extensive staff development programme through the LitMus:² a thorough scheme 'specifically designed for instrumental and vocal musician-teachers working in conservatoires and university music departments'.

The programme is comprehensive (offering an introduction to professional development and action research, aspects of educational theory and practice, assessment, learning styles, programme evaluation, self-evaluation, peer evaluation, the place of musicians in the twenty first century, quality assurance and institutional issues) and implemented via ten seminar-workshops over two academic terms, a study resources pack, LiTMus websites, online advice and mentoring and tutorial support upon request. Significantly, the LiTMus may lead to membership of the ILT³ (Institute of Learning and Teaching) and to national Associate SEDA⁴ (Staff and Education Development Association) accreditation.

Costs are at present met by the institution and via HEFCE funding, £120 for the seminar-workshops only, £180 for seminar series and ILT mentoring, £195 for seminar series SEDA examination and accreditation and £225 for both ILT mentoring and SEDA examination and accreditation.

² The LiTMus is described in detail at www.litmus.rcm.ac.uk. The LiTmus scheme also provides advice and training to other HE institutions via the ³LiTMus Partnership². Materials are free and available via the internet.

³ The Institute of Learning and Teaching has been set up to ensure that teaching standards in higher education are improved and upheld, and, through selective membership, to provide national endorsement of teaching competence.

⁴ The Staff and Educational Development Association nationally accredits courses of professional development for teachers in higher and further education.

At present, 25 staff members at the RCM are taking the LiTMus of which, 4 will proceed to the SEDA accreditation.

The Guildhall School of Music & Drama and the Legacy of QAA

All this evidence demonstrates that one of the most profound challenges that has emerged from the increased emphasis upon quality assurance within higher education is the need for institutions to devise modes of staff training and development which adhere to and enhance their own stated mission and goals, without detracting from institutional and individual strengths through adoption of inappropriate evaluative paradigms. The conservatoire environment is one in which this potential schism needs to be addressed with some urgency. The one-to-one lesson that has been the traditional mainstay of conservatoire teaching is being increasingly challenged by those who advocate more open educational models, accessible to the current qualitative checks. The risk of stratification around extreme positions in this debate are considerable, a situation which becomes all the more egregious when one considers that some of the participants are generally unused to and unfamiliar with educational vocabularies and procedures. Part-time conservatoire staff are apprenticed to practical music-making from an early age, often bypassing higher education altogether, with the enthusiasts of the quality movement generally emerging from the universities, often from the higher levels of the administrative side. Effective staff development and research into human potential within educational environments must be carried out with regard to such pressures. Co-Mentoring has been developed with these issues in mind.

The stated purpose of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama is ‘to provide the highest attainable quality of education and professional training’. Emanating from this purpose is a series of goals:

To create a culture which fosters collaboration, innovation, personal motivation and reflection, mutual tolerance and respect, professional integrity and a lateral approach to problem solving.

To implement a curriculum which aims at the highest standards of performing skill and at the development of individual autonomy, curiosity, leadership flexibility and risk-taking through imaginative forms of teaching and learning.

To achieve an educational environment that supports outstanding practice-based research, continuing professional development and innovative approaches to the design and delivery of teaching.

To form significant local, national and international partnerships and

collaborations with professional and artistic organisations and educational and community groups.

To have an efficient and cohesive administration that fully supports a creative environment.⁵

The extent to which Co-Mentoring enhances the stated aims is one way to gauge its effectiveness from an institutional viewpoint. The corollary is that the appropriateness of the given purpose and goals may be examined through the processes of institutional action-based research carried out by its staff members. Particularly since the formulation of these objectives, and the vision statement⁶ which aids in their dissemination, is relatively recent, it is important that the institution takes note of the relevance of these to staff who must apply them on a day-to-day basis. All too often, goals and missions form procedural wallpaper, imposed from on high and ignored by those who are caught up in the practicalities of teaching. Effective staff development is one way to begin to rectify such a situation, though ideally, a mission should be created by those who must carry it out, rather than being imposed from above:

What we need if educational research is truly to inform educational practice is the construction of our own unique conceptual apparatus and research methods.⁷

Mentoring, Origins and Structuring Devices

The Co-Mentoring process that is the subject of this paper has its origins in an early GSMD staff development initiative (emanating from the mission) known as Course Tutoring, something that has since become more firmly established in the staff structure on a departmental basis. The premise is that individual staff members may apply for a two-year tenure as a Course Tutor, enabling them to contribute more actively to the activities of the School in ways related to their interests and strengths. This opens up a means by which non-salaried staff can be paid for developmental activities going beyond the teaching remit.

⁵ *Quality Assurance Handbook*, Guildhall School of Music & Drama, (London: June 1998), p. 2.

⁶ See Peter Renshaw, *An Enabling Framework of the future of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama – A Continuing Journey*, (London: February 2001).

⁷ Elliot Eisner, *The Art of Educational Evaluation: A Personal View*, (London and Philadelphia: Falmer 1985), in A.V.Kelly, *The Curriculum - Theory and Practice, Fourth Edition* (London: Paul Chapman Publishing, 1997) p.120.

The two facilitators mentored each other between 1997 and 1999 as Course Tutors, developing the model for the current exercise based loosely on similar work being carried out at the University of Glamorgan⁸, and adjusted to suit the particular demands of the GSMD. This process involved pair-meetings, check-ins, and the development of a teacher research project within Musical Awareness. These facilitators have continued to mentor each other, both for the current research, and for other matters related to teaching and learning and personal development, and have devised the structure for the current initiative based on findings from this foundation work.

The project in Co-Mentoring presents a form of staff development in which the one-to-one model, as made manifest within the mentoring pairs, is formalised through a series of structuring devices:

- Learning Agreements
- Pair meetings
- Pair meetings with facilitators
- Group meetings
- Exploration of teaching models
- Questionnaire

In effect, these structuring devices extend the mentoring relationship from the historical environs of the principal study lesson towards mutual and developmental relationships between teaching staff.

