



International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Edu

Mentoring and coaching in education practitioners' professional learning:

Realising research impact

Marion Jones

Article information:

To cite this document:

Marion Jones , (2015), "Mentoring and coaching in education practitioners' professional learning", International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education, Vol. 4 Iss 4 pp. 293 - 302

Permanent link to this document:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-09-2015-0027>

Downloaded on: 10 November 2016, At: 02:08 (PT)

References: this document contains references to 20 other documents.

To copy this document: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

The fulltext of this document has been downloaded 476 times since 2015*

Users who downloaded this article also downloaded:

(2015), "The Gradual Increase of Responsibility Model for coaching teachers: Scaffolds for change", International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education, Vol. 4 Iss 4 pp. 269-292 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-06-2015-0017>

(2015), "Educative mentoring: a way forward", International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education, Vol. 4 Iss 4 pp. 240-254 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-03-2015-0006>

Access to this document was granted through an Emerald subscription provided by emerald-srm:563821 []

For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit www.emeraldinsight.com/authors for more information.

About Emerald www.emeraldinsight.com

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

*Related content and download information correct at time of download.

RESEARCH IMPACT IN FOCUS

Mentoring and coaching in education practitioners' professional learning

Realising research impact

Education
practitioners'
professional
learning

293

Received 29 July 2015
Revised 27 August 2015
12 September 2015
Accepted 22 September 2015

Marion Jones

School of Education, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool, UK

Abstract

Purpose – Mentoring and coaching are key strategies employed in workplace learning and are perceived as effective ways to provide learner support. However, there is a paucity of evidence of how research outcomes may have influenced these practices and to what extent they have benefited those involved in this process. The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that research on mentoring and coaching can in fact result in beneficial impacts on education professionals' learning and development.

Design/methodology/approach – The paper critically reflects on the process of developing an impact case study submitted to the UK Research Excellence Framework 2014. It seeks to make explicit the close relationship that exists between research and professional practice and how evidence of any resulting impact of research on user communities can be identified, collected and verified.

Findings – In describing the process of developing such an impact case study the article focuses on three key aspects: identifying a suitable case; meeting the criteria of high quality research; and evidencing impact. It highlights the importance of a collective, cross-professional approach and draws attention to the nexus that needs to be established between user and research communities, between academics and professional practitioners, in order to generate evidence of research impact in the field.

Originality/value – This paper brings to light the benefits research in mentoring and coaching can have on policy and practice, specifically in terms of education professionals' workplace learning and continuing professional development in a local and international context.

Keywords Workplace learning, Mentoring in education, Professional development and mentoring, Continuing professional development, Adult workplace coaching

Paper type Case study

Introduction

Over the past 20 years or so, mentoring and coaching have enjoyed growing popularity and have been employed as key strategies in professional learning and career development (Cordingley, 2005; Brockbank and McGill, 2006; Pask and Barrie, 2007; Hobson *et al.*, 2009; Tolhurst, 2006; Burley and Pomphrey, 2011). In the teaching profession in particular, mentoring and coaching have formed a key component in pre-service preparation, induction and continuous professional development programmes. During this period there has been an increased interest in examining the theoretical foundations and conceptual frameworks underpinning this practice, which has resulted in a plethora of research literature (Fletcher and Mullen, 2012; Lord *et al.*, 2008). However, the relationship between research and practice in this field warrants greater attention and there is a paucity of evidence with regard to how research outcomes may have influenced mentoring and coaching practices and to what extent this has benefited those involved in this process. Against this backdrop the paper highlights the need for making explicit the relationship between research and its impact on user



communities, such as education practitioners. In doing so, reference will be made to the development of an impact case study on mentoring and tutoring, which formed a component of my university's submission to the UK Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2014 (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2014a).

The REF

In the UK, the REF is an exercise that takes place approximately every five to six years with the aim of evaluating the quality of research conducted by British higher education institutions. It is undertaken on behalf of the four UK higher education funding councils to distribute funding for research. For the first time a submission not only required providing evidence of high quality outputs (normally taking the form of peer-reviewed publications), but also demonstrating the impact of research on the economy, society, public policy, culture and the quality of life (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2012). The case study to which this paper relates was one of 36 Units of Assessment[1] (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2014b), each of which was awarded a quality profile as a measure of its overall or average quality of its research. It was expressed as a grade point average (GPA), which determined a unit's ranking in the national performance league tables. The quality profile consisted of three sub-profiles, namely outputs, impact and environment. Impact accounted for 20 per cent of the scoring system and thus constituted a component that could critically influence the GPA Assessment of impact was expressed at four starred levels[2] and in relation to two criteria: "reach", which related to how widely impact was felt, and "significance", which indicated how much difference it made to the beneficiaries. One of the key requirements was to make explicit the relationship between an institution's research and its resulting benefits for user communities, which also provided an opportunity to identify, acknowledge and make public the beneficial impact of research in the real world.

