



Evidence of change. Not just satisfaction. Built into Embed.

Most professional development is judged by whether people enjoyed it. The BRIDGES evaluation shows your organisation whether BRIDGES is changing how educators design and deliver learning, using what educators report over time and what their learners experience, not just whether they enjoyed it.

AT A GLANCE

Included with Embed BRIDGES at no extra cost

6 months

with a short follow-up at
around 9 months

About 1 hour

per educator in total, in
short questionnaires

Run by ICL

inside your Embed
environment, no extra
systems

Voluntary

and kept separate from
appraisal

YOUR ROLE Choose a start date and encourage your team to take part. ICL does the rest.

01

Practice, not satisfaction

Looks for real changes in how sessions are planned and delivered, and in the decisions educators make.

02

Evidence from several sources

What educators report at each stage, and
what their learners experience.

03

Safe to be honest

Your organisation sees progress counts,
never individual answers or results.

FOUR STAGES, FROM THE START DATE YOU CHOOSE

Baseline

Start date

Interim

Month 3

End of pilot

Month 6

Follow-up

Month 9

Talk to us about Embed BRIDGES

Organisation-wide development with evaluation built in.

icleducation.com/bridges

PART 1 · FOR ORGANISATIONS

Why evaluate, and why this way

Satisfaction scores say little about whether anything changed in the room. The BRIDGES evaluation looks for changes in professional behaviour: how sessions are planned, the decisions educators make and what learners experience.

It brings together four kinds of evidence, so that no finding rests on any one of them.

What educators tell us

Short questionnaires and reflections at set points.

How it changes over time

The same questions at each stage show what moves, and what lasts.

What learners experience

Anonymous learner ratings from the Digital BRIDGES Review.

What changes around them

Other training or events, so BRIDGES isn't credited with what it didn't cause.

What is involved

Everything happens inside your Embed environment, so there are no extra systems to learn.

For the organisation

- ✓ Choose the start date on the Evaluation page, ideally before the team starts using BRIDGES. The later stages follow automatically.
- ✓ Let the team know the evaluation is happening and give educators time to take part.
- ✓ Tell ICL about anything that might affect the findings, such as other training or changes in the team.

Included in Embed. The evaluation is part of Embed BRIDGES at no extra cost. ICL designs it, runs it and writes the report; your organisation chooses when it starts.

For each educator who chooses to take part

WHEN	WHAT THEY DO	ROUGHLY
Start	Read the information sheet and consent; a few questions about their role and confidence; optionally set one or two goals	10 to 15 minutes
Throughout	Link about two Digital BRIDGES Reviews a month, each with a one-line note	A few minutes a month
Month 3	Short questionnaires and a reflection; rate progress on any goals	About 15 minutes
Month 6	Short questionnaires, including a look back at where they started, and a reflection	About 20 minutes
Month 9	A short follow-up questionnaire and reflection	About 15 minutes

Some educators may also be invited to a 30 to 45 minute conversation with an ICL evaluator.

PART 1 · FOR ORGANISATIONS

What you receive

A clear, honest picture of what BRIDGES has and has not changed in your organisation, and why.

Live progress

On your Evaluation page and dashboard: how many people are taking part, how each stage is going and, once enough people have contributed, what learners said before and after.

A short update at month 3

How implementation is going, so anything getting in the way can be addressed during the pilot rather than discovered at the end.

An evaluation report after month 6

Structured around engagement, perceived value, confidence, professional judgement, reported changes in practice, and what helped or hindered.

A follow-up note after month 9

What has lasted once the pilot has finished.

The report says plainly what the evidence supports and what it does not, so you can use it with confidence with your board, funders and inspectors.

Privacy and trust

The evaluation is about how well BRIDGES works, not how well any individual teaches. ICL never assesses anyone's work, and educators only engage honestly if they trust that, so it is built into how the tool works.

Voluntary

Everyone can use all of BRIDGES whether or not they take part, and can withdraw at any time.

Never used for appraisal

Nothing is used in appraisal, capability or contractual decisions.

Counts, not people

Your organisation sees how many people are taking part, never anyone's answers or results.

Small groups protected

Team figures appear only once an agreed minimum number of people have contributed.

