NQT Quality improvement study

4.4 Induction

4.4.1 In House Induction Process

Induction processes overall

Overall, almost all (96.7%) of the SLT respondents to the survey indicated they had some kind of induction process within the school. It seems from SLT responses that 10% time release from the timetable for NQTs and having an induction tutor are standard (as was also apparent from the environment map stage). Common practices include using TDA standards, observing others teach and training courses. It seems less common for NQTs to visit other schools and access help / support in working with Teaching Assistants (Table 21 below). Consistent with SLT findings, NQTs responding to the survey also indicated that 10% time release was standard practice although significantly fewer NQTs indicated that using TDA Standards was common practice (Table 21 below). As with the Environment Map report, we found that in general NQTs' experience was far less complete than the SLT responses suggest. In particular, they were less likely to experience SLT support, to use TDA standards, observe others teach, be engaged in an LA induction programme or be given help in working with TAs. There were particularly large discrepancies between the SLT claims of having an in house induction programme and a written induction programme by NQTs, perhaps indicating that the policy of having such plans was not always implemented in practice.

Table 21 Overall induction support - Survey Respondents - SLT and NQT Responses

Activity	SLT: Always Include		NQTs: actually received	
	Total %	Total n	Total %	Total n
10% time release from timetable	99.1	800	96.6	465
Induction tutor	98.6	797	91.2	465
Using TDA Standards	95.3	783	81.9	465
Observing others teachers	94.4	805	91.6	465
Training courses	93.5	803	87.5	465
In house induction programme	87.8	768	59.1	465
Career Entry & Development Profile (CEDP)	82.9	767	80.9	465
Local Authority Induction Programme	81.7	789	62.4	465
Other mentor / coach e.g. member of SLT responsible for CPD	80.8	754	61.9	465
Written individual programme	76.1	754	48.4	465
Help / support in working with Teaching Assistants	64.9	776	43.2	465
Visits to other schools	52.3	790	44.1	465

A study commissioned by the Training and Development Agency for Schools
Carried out by the Centre for Education and Inclusion Research, PCASO and Primary Subject Groups
Sheffield Hallam University

NQT Quality improvement study

Induction: differences by school type

Overall the pattern of survey responses does not seem to differ greatly much between types of school, and we only report the major differences in Table 22 below. Secondary schools are more likely to include another mentor/coach and special schools are more likely to include visits to other schools and help / support in working with Teaching Assistants (Table 22 below).

Table 22 Some differences in overall induction support by school type - Survey Respondents (SLT Responses)

Activity		Always include	Total n
Other mentor/coach e.g. member of SLT responsible for CPD	Primary	77.3	507
	Secondary	90.4	187
	Independent	82.9	35
	Special	77.3	22
Written individual programme	Primary	78.9	512
	Secondary	67.8	183
	Independent	77.1	35
	Special	76.2	21
Visits to other schools	Primary	59.5	543
	Secondary	28.5	186
	Independent	51.4	35
	Special	73.9	23
Local authority induction programme	Primary	91.4	546
	Secondary	64.9	188
	Independent	29.0	31
	Special	66.7	21
In house induction programme	Primary	84.0	518
	Secondary	96.8	190
	Independent	100.0	35
	Special	81.8	22
Using TDA standards	Primary	94.4	533
	Secondary	97.9	188
	Independent	94.6	37
	Special	95.5	22
Help/support in working with Teaching Assistants	Primary	69.7	532
	Secondary	54.6	185
	Independent	35.3	34
	Special	86.4	22

Table 23 below indicates that practice in supporting NQT induction seems more variable between SLTs and NQTs with almost all SLT respondents indicating they have one member of teaching staff overseeing NQT induction and the majority explicitly monitor NQT induction. Consistent with SLT findings almost all NQT respondents indicated they have one member of teaching staff overseeing their induction. Almost two thirds stated their induction was monitored and over half stated their induction was evaluated (Table 23 below), these figures

A study commissioned by the Training and Development Agency for Schools
Carried out by the Centre for Education and Inclusion Research, PCASO and Primary Subject Groups
Sheffield Hallam University

show a discrepancy with the SLT findings where over 80% stated that there was explicit monitoring of NQT induction and almost three quarters stated they have other teaching staff designated to support NQTs.