Developing the impact case study

This example focuses on the REF impact case study on "Mentoring and coaching in education practitioners' professional learning" (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2014c), the development of which created an informed perspective on the impact of research in mentoring and coaching on professional practice and the beneficial effect that can be derived from these two learner support strategies. Although these two approaches to learner support can be perceived as independently occurring processes, each of which is driven by distinct aims and objectives, they can be understood as complementing one another. While mentoring is primarily concerned with "growing an individual", both professionally and personally, and as such is of a more developmental nature, coaching tends to have a narrower remit relating to specific areas of performance and learning outcomes (Lord *et al.*, 2008; Whitmore, 2010). For the purpose of this paper, mentoring and coaching can thus be understood as interrelated concepts, the boundaries of which are blurred (CUREE, 2005).

The challenges confronting us

The REF2014 results indicate that since the previous Research Assessment Exercise in 2008, the quality of educational research has improved, and the impact case studies submitted for education were excellent overall (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2014d). However, as highlighted by Menter (2015), the criterion that the

underpinning research had to be of “two star” graded quality meant that outputs, such as research-based textbooks and research practitioner reports, regardless of how valued and important they were amongst users, were excluded. A time frame of up to 15 years between impact and research applied, which meant that the impact described had to have occurred between 1 January 2008 and 31 July 2013. Furthermore, the underpinning research had to be produced by the submitting university between 1 January 1993 to December 2013, not by individual researchers (Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), 2014e). This meant that if a researcher left a higher education institution before the REF submission census date, impact related to his/her work could only be claimed if the underpinning research was continued by the department in which it was started. It is thus possible that, in some cases, high quality impact may have been excluded from the process. Within these given time parameters the challenge was to select an example that would meet the criterion of high impact as well as high quality research. Moreover, the case study had to be constructed as a meaningful, contextualised, coherent narrative with evidence of specific benefits, demonstrating “reach” and “significance” (HEFCE, 2014e). Accordingly, the pathway to impact had to be made explicit. In relation to our case study we had to demonstrate how a publicly funded research project led to formal outputs, such as resources for training and development programmes for mentors supporting the professional learning and development of novice teachers. To achieve this we identified specific examples of local, national and international impact in the form of benefits derived by user communities in a range of educational practice settings. By describing the process through which this was accomplished, the paper will focus on the following three key aspects: identifying a suitable case; meeting the criteria of high quality research; and evidencing impact.

Identifying the case

The rationale for selecting our case was primarily informed by the fact that as part of our Initial Teacher Education (ITE) Partnership we provided professional development programmes in mentoring and coaching for teachers in schools, who assisted trainee, newly qualified and practising teachers in their pre-service preparation, induction and continuing professional development. We thus regularly engaged with the user community and the resources and learning strategies employed in our work with education practitioners locally, regionally and internationally were informed and underpinned by our research.

The main challenge confronting us was to establish the link between professional practice and high quality academic research. As expressed in the reflections of the Chair of the Education Sub-Panel, Andrew Pollard, “The activity required to compete successfully in social scientific terms is [...] becoming increasingly distinct from the activity required to flourish in the rapidly changing fields of teacher education” (Pollard, 2014, p. 2). Here the division of labour is apparent in the increasing bifurcation of research and teaching (Murray *et al.*, 2009; Beath *et al.*, 2012), which has meant that those engaging in mentoring and coaching practice and delivering mentor and coach training often work independently from those undertaking the research in this field. This phenomenon reflects a situation where mutual engagement and collaboration between researchers and education practitioners was the exception rather than the rule. The REF requirement for high quality research crystallised this division of labour in teacher education even further. It demanded time and effort to liaise with and seek the assistance of colleagues who had the relevant links to the user community but were not active members of the research community.