Learners anonymous

Learner ratings are anonymous, and learners are told when a review is part of the evaluation.

Identities stay with ICL

Analysis and reports use participant codes, never names.

PART 2 · THE DETAIL

Evaluation questions

Seven questions guide every evaluation. They move from whether BRIDGES is used, to whether it is valued, to whether it changes thinking and practice, to whether that change lasts.

AREA	QUESTION
Implementation	1 To what extent, and how, did educators engage with BRIDGES, and how far did their use match what was intended?
Implementation	2 What organisational conditions (time, leadership, culture, freedom over design) supported or limited implementation?
Perceived value	3 How acceptable, appropriate and feasible did educators and managers find BRIDGES for their context?
Knowledge and confidence	4 What changes did educators show in their understanding of the BRIDGES elements and their confidence to apply them?
Judgement and practice	5 Did the reasoning educators gave for design and delivery decisions change, and if so how?
Judgement and practice	6 What changes in design and delivery do educators report, how far do learner ratings back them up, and how plausibly can they be linked to BRIDGES?
Sustainment and mechanisms	7 Which changes persisted, and through which mechanisms (capability, opportunity, motivation) did adoption succeed or stall?

Design and stages

A single-group, mixed-methods design with before, during and after measures, and repeated learner ratings for each educator. Your organisation chooses the start date; the later stages open at three, six and nine months.



The baseline should open before the team starts using BRIDGES, so the first answers genuinely come from before. Month 3 is mainly formative. The follow-up is what allows anything to be said about change that lasts.

PART 2 · THE DETAIL

Underpinning theory

The evaluation is theory-based: it sets out how BRIDGES is expected to change practice, then tests each link in that chain against evidence. No single established model fits professional learning well, so each framework does one clear job.

FRAMEWORK	WHAT IT DOES HERE	WHY NOT USE IT ALONE
Theory of Change Weiss, 1995; Funnell and Rogers, 2011	The spine. Sets out the target behaviours, mechanisms, assumptions and conditions BRIDGES needs, agreed with the organisation at the start.	Gives no rules for judging evidence on its own.
Contribution analysis Mayne, 2012	The causal logic. Builds a plausible “contribution story” without a control group and actively tests rival explanations.	Gives plausibility, not proof.
Guskey’s levels Guskey, 2000; 2002	The outcome structure: reactions, learning, organisational support and use of new skills, with learner experience in place of learner outcomes.	Assumes a linear chain; teacher change is often cyclical (Clarke and Hollingsworth, 2002).
Implementation outcomes and CBAM Proctor et al., 2011; Hall and Hord, 2015	Separate “used it” from “liked it”: adoption, acceptability, appropriateness, feasibility, fidelity and sustainment.	Formal Levels of Use ratings need trained interviewers, so they are used as a coding frame.
COM-B Michie, van Stralen and West, 2011	Organises barriers and enablers into capability, opportunity and motivation.	Can over-simplify complex professional judgement.

Why not Kirkpatrick? Kirkpatrick’s four levels (Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick, 2016) are familiar to many organisations and are referenced in reporting, but they are not used as the framework: correlations between levels are weak (Alliger et al., 1997) and the model largely ignores context (Holton, 1996).

Understanding how and why BRIDGES is used is treated as essential, not optional, following Medical Research Council guidance on evaluating complex interventions (Moore et al., 2015; Skivington et al., 2021).

How the frameworks fit together

1. Plan

A Theory of Change workshop sets out what BRIDGES should change in your context, and what has to be true for that to happen.

2. Gather

Guskey’s levels and the implementation outcomes decide what is measured at each stage, from use to changed practice.

3. Judge

Contribution analysis weighs the evidence against rival explanations; COM-B explains what helped and what got in the way.

PART 2 • THE DETAIL

Measures and evidence

The evaluation is built on self-report, with learners' anonymous ratings as the independent check on what educators tell us.