Personnel

With one exception, the ten staff and two facilitators involved in this work are members of the Music Studies department, responsible for delivering part of the academic component of the curriculum, including essay and dissertation writing, composition, practical skill development, and study of set works through contextualisation, via the weekly three-hour Musical Awareness lesson, (taught in groups of approximately seven to nine students). Most of these staff members are also involved in one-to-one instrumental teaching. Given this, it was envisioned that as well as providing a cohesive group with a set of common experiences and aims, this group of individuals might be able to provide insights as to the applicability of the Co-Mentoring model within Principal Study departments, some of which have resisted conventional staff development paradigms as being potentially deleterious to the effectiveness of the one-to-one teaching model. Moreover, the Music Studies staff demonstrated particular interest and need for a somewhat intensive form of staff development at a time when proposed curriculum changes have been creating challenges for many of those involved. The

⁸ Post-Graduate Certificate in Educational Development Handbook. University of Glamorgan Business School. Field Leader Professor Chris James (1998).

facilitators responded to evidence in educational literature that peer-coaching could be very appropriately applied:

Skill acquisition and the ability to transfer vertically to a range of situations require on-the-job support. This means the opportunity for immediate and sustained practice, collaboration and peer coaching, and studying development and implementation.⁹

Research basis of co-mentoring as teacher research

Core questions

The relatively recent genesis of the Centre for Teaching and Learning has presented the opportunity to reflect anew upon the nature of education within the specialised environment of a conservatoire. This was clearly the start of an ongoing process that would need to take place over a significant period of time. From the outset, one of the main objectives was to identify and disseminate ‘good practice’, as opposed to detecting ‘bad practice.’ It was also necessary to ask whether this project was in fact research, staff development, or research into staff development, and how this would be most valuable to the school. The following questions quickly emerged:

Did the work concern:

1. Examination of the nature of staff development?
- or**
2. Evaluation of the implementation and results of staff development?

These two questions formed a crucial focus in the research. The first depicts the whole picture, embracing the presence and contribution of the observer. Implicit in the second is the judgement of effectiveness according to tangible and static measuring points. Point One is a cyclical process of enquiry, action and reflection, responsive to ever-changing realities, while Point Two is linear, a model with a beginning and end, a pass-fail measurement. It does measure, does introduce a commitment to accuracy but Point One steers the more challenging course amongst absolute measurements and evolving notions. As a result we decided that:

The process of staff development is the field, what occurs is the action, how we understand its nature is the value.

⁹ David Hopkins *A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research*, (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1985/1992) p.184.

Historical Background and Teacher Research

Traditional educational research has borrowed its rationale from the data analysis methodologies originally designed for agriculture.¹⁰ Understandably, these have been found to be unsuitable, and more recently researchers, notably Lawrence Stenhouse, have developed action-based research models and the notion of ‘teacher as researcher.’¹¹

David Hopkins, too, advises an approach to research that is grounded in the reality of classroom culture and further redefines this type of work as ‘teacher research.’ This emphasis owes its origin to action-based research, basically, action followed by reflection.¹² He cites Stephen Kemmis, who asserts that action-based research is:

- a form of self-reflective enquiry;
- collaborative;
- part of curriculum development and school improvement.¹³

While the autonomy of the teacher as researcher is central to the intrinsic nature and effectiveness of action-based or teacher research, there still must be reflection and alertness to outcomes. Hopkins suggests underlying principles for the effective implementation of classroom research by teachers:

- The teacher’s job is to teach and any research method should not disrupt the teaching commitment.
- Any method of data collection must not be too demanding on the teacher’s time.
- The methodology employed must be reliable enough so that the teacher may formulate hypotheses with confidence and subsequently develop strategies.
- The research problem should be one to which the teacher is committed.
- Teacher researchers [are] to respect ethical procedures surrounding their work.
- Classroom research must be of value to the whole school.¹⁴

¹⁰ Ibid Chapter 3.

¹¹ Ibid Chapter 2.

¹² Action-based research has become a well-documented mode of inquiry; for further background into the subject, and its theoretical origins, see David Hopkins *A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research*, (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1985/1992) Chapter 4.

¹³ Stephen Kemmis 'Action Research' in Husen, T. and Postlethwaite, T. (eds.), *International Encyclopaedia of Education: Research and Studies*. (Oxford: Pergamon 1983), in David Hopkins *A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research*, (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1985/1992), p. 44. See also A.V. Kelly, *The Curriculum - Theory and Practice, Fourth Edition* (London: Paul Chapman Publishing 1995/1997), p119 - 124.

¹⁴ David Hopkins *A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research*, (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1985/1992) p 57 - 60.

These criteria formed the basis of our assessment of the Co-Mentoring process. While this work, and the institutionally-oriented research aims that underpin it, is relatively new, the criteria given above have provided a framework by which the usefulness of the research may be evaluated.

Why Co-Mentoring?

Rationale

Mentoring is becoming widespread as an effective resource in human development and can be found in both the public and private sectors. Its uses include induction, support for development and career progression through to support within programmes of change, issues which are very relevant to the challenges facing the conservatoire in the twenty-first century,¹⁵ and illustrative of trends within staff development in education ‘from individualism to collaboration...[and] supervision to mentoring.’¹⁶ While evidence has shown that mentoring is generally a part of staff development in diverse institutions, the current project involved the adoption of mentoring on a weekly and formal basis, rather than as an ad-hoc response to particular needs. This means that mentoring becomes an integral, as opposed to reactive, mechanism.

The Co-Mentoring scheme created a flexible means of providing support for development that recognised the different needs and potentials of the various participants through open co-mentoring by peers. Insight gained from continuing experience and reflection could flow directly to and from the classroom via discussion and scrutiny within the pairings, while further objectivity would be administered by facilitators in triangular meetings. Co-Mentoring presented its own mechanisms not dissimilar to those of educational research, namely clarity of purpose and an appropriately reflective mode of enquiry. Effectively this scheme was teacher research through and within co-mentoring pairings.