Table 23 Induction processes in school for NQTs - Survey Respondents (SLT and NQT Responses)

Activity	Total SLT % (n= 809)	Total NQT%(n= 457)
One member of teaching staff overseeing NQT induction	93.4	95.6
Explicit monitoring of NQT induction	83.8	61.1
Other teaching staff designated to support NQTs	72.9	43.1
Explicit evaluation of NQT induction	69.3	58.4
Explicitly supporting NQTs working with support staff*	41.3	31.9
Governors involved induction	12.2	2.2

*note for this question NQTs were asked specifically about support in working with TAs not support staff more broadly

Overall the pattern of NQT responses does not seem to differ greatly by school type. However, Primary and special schools are less likely to have other teaching staff designated to support NQTs and explicitly evaluate NQT induction. Special schools are much more likely to explicitly support NQTs in working with support staff. When looking at NQT respondents, the data suggests that secondary schools are more likely to use other teaching staff designated to support NQT induction and primary schools more likely to support NQTs in working with Teaching Assistants and support staff effectively (Table 24 and 25 below).

Table 24 Induction processes in school for NQTs by school type - Survey Respondents (SLT and NQT Responses)

		Total SLT (n=809	Total NQT (n=456)
		%	%
One member of teaching staff overseeing NQT induction	Primary	91.7	96.8
	Secondary	97.4	94.2
Other teaching staff designated to support NQTs	Primary	66.5	36.5
	Secondary	89.1	51.2
Governors involved in induction	Primary	13.2	3.2
	Secondary	10.9	1.0
Explicit monitoring of NQT induction	Primary	83.2	64.7
	Secondary	85.4	56.5
Explicit evaluation of NQT induction	Primary	66.2	61.4
	Secondary	76.6	54.6
Explicitly support NQTs in working with support staff *	Primary	44.3	38.4
	Secondary	29.7	21.5

*note that for NQTs this is an average of two separate questions, see below for the responses to these separate questions.

A study commissioned by the Training and Development Agency for Schools
Carried out by the Centre for Education and Inclusion Research, PCASO and Primary Subject Groups
Sheffield Hallam University

NQT Quality improvement study

Table 25 Induction Processes by type - Survey Respondents (NQT Responses)

Being supported to work effectively with teaching assistants	Primary	42.2	**249**
	Secondary	19.8	**207**
Being supported to work effectively with other support staff	Primary	34.5	**249**
	Secondary	23.2	**207**

Consistent with the telephone interview and survey findings, data from the case studies also illustrated varied activities included in a school's individual in-house induction programme. In total, 21 secondary schools commented on in-house induction procedures. Of these 15 secondary schools commented on how they start their in-house induction for NQTs in the July prior to NQTs starting in the September. One secondary case study school said that "*induction always starts for NQTs in July prior to new school year the following September. Induction in July starts with a full day which covers policies, meeting staff and a tour of the 11 feeder primary schools*" (Secondary SLT member). Another stated that "*there is a comprehensive induction process for all NQTs and induction starts in the June before the NQTs officially starts in order for the NQT to meet the head and other staff within the school. They also get inducted into school processes such as SEN and pastoral care*" (Secondary SLT member). Other common processes included in secondary in-house induction programmes are observations, meeting with assigned mentor, formal NQT meetings and meeting other NQTs in the school.

In total, 17 primary school SLT members commented on their in-house induction procedures and the majority of these were similar to secondary schools; however only three primary schools stated that they started NQT induction the previous school term. Popular in-house induction processes in primary schools included observations, informal 'open door' policy at all times and mentor meetings. One primary SLT member stated that "*there are formal induction procedures within the school but it is very much an informal open door policy*" (Primary SLT member).

All 4 special schools that took part in the case studies commented on their in-house induction processes. Each school tended to have very different procedures. For example one school seemed to have a very structured programme i.e. inducting the NQT from July onwards and having formal regular meetings whereas another special school had a very informal approach to inducting NQTs for example offering an open door policy and only arranging meetings when the NQT requests one.

All 3 independent case study school SLT members commented on their in-house induction processes. Overall, all three schools included the same types of activity including informal and formal meetings and regular observations.