WHAT WE MEASURE	HOW	STATUS
Adoption and engagement	Platform use, reviews linked, and a map of what good use of BRIDGES looks like	Shows exposure, not impact
Acceptability, fit and feasibility	AIM, IAM and FIM: twelve short items (Weiner et al., 2017)	Published measures, validated mainly in health settings
Confidence	"Can do" items for each BRIDGES element and the four cross-cutting themes (Inclusion, Agency, Metacognition, Transfer), 0 to 10, following Bandura (2006), plus a look-back version at the end	Developed for BRIDGES
Reported practice and judgement	Reflections at each stage asking for a specific example of what changed and why	Self-report, analysed qualitatively
Learner experience	The 14 standard Digital BRIDGES Review questions, linked about twice a month	Learner perceptions, not learning
Individual change	One or two personal goals per educator, using Goal Attainment Scaling (Kiresuk and Sherman, 1968)	Established method; not comparable across people
Barriers, enablers and rival explanations	Reflections, interviews and an ICL evidence log, analysed using COM-B	Qualitative

Apart from AIM, IAM and FIM, the questionnaires were written for BRIDGES and have no established psychometric properties. Reports say so.

Reported versus demonstrated change

Every claimed change is placed on an evidence hierarchy, and reports count how many changes reach each level.



The Digital BRIDGES Review's role. Self-ratings show how educators see their own practice, not how good it is (Dunning, Heath and Suls, 2004). As understanding grows, self-ratings can fall even when practice improves (Howard, 1980), so a retrospective rating at the end checks for this. Learner ratings are the main independent evidence, tracked for each educator before and after they start BRIDGES.

PART 2 · THE DETAIL

Analysis and reporting

Analysis is deliberately proportionate. Small teams do not justify sophisticated statistics, and pretending otherwise would weaken the findings.

Numbers

Counts, medians and ranges; each person's change shown individually; paired "went up, stayed the same, went down" counts. No significance tests at pilot scale.

Learner ratings over time

Each educator's linked reviews are plotted before and after their BRIDGES start date, in the style of single-case designs (Kratochwill et al., 2013).

Written answers and interviews

Framework analysis (Ritchie and Spencer, 1994) using COM-B and the evaluation questions, with room for themes that emerge.

Bringing it together

Each question set against each source (Fetters, Curry and Creswell, 2013), leading to a contribution story that names the alternative explanations considered.

Every figure in a report to your organisation is withheld if fewer than the agreed minimum number of people contributed to it.

Ethics and data protection

The evaluation follows BERA's *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research* (BERA, 2024) and UK GDPR.

Consent	Each educator reads an information sheet and agrees or declines inside Embed. If the information sheet changes, or the start date moves after people have consented, they are asked to confirm again.
Lawful basis and roles	Agreed with each organisation and stated in the information sheet. ICL and the organisation agree their data roles in writing.
Withdrawal	At any time, from the Evaluation page. Withdrawn participants drop out of every analysis and report, and ICL deletes their data on request.
Small-group protection	A minimum group size is agreed for every team figure. Quotations are anonymised and may be paraphrased.
Retention	Data is kept until a date stated in the information sheet, then deleted or fully anonymised.
Our interest	ICL provides BRIDGES and evaluates it. We declare that openly, use fixed questionnaires and report unfavourable findings.

PART 2 • THE DETAIL

What the findings can and cannot claim

A single organisation without a comparison group cannot prove that BRIDGES causes better teaching. Being clear about that is what makes the findings credible.

The evaluation can show

- ✓ How educators engaged with BRIDGES
- ✓ How acceptable, appropriate and feasible they found it
- ✓ What changes educators report in their planning and delivery
- ✓ Whether learner ratings back those changes up, and how plausibly they link to BRIDGES
- ✓ What helped and what got in the way

It cannot show

- That BRIDGES caused better teaching quality
- Any effect on learner outcomes or achievement
- That rising self-ratings mean better teaching
- That results will repeat in other organisations
- That changes last, without the follow-up

Main risks and how they are reduced

RISK	HOW IT IS REDUCED
No comparison group, small numbers	Contribution analysis and learner timelines for each person. Where team size allows, two cohorts starting a few weeks apart strengthen the design.
Enthusiasts take part, others do not	Everyone is invited, and people who engage less are deliberately included in interviews.
Self-report can be optimistic	Specific examples are asked for, a look-back question checks for shifting standards, and learner ratings give an independent check.
Choosing which sessions to review	Review sessions are agreed in advance where possible, and each carries a context note.
ICL evaluating its own product	Declared openly; fixed questionnaires, learner ratings as an independent check and reporting of unfavourable findings.