In developing the REF impact case study we needed to gain access to relevant user communities to gather evidence of research impact in support of our claims. However, we soon realised that this could only be achieved in collaboration with colleagues, who as part of their day-to-day work had established positive, professional relationships with members of the various user communities and, in so doing, had acquired a profound understanding of specific user needs and how they could be addressed. Furthermore, we sought answers to the following questions: how would we be able to provide convincing evidence of the beneficial impact of our research in the user communities in relation to mentoring and coaching? Who would we need to contact to verify our claims? What kind of interaction with the user groups would be seen as relevant? What kind of material would be recognised as valid evidence? How did our contribution effect change or a better understanding?

Meeting the criteria of high quality research

In selecting our case we were confident that the underpinning research we had undertaken would meet the criterion of “high quality”. Our research had attracted external funding from a range of sources and the resulting outputs had been published in peer-reviewed journals, both of which we considered to be an indication of quality. All related outputs were deemed to satisfy the threshold criterion of at least 2* (“internationally significant”) graded research and could specifically be tagged to two specific research projects.

Although the five key outputs and grants listed under “References to the Research” could include items dating back as far as 15 years, our publication window was effectively limited to eight years, dating back to September 2005, when I had moved to my current institution. As mentioned before, any earlier published work, however, relevant, was not eligible, as it was the research conducted by the submitting department that counted, not that conducted by an individual. This raises the issue of how reliable the current system is in capturing research outputs in relation to their impact. By applying these selection criteria, it could be argued that the impact of some research will remain invisible, regardless of its relevance and impact, while the impact of outputs published after 2005 may not yet have fully developed. It is not difficult to see how this requirement favours departments where a sufficiently high number of researchers can provide the critical mass necessary to ensure the continuation of research on a given theme. This places universities where ITE provision forms a substantial part of their portfolio, and where research is conducted by a relatively small number of staff, at a distinct disadvantage compared to their research-intensive counterparts. Where this is the case, thematically formed research groups are highly vulnerable in terms of sustainability of their work. For example, the loss of one key researcher may jeopardise the continuation of the research in a specific area and with it the submission of an impact case study, even if evidence of impact resulting from earlier research could be demonstrated.

By submitting our examples of research impact in two specific areas, we hoped to score highly through having a concentrated and verifiable effect in a small, focused area and a more modest effect across a wider, diverse user community.

The European Union (EU) funded (£200k) TISSNTE (Teacher Induction: Supporting the Supporters of Novice Teachers) project (February 2006-August 2009) was co-ordinated by us and focused on the needs of those supporting novice teachers in their professional learning during the early years of their career. It explored the mentoring dimension in education practitioners’ professional learning and generated insight and understanding

in relation to the complexity of the mentoring role, how it is perceived and enacted in the practice setting and the potential tensions arising. The project contained a research component (the TISSNTE needs analysis), which sought to identify key themes around which common support strategies for teacher learning could be developed. It involved a survey (semi-structured questionnaire and interview) completed by 283 practising teachers associated with 21 initial teacher education providers across the 12 participating European countries. The research outcomes consisted of the identification of support strategies, skills and resources, which mentors considered essential in providing effective support to novice teachers, and informed the development and delivery of an Intensive Course (Budapest 12-17 October 2008) attended by 30 teachers from 12 European member states Course Reference Number UK-2008-769-001 (www.tissnte.eu/docs/IC/IC-overview-oo-2.pdf). Furthermore, it produced evidence of the reciprocal benefits of mentoring and its potential to promote knowledge generation amongst education practitioners.

A second, two-phase research project was concerned with the Impact of ITE Partnerships on Schools. It was conducted collaboratively between the universities of Liverpool John Moores, Manchester, Manchester Metropolitan and the Open University. Phase 1 (Oct 05-May 06) consisted of a questionnaire survey, involving 1073 mentors from primary and secondary schools in partnership with 5 ITE providers in the Northwest of England. One of the key findings was that over three quarters of teachers believed that working with trainee and newly qualified teachers afforded them opportunities for their own professional learning and development. Following on from this survey, the Teacher Development Agency (TDA)[3] commissioned and funded a small-scale, qualitative study. Phase 2 (January 2008-December 2008; Funding: TDA £13k) was led by Jones in collaboration with McNamara (Manchester University) and Campbell (Leeds Metropolitan University), with the aim of investigating the learning benefits accrued by the mentors in the form of ten case studies for the TDA's resources bank (no longer available online following abolition of the TDA). The findings of this research indicated that mentoring can: facilitate high quality, specific and contextual workplace learning that is intergenerational; promote leadership of learning by the practitioners themselves; lead to school wide innovations and dissemination of practice that results in positive effects on pupil behaviour and achievement.