In total, 41 NQTs commented on their in-house induction process. The findings are consistent with the SLT comments. Overall, 19 primary NQTs commented on activities within their induction processes. The most common in-house induction procedure is observations and meetings with individual mentors which would be expected in line with SLT comments. In addition, seven primary NQTs were very positive about the induction programme within their school and one NQT stated that "*the school has been very supportive; everyone is*

A study commissioned by the Training and Development Agency for Schools
Carried out by the Centre for Education and Inclusion Research, PCASO and Primary Subject Groups
Sheffield Hallam University

willing to help with any problems that might arise" (Primary NQT). Another NQT noted that "*there is a great deal of autonomy within the induction programme with a very personal, tailored approach"* (Primary NQT).

Overall, 16 secondary NQTs commented on their induction programme. In line with secondary SLT findings, secondary NQTs noted how their induction programme started the summer term before officially starting their NQT year. Another aspect of induction that was not mentioned in detail by secondary SLT members was tailored in-house training days that all NQTs attended within school. One NQT stated that "*all NQTs must attend a minimum of three in-house training sessions and they have covered things such as gifted and talented, differentiation and ICT, I have been to them all and it's a good opportunity to meet other staff within the school"* (Secondary NQT). Secondary NQT induction comments were overall more positive than primary NQTs with 12 NQTs stating that their NQT induction programme was helpful and supportive "*I feel like my NQT mentor has been very supportive and focuses on all the positives, overall the support and induction has been exceptional"* (Secondary NQT).

The comments made by NQTs from special and independent schools were consistent with primary and secondary NQTs. Induction programmes within their school included observations and mentor meetings. Again, the comments overall were very positive.

4.4.2 Local Authority Involvement

The survey asked respondents to provide comments on the Local Authority (LA) Induction Programme in their area and comment on how useful the sessions are. In total, 639 SLT members and 238 NQTs made comments on the programme (Table 26 below).

Table 26 LA Induction Programme - Survey Respondents (SLT & NQT Responses)

	SLT Total	NQT Total
	n (%)	n (%)
Useful	411 (64%)	156 (66%)
Variable	155 (24%)	48 (20%)
Not useful	73 (11%)	34 (14%)

About two thirds of both SLT and NQT respondents that responded to this question found their LA induction programme useful and used it on a yearly basis. Generally, SLT members and NQTs stated that the main benefits to using the programme are that LA induction programmes provide:-

- good networking opportunities for NQTs allowing them to share experiences with each other (SLTs & NQTs);
- additional support for NQTs on top of in house induction programmes (SLTs);
- specific training sessions tailored towards particular areas that may not be covered in school i.e. behaviour management, child protection and ICT (SLTs and NQTs);
- a useful starting point at the beginning of NQT induction giving supportive guidance (NQTs).

A study commissioned by the Training and Development Agency for Schools
Carried out by the Centre for Education and Inclusion Research, PCASO and Primary Subject Groups
Sheffield Hallam University

NQT Quality improvement study

In total, 155 SLT members and 48 NQTs passed variable comments on LA induction in their area. The comments varied with some aspects of the programme being found to be useful and other elements not so useful. The most common reasons were:-

- sessions vary depending on the trainer delivering the course (SLTs);
- timing / location of session sometimes not practical (SLTs);
- some courses not relevant / specific enough and some repetitive (SLTs & NQTs);
- the success of LA programmes depends very much on the needs of the individual NQT (SLTs and NQTs).

Only 73 SLT members and 34 NQTs stated that the LA induction was not useful and in some instances indicated that they did not use the programme within their area at all. The mean reasons given for this were that:-

- the LA programme is repetitive and not tailored to individual NQT needs (SLTs & NQTs);
- the school cannot release the staff due to time and travel issues (SLTs);
- the programme is not relevant to school i.e. independent and special schools (SLTs and NQTs);
- organisation of sessions is very poor (SLTs);
- in-house programmes much more comprehensive and cost effective (SLTs and NQTs;
- sessions are poor quality, particularly for secondary schools (SLTs).

Turning to the qualitative data, the majority of schools that took part in the telephone interviews followed their local authority induction programme by taking part in specific courses arranged for NQTs in the LA area. In total, 15 telephone interviews schools did not have any involvement with their local authority (see Table 27 below). Reasons given for this include *not good provision for NQTs in the area, independent school therefore cannot use the LA provision and schools in-house induction programme good enough*.