The Co-Mentoring project encourages shared learning and understanding amongst staff, and potentially students. It builds up a trusting environment that enables one to take risks as an artist, facilitator and teacher, without the fear of making mistakes along the way. It fuels the questions – ‘What constitutes quality?’ and ‘what constitutes failure?’

¹⁵ Alred, G, Garvey, R, Smith, R The Mentoring Pocketbook, (Hampshire: Management Pocketbooks Ltd 1998).

¹⁶ David Hopkins *A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research*, (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1985/1992) p218.

This project should contribute considerably to development of our undergraduate and postgraduate curricula – the frameworks we set up and the processes we run as individuals and groups within them.

Pairing issues

Selection of the pairs created challenges for the facilitators, since the internal dynamics of mentoring present various possibilities, especially within the context of a pilot scheme and with staff who were generally unused to regularised developmental activity as part of their teaching work. Whilst past research has shown that many possibilities exist in terms of mentoring and co-mentoring relationships, the exigencies of the educational environment at the GSMD caused the pairs to be formed on the basis of mutual interests and preferences, as well as the practicalities of timetabling. The participants were given the opportunity to express a preference about their pairings. Only one pair requested to work together; the remaining eight left the decision about pairing to the facilitators.

Significantly, the opportunity to form a pairing as a result of expression of preference did not automatically guarantee a smooth relationship within a pair. Indeed, the formalisation of the relationship may bring the potential for conflict precisely because of pre-existing familiarity. The similarity of their teaching tasks may create difficulties, since there is less of the novelty of discovery than existed for the other groups. Such early difficulties became an important point for the facilitators to deal with, since it cast an unexpected light upon the process of selecting the pairs. For most of the pairs, the opportunity to befriend a member of staff with whom they had previously been unfamiliar was extremely valuable. This is potentially very fruitful when it works inter-departmentally.

Types of meeting: pairs/threes/group

The development of several different meeting styles within the project created varied interpersonal dynamics, something that is very valuable in the context of the project. The pair meetings give the members of the group autonomy, self-discipline, and the opportunity to work through the planned teaching and learning issues without a sense of being observed, thus building up strong trusting relationships between the pairs. Though not immediately observable by the facilitators, the results of these relationships were made tangible through fulfilment of specific outcomes listed in the **Teaching** section of this report, as well as through a qualitative sense of improved communication within the Music Studies department. That the majority of the pairs intend to extend their mentoring relationships beyond the financial remit of the project demonstrates that the value of the work for the participants is considerable, especially since there is a scarce currency of time within the working structure of many. The challenge of timekeeping

was one of the most difficult issues surrounding the project in relation to all the kinds of meeting, as will be discussed below.

The meetings of pairs with facilitators were important as a point of problem-solving, definition of terms, monitoring of progress and outcomes on Learning Agreements, and providing a sense of coherence for the work. These meetings often brought forward particularly strong challenges for the facilitators, since the meetings in three provided a natural point for pairs to express frustration with aspects of the work.

The facilitators provided a sympathetic sense of direction to the meetings and to our co-mentoring efforts. They also helped to pose leading questions about what we were doing and why.

[They] enabled a fluent process.

It must be emphasised that in such a process, it is important for the facilitators to retain their own sense of working as a team for the provision a critical support. In addition, the provision of experienced guidance outside the process (in this case the Research Fellow) is critical.

The group meetings were an opportunity for the sharing of feedback, skills sharing, introduction of new materials by the facilitators, and contextualisation of the work by the group as a whole.

Time

The most prevalent complaint amongst the participants within the group was the difficulty of fitting in the activities generated by the project within daily schedules. Despite the fact that the pairs were being paid hourly for their participation within the project, the complaints about time were constant.

[There was] not enough time to talk about everything that we wanted to talk about.

There needs to be allowance for integrating the process within the timetable – effectiveness of discussion and progress was often compromised by exhaustion of those taking part!

[Continuation for] another year would have been very useful!

This problem is an institutional one that is in turn comprised of many levels. The part-time status of the majority of the participants creates a sense that time spent within the School must be generative of income; it is therefore not possible for all staff to be in on all days. This created significant problems in running group meetings in which all the members could be present. A related problem was the fitting in of meetings when members were present, since a day-long presence within the School usually meant a full agenda for the part-time staff.

Generally, the mentoring project exposed all too clearly the dysfunctional view of time within the institution, one which both causes schoolwide problems with clashes, and which also keeps students and staff from developing a mature and effective view of how to use time. The *result is chronic institutional tardiness and a sense of overload*. There are strong hopes that the development of the new BMus curriculum will alleviate this; yet, there is reason to believe that external formal changes will only provide a band-aid, when what must be considered by all involved is a more responsible balance of the truly important over the addiction to urgency.

Ownership by Department Heads and Directors

The possibility of having inter-departmental Co-Mentoring lies with the Heads of individual departments. Ironically, there seems no way that Heads may determine whether mentoring is appropriate for their staff members unless they undergo the process themselves. Pairings involving those who have previously experienced mentoring, and who have demonstrated interest in continuing the work would be one way of carrying out such a plan. This does bring forward a problem about having staff development that is too rigidly controlled, since the experiences of a single head of department cannot encompass all the possibilities for staff development, particularly since the heavy administrative responsibilities of running departments mitigate against being up-to date with external developments in this area. The input of the Director of Academic Support is potentially very valuable here.

Reportage and Interpretation

Overview

Throughout the project the co-mentoring pairs demonstrated their transformative value, as participants pointed to the provision of mutual support alongside critical friendship. The process awakened the idea of teaching as a reflective practice, stimulating insights and the development of objective points of reference while allowing mentees time to explore ideas and new approaches to problems within a safe space. The co-mentors were able to point to tangible benefits from working in this way and some gained an enhanced appreciation of their place within the school. Significantly, all participants felt of value to each other both supportively and educationally.