The knowledge accrued from both these projects was disseminated to teacher education practitioners at Seminar 5 of the (ESRC)[4] funded (£18k) Seminar Series on Workplace Learning in Teacher Education (WLITE) in June 2011, managed by Professor Jones and Dr Stanley (Liverpool John Moores University) in collaboration with Profs McNamara (Principal Investigator, Manchester University) and Murray (Co-Investigator, University of East London).

Evidencing impact

In order to demonstrate that our research on mentoring and coaching had informed the development of teaching and training programmes, we had to produce convincing evidence that it had resulted in impact as defined by the REF framework. To tackle this challenge we had to find answers to the following three questions: what counts as evidence of impact? Where can it be located? Who can verify it, especially in case of an audit?

In developing the two examples we submitted in our impact case study, we were cognisant of the need to strengthen the robustness of our evidence base by presenting a combination of qualitative (individual testimonials, programme evaluations) as well as quantitative (number of participants completing mentor/coach training programmes)

data. We were equally aware that dissemination and awareness-raising was not enough. In order to meet the criteria of “reach” and “significance” we had to demonstrate that the impact of the research manifested itself in change, i.e. in making a difference. In order to track down those individuals and organisations where we expected this to be the case, we requested the assistance of colleagues who had established positive relationships with members of the user communities and who could act as conduits in our quest for key individuals (e.g. headteachers and school-based mentors), who as a direct result of having undertaken training had modified their professional practice as mentors/coaches or had introduced a new mentor/coach framework in their school. We hoped that their testimonials would provide us with powerful voices in support of our claims.

Details of the impact

The following extract from our impact case study provides an example of how we presented evidence of impact by clearly outlining how it was connected to the research. This included detailed information about how the research was funded, its aims and purposes, the participants, associated activities and related outcomes.

Our research in the context of teachers’ professional learning has enabled teachers to develop a critical understanding of their role as mentors and to enact this role effectively in the practice setting. The development of the TISSNTE Needs Analysis tool was achieved through active engagement with over 100 practitioners across the 12 European countries involved in the TISSNTE project. Teachers with responsibility for Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and Local Authority staff took part in the piloting and evaluation of the survey questionnaire and interview schedule. The outcomes of the TISSNTE needs analysis exercise informed the development and delivery of a one week Intensive Course on Mentoring (www.tissnte.eu/docs/IC/IC-overview-oo-2.pdf) held in Budapest (12-17 October 2008). It was aimed at practising teachers supporting novice teachers in their professional development in the early stages of their career. The event was attended by 30 teachers from 13 European member states, who had received financial support from their respective regional National Bureaus. As evidenced in participant feedback, the Course contributed to teachers’ and teacher educators’ professional learning by enhancing sensitivity to novice teachers’ needs, facilitating a critical understanding of the complexity of the mentoring role and developing their skills and strategies employed in the effective support of novice teachers. These include: classroom observation, monitoring of progress, evaluation and assessment of competence and providing constructive feedback. A further benefit of the TISSNTE research was that the materials and resources produced for the Intensive Course are used by the University of Lisboa (Portugal) to assist teachers in supporting novice teachers’ professional learning in schools.

Furthermore, to illustrate “reach” beyond the original boundaries of the research we highlighted the wider national and international engagement with professionals, not only in teaching but also in nursing and social work.

On the basis of the EU and TDA funded research, Jones received a number of invitations to deliver keynote lectures (Finland 2010; England 2013) and run seminars/workshops (Norway 2008; Hungary 2012) aimed at practitioners from education, health and social work. The participants of these dissemination and professional development events reported benefits in terms of an increased awareness of the complexity of the mentoring role, the wide range of strategies and skills that effective mentoring requires and the reciprocal benefits accrued for themselves as individual practitioners as well as

on a departmental and institutional level. For example, a teacher educator, who attended the ESRC Higher Education Institutions Knowledge Transfer Seminar on Hybridity, Creativity and “New Professionalism” University of Chester, June 2012 (www.chester.ac.uk/node/14086) requested permission (e-mail sent on 02.09.2012) to use the resources developed by Jones in 4 training workshops attended by 120 novice teachers.