Table 27 LA Involvement - Telephone Interviews (SLT Responses)

Activity	Total
	n
Yes LA Involvement - Courses	237
Yes LA Involvement - Advice	7
Yes LA Involvement - Information Packs	7
Yes LA Involvement - Observations	1
No LA Involvement	15

In total, 11 primary case study schools indicated that they use the LA induction programme as part of their overall induction for NQTs. Overall, the comments made by primary SLT members were positive, six schools indicated that the provision was very good and one SLT stated that "*LA induction and training is planned by someone who has a great deal of experience, but is very aware of current issues. LA training for NQTs is half a day each week where all NQTs in the borough get together, the programme encompasses everything from child protection to primary national strategy to general first aid. Very broad and comprehensive programme*" (Primary SLT member).

A study commissioned by the Training and Development Agency for Schools
Carried out by the Centre for Education and Inclusion Research, PCASO and Primary Subject Groups
Sheffield Hallam University

NQT Quality improvement study

Overall, eight secondary school SLT members stated that they use LA induction within their area. The comments made were less positive than primary SLT members, one SLT commented that "*LA secondary induction in the area is very weak and limited*" (Secondary SLT member) another stated that "*the school decided not to avail itself to the three days of induction training offered by the local authority because of the 5k cost incurred, the school can offer similar training and a lower cost in-house*" (Secondary SLT member).

The comments made by special and independent case study schools were limited. Overall, one independent school said they were able to use the LA induction but found this limited as a lot of the information not relevant to independent schools. In total, two special schools used the LA induction and found the programme useful and supportive.

Overall nine NQTs commented on LA induction procedures within their school (four primary and five secondary). The comments made by secondary NQTs were generally more positive than primary with all four NQTs stating that they attended LA induction and found it helpful. One secondary NQT stated that "*being able to choose LA courses appropriate to my induction was useful, for example I was able to choose an EAL course because I needed to know more about it*" (Secondary NQT). Although there were positive comments made by primary NQTs on LA induction, an equal amount of comments were also very negative. For example, one NQT stated that "*I have not found the LA NQT days very helpful, for example, the session on assessment was far too late in the year*" (Primary NQT). Another NQT commented on how "*the LA does have NQT provision but I have not attended them as other classroom commitments and many of the courses are a duplication of what had already been completed as part of PGCE course*" (Primary NQT). There was no data available for special school and independent NQTs for this.

NQT Quality improvement study

4.4.3 Career Entry and Development Profile (CEDP)

Survey Data

SLT and NQT survey respondents were asked to comment on whether their school used the Career Entry and Development Profile (CEDP) and the transition points (TP) at appropriate times and whether they find them useful. Overall, the majority of SLTs and NQTs indicated that they used CEDP for TP1; fewer SLTs and NQTs used TP2 and TP3. Over half of SLT respondents indicated that they found the transition points useful, although many felt that they were adequate and some not useful at all. A higher proportion of NQTs stated that although they did use the CEDP they did not find it useful. (Table 28 and 29 below).

Table 28 CEDP - Survey Respondents (SLT & NQT Responses)

CEDP	Use	Use
	Total SLT (n = 670) %	**Total (n = 345) %**
Transition Point 1	83.0	83.0
Transition Point 2	69.3	71.5
Transition Point 3	66.0	67.8

Table 29 CEDP Usefulness- Survey Respondents (SLT & NQT Responses)

CEDP	Useful		Adequate		Not Useful		Total	
	Total SLT %	**Total NQT %**	**Total SLT %**	**Total NQT %**	**Total SLT %**	**Total NQT %**	**SLT n**	**NQT n**
Transition Point 1	56.1	47.2	38.7	40.6	5.2	12.2	535	352
Transition Point 2	51.3	41.8	40.6	44.1	8.1	14.1	409	306
Transition Point 3	50.7	42.7	41.0	40.9	8.3	16.4	373	274

Table 30 and 31 below shows the use of CEDP by school type. Overall, there is very little difference between primary and secondary SLTs and NQTs although special school SLTs were slightly less likely to use the CEDP at all points. There are also little difference in perceived usefulness between school type and SLTs and NQTs.