I feel more open about my teaching. I would seek, more actively in future, feedback about my teaching.

[Co-Mentoring] came at a useful time for me because I had just started teaching Musical Awareness. I found the support provided by [my co-mentor] and the group very helpful.

[Co-Mentoring] raised self-esteem regarding teaching.

Meeting regularly in pairs began to address the sense of isolation experienced by part-time staff (this experience of isolation and being unheard and undervalued was expressed repeatedly in group meetings and check-ins and cannot be overestimated), but repeated discussion and reflection also served to highlight and emphasise problems with existing syllabi and curricula. All participants felt that at times their intended teacher research was almost pointless and impractical within the context of a syllabus deemed to be unresponsive to the presenting daily needs of students and all too recurrent internal organisational problems.

[Co-Mentoring provided] ways of containing my frustration with [the] Syllabus so as not to feel punitive towards [my] Musical Awareness group.

All participants emphasised the importance of a safe space for discussion and once begun, the co-mentoring made an immediate impact on morale and motivation as staff declared a common desire for clarity of purpose and achievable goals in their work.

The early group meetings and check-ins established a group rapport, supportive framework and atmosphere of trust where staff felt safe to discuss weaknesses and fears. While the initial discussions were mainly anecdotal and general, the group gradually developed a conceptual framework and vocabulary as a result of their reflection and insights.

The facilitators themselves were generally perceived and received as advisors, providing support and feedback alongside input, secondary sources and a personal experience of the process. Due to the structure of the scheme and its novelty within the educational and historical culture of the GSMD, the relative roles and status of co-mentors and facilitators were at times unclear. It must also be said that for some participants the nature of co-mentoring as a person-centred activity was at times at odds with deliberate teacher research and any notion of directive leadership.

Sometimes it might have been useful if [the facilitators'] agendas had been more explicit.

...Some of the more 'theoretical' ideas seemed a little piecemeal, especially to members of staff not 'formally' trained. Also, a little structuring of final goals/aims might have helped. But only a little!

I would have liked [the roles of the facilitators] to have been more clearly defined.

It appears that the agenda could have been made more explicit, although the facilitators entered the project eager to allow maximum flexibility. (See: ***Learning Agreements***). Nonetheless, the very real (and often difficult) challenges presented to facilitators by the participants were of themselves a barometer of growth achieved during the project and indicative of areas of further potential development.

It was also felt by some that the enormity of topic affected the clarity of purpose and points of engagement.

Teaching

Learning Agreements, External Models and Evaluation

The current educational climate requires the identification and recording of teaching outcomes. This project, that was part staff-development, part research, part pilot-scheme, presented us with challenges. While Co-Mentoring provided the framework, it was necessary to utilise resulting insights and awareness with the hope that this would enhance and disseminate good practice, motivation and belief. Objectivity had to be preserved while maintaining the developmental processes of individual growth. Here, traditional models of *training* collided with the presenting realities and challenges of person-centred approaches to change. In research terms, this required teacher research as *profiling*, as opposed to vertically imposed teaching techniques or adherences. It was essential that a shift occurred in the discussion amongst teachers from 'What I teach...' towards 'How students learn...'. This was to be the most challenging part of the work.

The Learning Agreement was a personal but formal structuring device allowing each participant to select an area of focus, one area/topic, directly relevant to the teacher's needs or enthusiasms. This was a key element in preplanning, a means by which teacher/educational development could be focused, objectified and hopefully, recorded.

By pin-pointing areas of focus, we could home in on possible solutions and self-development.

It helped me clarify the areas I wanted to develop.

I found [the Learning Agreement] helpful when evaluating my lessons and planning how to move forwards with a class.

External models and secondary sources were intended to provide a conceptual context for discussion and practical ideas for developing and enhancing teaching practice:

- External models and secondary sources:
- Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives¹⁷
- Excerpts from: Accelerated Learning,¹⁸ The Inner Game of Music¹⁹

NAOMIE²⁰ was introduced as a mechanism for the 'plan-reflect-change-reflect' cycle, applied to teaching and learning. We considered this useful as it serves to assist a teacher in his *own work*, encouraging creative problem-solving alongside reflection and self-monitoring. It was stressed that the process of individual teacher development through reflection was considered as important as any short-term results achievable through skill-sharing and workshops prescribing favourite teaching techniques.

Written materials were aimed at introducing aspects of educational psychology - excerpts from *Accelerated Learning*²¹ addressed hemispherical function in the brain, while a chapter from *The Inner Game of Music* raised issues about experiential questioning.²² Bloom's *Taxonomy* provided a stronger conceptual challenge as the group members began to reflect upon, and hypothesise about, the move from 'how they *teach*' to 'how students *learn*'. The devising by mentors of the own learning taxonomies could not be fitted within the time-constraints of the project, but was viewed by the facilitators as being an important, and logical, subsequent step in the process.

The perceived value of both the learning agreements and secondary sources was mixed:

¹⁷ Benjamin S. Bloom. and David R. Krathwohl, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals, by a committee of college and university examiners. *Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*. (New York: Longmans, Green, 1956).

¹⁸ Alistair Smith, *Accelerated Learning* Network Press, Stalhord. (1996)

¹⁹ See.W. Timothy Gallowey and Barry Green, *The Inner Game of Music*, (London: Pan Books, 1987).

²⁰ NAOMIE, an acronym for Needs, Aims, Objectives, Methods, Implementation, Evaluation (Public domain).

²¹ Smith, *Accelerated Learning*.

²² See.W. Timothy Gallowey and Barry Green, *The Inner Game of Music*, (London: Pan Books, 1987).

I still struggle with 'methodologies' and 'agreements', though I am beginning to see the benefits of more rigorous approaches to my own teaching and music-making. It's very easy to talk myself (and sometimes others) into convenient alternatives.