An invitation was received from the *CPDUpdate* Editor to report the key findings of the TDA funded research on the Impact of ITE Partnerships on Schools. *CPDUpdate* is a widely circulated magazine amongst education professionals in schools. One of its aims is to present research findings in a digestible, easily accessible form to practitioners (See Jones, Campbell, McNamara & Stanley, Developing professional learning communities – the hidden curriculum of ITE mentoring, May 2009, No. 116, pp. 6-9).

As illustrated by these examples, the impact of our research was highly specific and significant in relation to individual users and user groups.

Regionally, the research has informed the University’s mentor training and development programmes attended by education practitioners. Thus the research has influenced the professional practice of over 100 individual teachers, senior managers and teaching assistants in primary and secondary schools and shaped the development of departmental and whole school initiatives. Examples include:

- enhanced mentoring and coaching support for newly qualified teachers;
- promotion to the school’s leadership team as a result of undertaking one of our CPD programmes in mentoring and coaching;
- implementation of a Virtual Learning Environment forum to develop a multiple mentor network with the aim of improving the quality of teaching and the school’s Ofsted Inspection result; and
- implementation of active listening skills as part of an effective mentoring strategy employed in supporting adolescent learners.

Formal participant evaluations indicate the extent to which participants have benefited from these programmes:

- All three participants from Clare Mount Specialist Sports College attending the “Mentoring skills for Teaching Assistants” training session in February and June 2013 stated that it had had a “significant” impact on their understanding of the mentoring concept and its application in the practice context.
- In total 97 percent (28/29) of the teachers attending the “Outstanding Mentoring” session in February 2013 stated that it had deepened and clarified their understanding of what constituted “outstanding mentoring” as defined by Ofsted.
- In total 97percent (31/32) of the participants completing the A P Mentoring and Coaching modules rated the professional relevance of the course as either “good” (3), “very good” (14) or “excellent” (14) and reported “significant”/“very significant” impact in relation to their own professional development, teaching skills, pupils’ learning outcomes and practice within their institution. They reported benefits in relation to their personal/professional development and their practice within the school as well as learner development. The course had enabled them to extend their range of mentoring and coaching techniques, for example, the use of “clean language” in feedback, which resulted in improved

student responses in class and getting students to talk more, and generally improved relationships between teaching staff and students. The coaching techniques acquired by school staff attending the LJMU programme led to the introduction of peer mentoring and staff focus groups for collaborative planning and development of learner support in the school's professional development programme.

- Feedback from the 16 teachers who completed the LJMU Mentoring and Coaching module delivered at Notre Dame High School, Liverpool, in 2011 as part of the school's continuing professional development programme indicates benefits accrued in relation to informing professional practice (12/16). Particular benefits highlighted by the participants were stronger relationships with peers and pupils (6/16), mentoring techniques used with pupils (8/16) and staff (6/16) and improved communication skills (9/16). This is what some of the participants said:

I am able to use some of the mentoring techniques from the course with pupils in the classroom, especially around listening and questioning.

I have a deeper understanding of the mentoring process. My new knowledge now allows me to understand pupils better and access their needs at a higher level.

There has been an impact on our pupils from the staff who have engaged in this course. Some pupils have become more cooperative and open with feelings and emotions.

I now use learning communities more extensively within my role to focus staff and encourage professional dialogue.

Concluding comments

Given that this was a first attempt at developing an impact case study, the REF outcome of a "three star" grading was very favourable. But what has been particularly rewarding is the knowledge that research concerned with the conceptual definition and practical application of mentoring and coaching can be evidenced through real and tangible examples in user communities. This is particularly pleasing in view of the often casual and superficial use of the terms "mentoring" and "coaching", when learning needs are to be addressed and quick fixes are required, but when concrete and specific evidence of beneficial impact is rarely supplied.

No doubt, preparations for the next REF 2020 are already underway and institutions are employing strategies to enhance the robustness of their impact evidence base. We are only too aware that in order to continue our impact case study on mentoring and coaching, we need to ensure that we not only provide the necessary high quality underpinning research, but, what is equally important, we make engagement with the user communities our priority with the aim of establishing new and maintaining positive existing relationships. In this endeavor we need to enlist the support and cooperation of key individuals within our institutions, who, for example, provide consultancy services and are involved in the delivery of training and professional development programmes for novice teachers and existing practitioners. For, they play a central role in establishing and maintaining positive relationships with the user community and can act as conduits between researchers and practitioners to facilitate the collection and collation of valid evidence and the verification of impact claims. Only through the collaborative, collective effort of academics, researchers, professional practitioners and users will we be able to ensure that research impact is captured accurately and reliably.