Table 30 CEDP by type - Survey Respondents (SLT & NQT Responses)

	Transition point 1 Use		Transition point 2 Use		Transition point 3 Use	
	SLT %	**NQT %**	**SLT %**	**NQT %**	**SLT %**	**NQT %**
Primary	83.0	84.5	69.1	72.3	66.1	67.6
Secondary	86.8	81.1	71.1	70.9	66.7	68.4
Independent	72.7	N/A	66.7	N/A	67.7	N/A
Special	63.2	N/A	56.3	N/A	50.0	N/A

A study commissioned by the Training and Development Agency for Schools
Carried out by the Centre for Education and Inclusion Research, PCASO and Primary Subject Groups
Sheffield Hallam University

NQT Quality improvement study

Table 31 CEDP Usefulness by type - Survey Respondents (SLT & NQT Responses)

| | Transition point 1 | | | | | |
| | Useful | | Adequate | | Not useful | |
	SLT %	NQT %	SLT %	NQT %	SLT %	NQT %
Primary	59.1	45.6	36.2	42.6	4.7	11.8
Secondary	46.5	48.7	46.5	38.5	7.0	12.8
Independent	66.7	N/A	33.3	N/A	0.0	N/A
Special	50.0	N/A	40.0	N/A	10.0	N/A
	Transition point 2					
	Useful		Adequate		Not useful	
Primary	53.5	42.1	39.9	45.0	6.6	12.9
Secondary	46.4	41.5	42.7	43.0	10.9	15.6
Independent	41.2	N/A	41.2	N/A	17.6	N/A
Special	57.1	N/A	42.9	N/A	0.0	N/A
	Transition point 3					
	Useful		Adequate		Not useful	
Primary	55.6	42.5	38.3	42.5	6.0	15.1
Secondary	38.8	43.0	49.0	39.1	12.2	18.0
Independent	38.9	N/A	38.9	N/A	22.2	N/A
Special	57.1	N/A	42.9	N/A	0.0	N/A

Case Study & Telephone Interview Data

Overall, 217 telephone interview schools commented on the CEDP. The majority (158) did use the CEDP as part of their NQTs' induction programme, almost a fifth did not use it at all and 14 schools sometimes used the file. A small number of schools (16) commented of the role of the CEDP. In total 7 schools believe the CEDP is a useful starting point for their NQT year (see Tables 32 & 33 below).

Table 32 CEDP- Telephone Interviews (SLT Responses)

	Total
	n
Yes use it	158
No, don't use it	45
Sometimes use it	14

NQT Quality improvement study

Table 33 Role of CEDP- Telephone Interviews (SLT Responses)

	Total
	n
Useful starting point	7
No idea of role	3
Clarifies thinking	3
Good assessment tool	2
Good for setting targets	1

Overall, secondary SLT members from the case study interviews commented more on the use and role of the CEDP compared to Primary SLT members. In total six secondary SLT members indicated that they find the CEDP useful and three schools commented on how the file was very good and needed to be taken seriously by NQTs. On SLT pointed out that "*CEDP is a useful file if NQTs and mentors are honest and understand why it is used and use it properly*" (Secondary SLT member). Overall, seven secondary SLT members indicated that they were not familiar with the CEDP, one SLT stated that "*I do not know anything about this folder as all NQTs within the school have their own school file*" (Secondary SLT member).

Comments from primary SLT members were much more limited. Overall, eight primary SLT members indicated that they did not use the CEDP within their school one SLT commented that "*I do not take much notice of the CEDP, it doesn't really fit into our induction processes for NQTs*" (Primary SLT member). Even though the comments from primary SLTs tended to be more negative than from secondary school SLTs, three schools find the CEDP useful for setting targets and three schools use the CEDP initially at the start of the NQT induction year. One primary SLT stated that "*it is used initially to set objectives and the file is a good checklist and a valuable way of highlighting aspects that may, otherwise not be dealt with fully*" (Primary SLT member).

Comments made by special and independent school SLT members were limited. Overall, three special schools used the CEDP as part of their NQT induction process and find the file a useful tool for setting targets. However, one SEN school did not regard the CEDP very highly stating that "*the CEDP needs to be tied in to the specific needs of the school, particularly a special school*" (Special school SLT member). All three independent schools commented on the use of the CEDP within their induction programme. One school uses the CEDP but feels that it needs to be more informative, one school uses the file but only for setting targets for TP1 and the third school does not use it at all stating that "*it is a complete waste of time*" (Independent SLT member).