While some found them useful in lesson planning and evaluation, a reference point, that sharpened reflection, assisting self analysis and discussion, others were unable to follow through with one particular aim, citing pressure to address immediate and pressing needs or the feeling that this was a teaching and learning objective external to the everyday teaching load. They were also viewed by some as an imposition, counter to the organic developmental nature and function of a co-mentoring pair. It was also felt that the implementation of these ideas would take longer than the scheme allowed within the present School culture.

The facilitators also experienced unease and frustration at times, as some of the group appeared to disregard or underestimate the potential value of these resources. The facilitators strove to emphasise the developmental nature of this work and the length of time it takes for musicians who are also teachers to become confident in embracing new ways of perceiving the processes of teaching and learning. Despite this, all participants reported that the process had enhanced their teaching, for most, moderately and for others substantially. They had been able to focus on clearly identified areas of teaching practice. The tangible teaching outcomes named by the participants of this work are listed below:

Clearly identified areas of teaching practice explored within Co-Mentoring pairs:

- Containing frustrations
- Dealing with specific issues
- Developing awareness of group versus individual teaching
- Developing mixed ability group work
- Enhanced teaching of keyboard harmony
- Essay marking
- Evaluation – assimilating new ideas
- Generation a working atmosphere
- Identifying needs
- Lesson planning
- Managing challenge between students
- Organisation
- Questioning techniques
- Recognising student responsibility
- Report writing
- Role of humour in teaching
- Setting clear goals and guidelines in teaching

- Teaching of aural skills

Examples of actual outcomes:

- Developing clarity in 1:1 lessons
- Developing realistic targets for students
- Development of structured approach towards lesson planning and evaluation
- Development of student led work
- Development of weekly tests
- Enhanced awareness
- Improved management of dialogue in class
- Improved presentation of syllabus
- Improved time management
- Improved utilisation of resources
- Improved and developed feedback on essays
- Improved planning lectures and seminars
- Problems with this question and notions of 'Tangible outcomes'
- Project in analysis, improvisation and performance during 2001

While participants were able to list numerous teaching outcomes, they generally claimed to be evaluating the outcomes of their work amongst themselves, but with little conscious reference to external models or declared criteria. As a result, the scheme revealed little evidence of provable educational fact. Hopkins lists 'tough bottom-line questions'²³ when evaluating classroom research and improvement:

- What changes have occurred in teachers or students knowledge base?
- What changes have occurred in teachers or students skill level and use?
- What changes have occurred in teachers or students opinions and feelings?
- What changes have occurred in the culture or organisation of the school?
- What changes have occurred in teachers or students test or examinations?

Through the process of Co-Mentoring, the participants came face-to-face with these issues. How does one determine whether these outcomes have occurred, and by which criteria are they deemed accurate? Within the context of developing educational practice within the conservatoire these are important questions

²³ David Hopkins *A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research*, (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1985/1992), p195.

Monitoring and evaluation of the scheme

Evaluative procedure requires examination of the evaluation itself, specifically on whose behalf this was taking place.²⁴ While recognising the context of this work, (the various agendas driven by quality, real staff needs and high aspirations of various parties), it is necessary that the perceived value of the scheme is recognised through the experience and interpretation of the participants - its meaning, usefulness and relevance rather than a capacity to measure up to externally conceived aims and objectives. The experience of each person has been appreciated 'as [a] unique focus of the observation'.²⁵

In terms of the usefulness to the School, the perception of the evaluative process by the participants will inform future planning in relation to anticipated responses from staff, as much as likely educational outcomes.

Evaluation assumed a number of forms - ongoing discussions through pairs, triangular and group meetings as well as the questionnaire. Generally, the participants refer to the monitoring of job satisfaction, motivation and 'usefulness' at the same time as neglecting more objective evaluation of teaching outcomes that might also represent "usefulness". This suggests unfamiliarity with formal appraisal within educational and developmental aspects of institutional life as opposed to artistic and expressive areas in which staff are highly expert.

As a result, the scheme challenges the School to develop deeper self-evaluative practice, heightening awareness of factors present within teaching and learning, the mechanisms surrounding and facilitating them, at the same time as enhancing the responsiveness of strategies designed to utilise the collective potentials of staff, students, managers and planners alike.

Staff development and The Curriculum

For planners, this pilot scheme raises key questions relevant to staff development within a conservatoire. Teachers within a conservatoire have always exchanged ideas informally but until the formation of the Research Centre for Teaching and Learning at GSMD, the school has provided few formal opportunities for staff development and none on an ongoing basis. Until now these have largely been informal workshops and skill-sharing sessions organised through the Course Tutors or departmental meetings where elements of course work have been explained rather than explored and developed.

²⁴ Kushner, Saville *Personalising Evaluation* (London: Sage 2000), p.79, details 6 questions for researchers and evaluators of programmes.

²⁵ Kurt Lewin, in Danziger, K., *Constructing the Subject: Historical Origins of Psychological Research*, (Cambridge University Press 1990), in Kushner, Saville, *Personalising Evaluation*, (London: Sage 2000), p.69.

The ongoing nature of Co-Mentoring enabled substantial teacher development through the opportunities for support and progression and a balance of structure and freedom. While the outcomes of teacher development are listed above, feedback from participants expressed that there may in fact be more scope for skill sharing and further challenges. This is interesting, bearing in mind the problems encountered with timetabling discussed above.

Feedback from co-mentors pointed to the potential for cross-departmental activity with the expectation of generating interdepartmental consistency, harmony and the sharing of expertise. They also suggested that this would result in further debate encouraging reassessment of teaching habits. It was made very clear that this work should be developed throughout the school as a clear sign of the school's commitment to staff, a recognition of needs and potential. Furthermore, this work was perceived as a vital and responsive agent of change within curriculum development as well as part of the emerging teaching and learning culture of GSMD. The Co-Mentoring project has the potential to provide not only evidence of teaching and learning but first-hand evidence and intimate assessment of students' needs. It was considered not only necessary for staff morale but for the educational health of the school that future curriculum planning must be built on classroom evidence.