Bring BRIDGES and its evaluation to your organisation

Talk to us about Embed BRIDGES: info@icleducation.com

icleducation.com/bridges

PART 2 • THE DETAIL

References

- Alliger, G.M., Tannenbaum, S.I., Bennett, W., Traver, H. and Shotland, A. (1997) 'A meta-analysis of the relations among training criteria', *Personnel Psychology*, 50(2), pp. 341–358.
- Bandura, A. (2006) 'Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales', in Pajares, F. and Urdan, T. (eds) *Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, pp. 307–337.
- BERA (2024) *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*. 5th edn. London: British Educational Research Association.
- Clarke, D. and Hollingsworth, H. (2002) 'Elaborating a model of teacher professional growth', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(8), pp. 947–967.
- Dunning, D., Heath, C. and Suls, J.M. (2004) 'Flawed self-assessment: implications for health, education, and the workplace', *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 5(3), pp. 69–106.
- Fetters, M.D., Curry, L.A. and Creswell, J.W. (2013) 'Achieving integration in mixed methods designs: principles and practices', *Health Services Research*, 48(6pt2), pp. 2134–2156.
- Funnell, S.C. and Rogers, P.J. (2011) *Purposeful Program Theory*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Guskey, T.R. (2000) *Evaluating Professional Development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Guskey, T.R. (2002) 'Professional development and teacher change', *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 8(3), pp. 381–391.
- Hall, G.E. and Hord, S.M. (2015) *Implementing Change: Patterns, Principles, and Potholes*. 4th edn. Boston: Pearson.
- Holton, E.F. (1996) 'The flawed four-level evaluation model', *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 7(1), pp. 5–21.
- Howard, G.S. (1980) 'Response-shift bias: a problem in evaluating interventions with pre/post self-reports', *Evaluation Review*, 4(1), pp. 93–106.
- Kirkpatrick, J.D. and Kirkpatrick, W.K. (2016) *Kirkpatrick's Four Levels of Training Evaluation*. Alexandria, VA: ATD Press.
- Kiresuk, T.J. and Sherman, R.E. (1968) 'Goal attainment scaling: a general method for evaluating comprehensive community mental health programs', *Community Mental Health Journal*, 4(6), pp. 443–453.
- Kratochwill, T.R., Hitchcock, J.H., Horner, R.H., Levin, J.R., Odom, S.L., Rindskopf, D.M. and Shadish, W.R. (2013) 'Single-case intervention research design standards', *Remedial and Special Education*, 34(1), pp. 26–38.
- Mayne, J. (2012) 'Contribution analysis: coming of age?', *Evaluation*, 18(3), pp. 270–280.
- Michie, S., van Stralen, M.M. and West, R. (2011) 'The behaviour change wheel: a new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions', *Implementation Science*, 6, 42.
- Moore, G.F. et al. (2015) 'Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance', *BMJ*, 350, h1258.
- Proctor, E. et al. (2011) 'Outcomes for implementation research: conceptual distinctions, measurement challenges, and research agenda', *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 38(2), pp. 65–76.
- Ritchie, J. and Spencer, L. (1994) 'Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research', in Bryman, A. and Burgess, R.G. (eds) *Analyzing Qualitative Data*. London: Routledge, pp. 173–194.
- Skivington, K. et al. (2021) 'A new framework for developing and evaluating complex interventions: update of Medical Research Council guidance', *BMJ*, 374, n2061.
- Weiner, B.J. et al. (2017) 'Psychometric assessment of three newly developed implementation outcome measures', *Implementation Science*, 12, 108.
- Weiss, C.H. (1995) 'Nothing as practical as good theory: exploring theory-based evaluation for comprehensive community initiatives for children and families', in Connell, J.P., Kubisch, A.C., Schorr, L.B. and Weiss, C.H. (eds) *New Approaches to Evaluating Comprehensive Community Initiatives*. Washington, DC: Aspen Institute, pp. 65–92.