Notes

1. Submissions were made in 36 subject areas, so-called Units of Assessment.
2. 4* Outstanding impacts; 3* Very considerable impacts; 2* Considerable impacts; 1* Recognised but modest impacts; U Impact of little or no reach and significance; impact was not eligible; or the impact not underpinned by excellent research produced by the submitting unit.
3. The Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA), formerly known as the Teacher Training Agency (TTA), was a body responsible for the initial and in-service training of teachers in England. It was relaunched in April 2012 as the Teaching Agency with responsibility for the supply, retention and quality of the workforce and regulation of teacher conduct.
4. The Economic Social Research Fund (ESRC) is the UK's largest organisation for funding high quality research on social and economic issues.

References

- Beath, J., Poyago-Theotoky, J. and Ulph, D. (2012), "University funding systems' impact on research and teaching", *Economics*, Vol. 6, available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5018/economics-ejournal.ja.2012-2> (accessed 23 July 2015).
- Brockbank, A. and McGill, I. (2006), *Facilitating Reflective Learning through Mentoring and Coaching*, Kogan-Page, London.
- Burley, S. and Pomphrey, C. (2011), *Mentoring & Coaching in Schools: Professional Learning Through Collaborative Inquiry*, Routledge, Abingdon.
- Centre for the Use of Research and Evidence in Education (CUREE) (2005), "National framework for mentoring and coaching", available at: www.curee.co.uk/national-framework-and-resources
- Cordingley, P. (2005), "The role of mentoring and coaching in teachers' learning and development", *Education Review*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 68-74.
- Fletcher, S.J. and Mullen, C.A. (Eds) (2012), *Sage Handbook of Mentoring and Coaching*, Sage, London.
- Higher Education Funding Council for England (2012), "Assessment framework and guidance on submission", available at: www.ref.ac.uk/media/ref/content/pub/assessmentframeworkandguidanceonsubmissions/GOS%20including%20addendum.pdf
- Higher Education Funding Council for England (2014a), "Research excellence framework (REF)", available at: www.ref.ac.uk/
- Higher Education Funding Council for England (2014b), "REF2014. Units of assessment", available at: www.ref.ac.uk/panels/unitsofassessment/
- Higher Education Funding Council for England (2014c), "REF2014. 25 – Education, Liverpool John Moores", available at: <http://results.ref.ac.uk/Results/BySubmission/217>
- Higher Education Funding Council for England (2014d), "REF2014 Research Excellence Framework. REF 2014 Panel Overview Reports", December, available at: www.ref.ac.uk/panels/paneloverviewreports/
- Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) (2014e), "REF2014 Research Excellence Framework", available at: www.ref.ac.uk/panels/assessmentcriteriaandleveldefinitions/
- Hobson, A.J., Ashby, P., Malderez, A. and Tomlinson, P.D. (2009), "Mentoring beginning teachers: what we know and what we don't", *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 207-216.

-
- Lord, P., Atkinson, M. and Mitchell, H. (2008), *Mentoring and Coaching for Professionals: A Survey of the Research Evidence*, TDA, London.
- Menter, I. (2015), "BERA and the REF: what have we learned?", *Research Intelligence*, No. 126, pp. 3-4.
- Murray, J., Campbell, A., Hextall, I., Hulme, M., Jones, M., Mahoney, P., Menter, I., Procter, R. and Wall, K. (2009), "Research and teacher education in the UK: building capacity", *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 25 No. 7, pp. 944-950.
- Pask, R. and Barrie, B. (2007), *Mentoring and Coaching: A Guide for Education Professionals*, Open University Press, Maidenhead.
- Pollard, A. (2014), "REF 2014: what does it mean for education? A commentary by Andrew Pollard", Chair of the Education Sub-Panel, 18 December, available at: www.bera.ac.uk/promoting-educational-research/issues/ref2014 (accessed 23 July 2015).
- Tolhurst, J. (2006), *Coaching for Schools: A Practical Guide to Building Leadership Capacity*, Pearson Education Ltd, Harlow, Essex.
- Whitmore, J. (2010), *Coaching for Performance: Growing Human Potential and Purpose: The Principles and Practice of Leadership*, 4th ed., Nicholas Brealy Publishing, Boston, MA.

Corresponding author

Professor Marion Jones can be contacted at: MJones@ljmu.ac.uk

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm

Or contact us for further details: permissions@emeraldinsight.com