Such a move in curriculum planning would shift the focus from a centre-periphery model towards a school-based curriculum. Evidence suggests that a school based curriculum provides more scope for the 'continuous adaptation of curriculum to individual pupil (student) needs than do other forms of curriculum development'.²⁶

Stenhouse reminds us that 'all well-founded curriculum research and development, whether the work of an individual teacher, of a school or a group is based on the study of classrooms. It thus rests on the work of teachers.'²⁷ This relationship is of course reflexive.²⁸ Quite naturally the teacher and school participate in a reciprocal process of planning, action and reflection combining real evidence and insight from classrooms alongside interpretation and planning on an institutional scale. While GSMD can expect its staff to be motivated, expert and professional, the School itself needs to adopt procedures that facilitate growth and deepen activity. Not only should its staff be offered

²⁶ M. Skilbeck, School-based curriculum development, in Open University Course 203, Unit 26 (Milton Keynes: Open University press 1976), in A.V. Kelly, *The Curriculum - Theory and Practice, Fourth Edition* (London: Paul Chapman Publishing 1995/1997), p 116

²⁷ Lawrence Stenhouse, *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*. (London: Heinemann 1975) page 142, in Hopkins *A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research* p 176. See also A.V. Kelly, *The Curriculum - Theory and Practice, Fourth Edition* (London: Paul Chapman Publishing 1995/1997) chapters 4 & 5.

²⁸ Hopkins once more reminds his readers that 'there is little school development without teacher development and that there is little teacher development without school development', p218.

opportunities to develop as teachers but internal structures must be employed that utilise the resulting insight and expertise. These two dynamics and collective responsibilities merge within the process of curriculum development.

The Future

We have now been able to witness and monitor something of the nature, psychology and implementation of change within the immediate teaching and learning environment at GSMD - its strengths and weaknesses, areas of potential expansion as well as areas of resistance.

In the process, the research has presented some clear evidence alongside other less definite messages. What the picture does reveal is an expert staff, well-motivated and conscientious, naturally reflective and imaginative as artists at the same time as being generally unfamiliar with music teaching as a discrete educational process and at times questioning the desirability of such a distinction. Of principal benefit to the School has been the opening of a dialogue and the formation of a mechanism that not only provides for the needs of staff but which also informs planners.

The chief findings are that:

- Peer mentoring and evaluation is highly beneficial and safe, leading to rapid problem solving and improved morale. It is very popular with the staff.
- Numerous teaching outcomes are detected.
- Problems and potential within with existing curricula are highlighted.
- The staff express a clear need to continue and develop this work.
- Mentoring is important for new members of staff.
- There is a need for clarity of agendas and roles.
- Staff are generally new to educational as opposed to teaching practice.
- Time management is a major factor in any staff development.
- There is a need for recognition of the value of reflective practice leading to the notion of *x hours teaching generating and demanding x hours paid reflection*.
- The process develops channels of communication within the School, engendering a sense of department/community.
- Demonstrates possible link to Continuing Professional Development

The implementation of staff development and expectations of both the School and its employees will be critical to the School's future as an environment concerned not only with artistic results but also with personal and artistic growth and development. While existing educational research offers a number of models for formal staff development, we are challenged to devise and implement a medium for teacher research and development that best utilises and enhances the special talents of the School's staff within a friendly framework, as well as being open and responsive to existing bodies of knowledge.

Furthermore, by assuming a researching sensibility, the School has demonstrated a

willingness to broaden its internal profile as an institution that is aware, responsive, willing to trust its staff and act when appropriate. While these are early days and extremely problematic for part-time staff, projects such as this may assist in expressing and clarifying perceptions in relation to the needs of an institution, its staff and the role of policy makers, managers and facilitators within the process of development and institutional change.

Recommendations

Short-term

- Apply insights from Co-Mentoring to enhance staff development and introduce teaching and learning dimension alongside course explanation type meetings.
- Introduce overtly *educational* elements within existing assessment procedures and reports that represent quality of learning and understanding processes alongside marks and percentage.²⁹
- Develop curriculum objectives that declare level and nature of understanding rather than lists of topics covered.³⁰
- Establish a responsive mechanism for school based curriculum planning.

Medium Term

- Continue with, and develop Co-Mentoring.
- Clarify roles of staff facilitators, Heads of Department, Directorate and staff with reference to curriculum development and the developing educational culture.
- Provide Co-Mentoring for all new staff, or staff experiencing difficulties.
- Offer mentoring/co-mentoring to any staff on request.

Develop self-evaluative culture through investigation of assessment and examination procedure; research into assessment in relation to curriculum development; student and staff self-appraisal.

Long Term

- Establish Teaching and Learning department, as a visible commitment to educational practice and development of long-term strategy.
- Engender recognition of the relevance of teaching and learning alongside its artistic remit.

The issue is not solely the readiness of a conservatoire staff to adopt formal educational procedures and new practices but also about trusting teachers within an institution unused to formal educational discussion to develop a reflective practice and vocabulary that

²⁹ Stenhouse, L. *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development* (London: Heinemann 1975) p.143, in A.V. Kelly, *The Curriculum - Theory and Practice, Fourth Edition* (London: Paul Chapman Publishing 1995/1997) p 120.

³⁰ John Biggs *Teaching for Quality Learning at University* SRHE & Open University Press, (Milton Keynes 1999) p.28

reflects their own diversity. The teaching and learning culture will be informed and enriched by reference to existing practice and insight but as teachers ourselves we know that any growth can only take place from where we are now. Further to this is a recognition that staff need to be valued for what they offer already and to perceive development, as enhancement rather than a requirement to adhere to vertically imposed and possibly foreign values or procedures.

*It is not enough that teachers' work should be studied, they need to study it themselves.*³¹

³¹ Stenhouse, L *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*, (London: Heinemann 1975) p.143, in A.V. Kelly, *The Curriculum - Theory and Practice*, Fourth Edition, (London: Paul Chapman Publishing 1995/1997) p 120.

Bibliography

Alred, G. Garvey, R. Smith, R. *The Mentoring Pocketbook*. Hampshire: Management Pocketbooks Ltd, 1998.

Biggs, J. *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. Milton Keynes: SRHE & Open University Press, 1999.

Bloom Benjamin S. and David R. Krathwohl. 'Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals, by a committee of college and university examiners', in *Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*. New York: Longmans, Green, 1956.

Danziger, K. *Constructing the Subject: Historical Origins of Psychological Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Eisner, E.W. *The Art of Educational Evaluation: A Personal View*, London and Philadelphia: Falmer, 1985.

Kelly, A.V. *The Curriculum - Theory and Practice, Fourth Edition*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing, 1995 (1997)

Post-Graduate Certificate in Educational Development Handbook. University of Glamorgan Business School. Field Leader Professor Chris James.

Galloway, W. Timothy and Green, Barry. *The Inner Game of Music*. London: Pan Books, 1987.

GSMD - Quality Assurance Handbook, Guildhall School of Music & Drama. London: June 1998.

Hopkins, D. *A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1985/1992.

Kemmis, Stephen. 'Action Research', in Husen, T. and Postlethwaite, T. (eds). *International Encyclopaedia of Education: Research and Studies*. Oxford: Pergammon in Hopkins 1983.

Kushner, Saville. *Personalising Evaluation*. London: Sage, 2000.

Renshaw, Peter. *An Enabling Framework of the future of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama - A Continuing Journey*. London: February 2001.

Skilbeck, M. (1976) School-based curriculum development, in Open University Course 203, Unit 26, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Smith, Alistair. *Accelerated Learning*. Network Press, Stalhord 1996.

Stenhouse, L. *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*. London: Heinemann, 1975.

Appendix 1

Co-Mentoring Questionnaire Results

1 The mentoring partnership

1.1 List the benefits of working in a mentoring partnership.

support	10
input	9
a second point of reference	9
specific guidance regarding teaching	8
self-esteem	7
other - please list	

(Own words)...

encouragement, stimulation (3)

reason to reflect and focus versus auto-pilot

stimulating ideas for collaboration and curriculum development

confidence to take risks

breaking isolation and uncertainties of teaching

developing awareness of activities throughout the school - cross department

sharing expertise

formal space and framework for support and development (2)

1.2 What problems did you encounter?

meeting regularly	9
agreeing how to use time	0
sustaining a learning agreement	3
clarity of purpose	4

(Own words)...

need to address immediate issues

attending group meetings

sustaining focus under pressure

not enough time to talk about everything!

Learning Agreement a problem

reconciling agenda as a pair versus secondary sources.

1.3 If possible, list some ways in which your co-mentor assisted you:

(Own words)...

sharing skills/materials (8)

recognition of effective practice

listening (5)

support

generating personal in confidence in less familiar aspects of curriculum

witnessing progress

confidence building

affirming belief in staff development

lesson observation/feedback (3)

locating sense of "self" as a teacher and in relation to the school and its ethos

constructive feedback (2)

perspectives on performance

questioning assumptions

developing openness

working through ideas

raising self-esteem

1.4 If possible, list some ways in which you assisted your co-mentor:

(Own words)...

understanding the syllabus

support (4)

reflection

confidence building

assisting in breaking down sense of isolation

developing existing ideas

sharing skills/materials (6)

lesson planning and observation

feedback (2)

listening

developing understanding of academic versus performance

problem solving

seminar/lecture presentation

perspective on academic work across departments

1.6 Was the "Learning Agreement" useful?

Yes	5
moderately useful	4
not very useful	1

If possible, please explain.....

(own words)....

providing focus/reference point (4)

appreciating short term and long term concerns

useful starting point

useful structure

developing rigour

assisting lesson planning and evaluation

clarification of tasks (2)

problems with adhering to LA too closely - fear of preventing development.

LA in opposition to organic development of co-mentoring pair (2)

LA an imposition - a measurable objective counter to the need to address issues as they arose.

1.8 Was the mentoring process of immediate relevance to your daily work?

YES 10

NO 0

Please explain briefly.....

(own words)....

personal development - listening, connecting to different situations

problem solving

commitment to reflection

confidence building (2)

support when teaching a new subject

shared approach to teaching (students and staff)

time to reflect and question own teaching

developing strategies

transforming work ethos of GSMD

work enhanced by supportive context and staff community

lesson planning

emphasises problems with existing syllabus/curriculum

1.9 In your view, what were the roles of the facilitators?

(own words)

<i>leaders</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>supporters</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>teacher</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>co-ordinators</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>consultant/objective support</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>guides</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>advisor</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>evaluator</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>no role</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>unsure</i>	<i>1</i>

1.10 List some ways in which the facilitators were helpful

(own words)...

stimulating secondary sources of educational material (4)
support (4)
flexibility (2)
feedback
good organisation
sensitive management
generating sense of shared learning
good team!
efficient
willing to listen

1.11 What were you expecting from the facilitators?

(own words)...

direction
support
convenors providing focus but with as little direction as possible
leading questions
secondary source provision
co-ordination
enablement

triangular consultation
shared learning
experienced leadership
don't know

1.12 List any problems or frustrations you experienced with the facilitators.

(Own words)....

Maintaining focus

Enormity of topic and its effect on clarity of purpose and points of engagement

Need for more explicit leadership -with hindsight - perhaps not

Agendas - who's, what were they? Role should be clearly defined.

Conflicting availabilities - structure and goals versus available time and contact issues

Relationship to external models obscured by structural problems and attendance

Need for clearer agenda and management

Too much directive material

Sense that facilitators were keen to prove the projects worth to the "fund-holders".

Confusion re nature of mentoring pairs in relation to an external educational schemes

2 Teaching

2.2 Has the project enhanced your teaching:

- a) not at all 0
- b) a little 1
- c) moderately 7
- d) substantially 2

2.1 Has it been possible to focus on clearly identified areas of teaching practice within your collaborative pairing?

- YES 10
- NO 0

If yes, what were they?

(Own words)...

Dealing with specifics

Recognising student responsibility

Enhanced teaching of Keyboard Harmony

Teaching of harmony, improvisation and sight reading

Developing mixed ability group work

Essay marking

Report writing

Teaching of aural

Questioning techniques

Managing challenge between students

Organisation

Lesson planning

Developing awareness of group versus individual teaching

Evaluation - assimilating new ideas

Generating a working atmosphere

Containing frustrations

Identifying needs

Role of humour in teaching

Setting clear goals and guidelines in teaching

If no, what problems did you encounter?

(No responses).

2.3 Did your mentoring partnership lead to tangible teaching outcomes?

Yes 8

Only in a small way

No

(1 mentee stated concerns over "tangible" outcomes)

If possible, please give 2 examples of such outcomes.

(Own words)

Developing realistic targets for students

Developing structured approach towards lesson planning and evaluation

Improves feedback on essays - and developing this
Improved management of dialogue in class
A project in analysis, improvisation and performance during 2001
Planing lectures and seminars
Improved utilisation of resources
Developing clarity in 1:1 lessons
Problems with this question and notions of "tangible outcomes"
Enhanced awareness
Developing student-led work through improved trust
Development of weekly tests
Improved time management
Improved presentation of syllabus
blank (3)

2.4 If possible, how did you evaluate these teaching outcomes? Please tick.

On the hoof	5
After the lesson	5
With your co-mentor	8
Informally	5
In relation to "theories"	1
Other....	in meetings (2), with facilitators, with students

2.5 How useful were the external models and written materials?

a) not at all	1
b) a little	3
c) moderately	5
d) substantially	1

2.6 Have the external educational models affected your work? (Bloom, Learning Cycles etc)

a) not at all	1
b) a little	7
c) moderately	2
d) substantially	0

If possible, please explain briefly

(Own words)....

No use

Little effect

Will take time to absorb and implement but good not to be rushed

Facilitated organisation of instinct and intuition

Models for reflection

Sharpening of thinking due to disagreement

Duplicating existing knowledge leading to openness as a result

Aid to self-analysis

Spur to greater clarity of purpose

Spur to discussion and debate

Didn't appeal - in opposition to nature of co-mentoring

blank

3 Staff Development:

3.1 How has the project met your needs?

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| a) not at all | 0 |
| b) a little | 1 |
| c) moderately | 4 |
| d) substantially | 5 |

3.2 What needs did you feel were unmet?

(Own words)....

Need for more structure (2)

Met more needs than expected

Problems of practicality

More skill sharing

Not challenged enough

'blanks' (4)

4 Significance of project and relevance to the work of the Research Centre

4.1 Do you see the work as being cross-departmentally applicable?

YES 10

NO 0

If so, list a few ways....

(Own words)....

A good thing! (x2)

Links across the school, cross arts etc

Cross-departmental value

Inter departmental consistency and harmony

Sharing expertise

Issues of delivery versus content

Encourages radical reassessment of teaching habits

Relevant!

Shows that there is more to music making than just music making.

Blank

4.2 Do you see this project relating to curriculum development?

YES 10

NO 0

Please tick as appropriate:

gathering evidence from the "shop-floor" 9

sharing experience and insight 9

representing different emphases 8

developing educational know-how 7

enhancing an educational culture that informs the planning of schemes of work 6

developing courses that reflect the needs of students and teachers 8

other - please continue....

4.3 How do you interpret this project in terms of the wider ethos and direction of the School?

(Own words)...

Co Mentoring needs to be developed wider within the school

Essential for staff - safe etc

Part of the future of GSMD

Represents staff contribution to curriculum development

Provides a balance - structure and freedom

Should have impact throughout GSMD (x2)

Essential for self-evaluation and evaluation of school

Needs to become the norm rather than a one-off.

Blank

5 Monitoring and Evaluation:

5.1 What criteria would you recommend to evaluate the usefulness of this process?

(Own words)...

Questionnaires

verbal feedback

Involving students in evaluation process

Create a vocabulary for dissemination

Monitor improvement/development in working environment

Monitor motivation and job satisfaction

Monitor whether staff find this process useful

6 Future recommendations:

If this project were to continue, what recommendations would you make:

6.1 For a continuation - ie a 2nd year?

(Own words)...

Timetable the scheme formally

Develop interdisciplinary element

Mentees to become mentors

Clearer guidelines

'Go for it'

Notion of choice in relation to use of external models

Flexibility within partnerships

Smaller meetings

Formalise link to curriculum development

6.2 For a new cohort of co-mentors and facilitators.

(Own words)...

Compulsory for new professors

Definitely continue with new intake

Specific training

Work with clearly defined agenda, agreed amongst co-mentors.

6.3 Having experienced this work, what are your views regarding formal staff development/training in teaching and learning?

(Own words)....

Great benefit - development and morale

Real need for staff development

"It's necessary!"

Should be a paid opportunity for everyone.

Peer evaluation was highly beneficial, safe, non-threatening.

Rapid identification of problems leading to solutions as soon as possible

Opens up channels of communication within institution.

Staff development - essential

Problems regarding notions of staff development in opposition to perceived nature, aims and objectives of co-mentoring.

This is essential

7 Please add any further thoughts and recommendations. You may also like to comment on the way we have gone about gathering information from you.

(Own words)...

Questionnaire helped focus

Link staff training/development to CPD

x hours teaching = x hours paid reflection

Important project - recognition of pilot scheme as exploratory and valuable

3 blanks