Overall, 45 NQTs commented on the use of the CEDP. Of these, 17 used the file and found it useful, 13 used the file sometimes and 15 did not use the file at all (see Table 34 below). In total 19 secondary NQTs commented on the use of the CEDP and the majority of these either use the file or sometimes use the file (14). Overall the comments were generally positive with one NQT commenting that the CEDP "*is helpful to get your ideas down on paper. The TPs go to the head and they are kept in their files. Therefore, it can make others aware of your interests, strengths and ambitions. TP1 and TP2 have already been completed and were discussed with my mentor; TP3 will be done next term*" (Secondary NQT). In contrast primary NQTs were more negative about the use of the CEDP. In total

A study commissioned by the Training and Development Agency for Schools
Carried out by the Centre for Education and Inclusion Research, PCASO and Primary Subject Groups
Sheffield Hallam University

nine out of 19 primary NQTs stated that they did not use the file. For example one NQT found the file very repetitive stating that *"I have not looked at the file, did TP1 upon completion of PGCE but not looked at it since. Do not find it useful and it is very repetitive, I tend to use the standards instead"* (Primary NQT).

Table 34 CEDP - Case Studies (NQT Responses)

CEDP	Secondary	Primary	Special	Independent
	n	n	n	n
Yes use it - helpful	8	5	2	2
Sometimes use it	6	5	1	1
Don't use CEDP	5	9	1	0
Total	**19**	**19**	**4**	**3**

4.4.4 Monitoring and Evaluation

Overall, survey data (see Table 24 on page 33) suggests that 77% of secondary schools and 66% of primary schools use some form of evaluation of induction. A total of 21 case study schools commented on how they monitored and evaluated their NQT induction programme. Overall, the comments suggest that secondary schools are more likely monitor and evaluate induction procedures. In total 11 secondary case study schools made comments relating to this, five schools highlighted that monitoring and evaluation is key to the induction process and feedback evaluation forms are used regularly on NQTs to enhance and improve induction, one secondary SLT stated that "*we are always asking for feedback via evaluation forms and this works well. For example, some NQTs have asked for additional sessions and we have implemented these as a result of proper evaluation*" (Secondary SLT member).

Overall, two primary schools felt that monitoring and evaluation was core to the NQT induction process and one primary school SLT stated that this was done regularly by the school and local authority. One primary school SLT highlighted that until recently there was no NQT induction within the school and now the school has implemented a formal induction programme with a full evaluation each year in which suggestions and changes are implemented. There was no data available from the special and independent case study schools.

4.4.5 Difficulties

Data from the telephone interviews suggests that SLTs have difficulties with aspects of their NQT induction programme, although comments were limited. In total, 11 SLT members found it difficult to tailor induction towards NQTs individual needs and 11 SLT members found induction difficult because there was not enough time to get through all that is required. Other difficulties mentioned were paperwork, lack of CPD courses and visits to other schools (see Table 35 below).

A study commissioned by the Training and Development Agency for Schools
Carried out by the Centre for Education and Inclusion Research, PCASO and Primary Subject Groups
Sheffield Hallam University

Table 35 Difficulties with Induction- Telephone Interviews (SLT Responses)

	Total
	n
Hard to tailor towards individual NQTs	11
Not enough time	11
Paperwork (too much / too difficult)	9
Lack of experienced team members committing time	5
Lack of CPD courses	5
Meetings between mentors and NQTs	4
Unproductive	3
Visits to other schools	2
Integrating NQTs into the school	2

In total eight comments were made by SLT members involved in the case studies regarding any difficulties they had experienced whilst inducting NQTs. Overall, four primary SLT members highlighted difficulties which included paperwork, visits to other schools, time and NQTs not taking advice. One primary SLT stated that "*problems with the induction process are not with the process itself, but when things are not going smoothly. Some NQTs find things hard and don't pick up on advice that they are being given*" (Primary SLT member).

One issue for one SLT from an independent case study school is that NQT induction is hard to tailor for individuals who are part time or start part way through the year as this quote clearly indicates "*One of the main difficulties in NQT induction is when a part time NQT is appointed or an NQT is appointed part way through the academic year as the NQT induction file is tailored for NQTs starting on a full time basis in September*" (Independent SLT member). One special school SLT commented that the paperwork throughout the NQT year is a problem.

NQTs from the case study schools did not have many negative comments regarding the whole induction process. Paperwork, finding time to do observations and lack of SEN training throughout NQT induction were the only issues mentioned by seven NQTs.

4.4.7 Summary

- Overall, the majority of schools that took part in the survey, telephone interviews and case studies included an in-house induction process including 10% reduction in timetable, observations, NQT mentors and regular meetings in their NQT induction programme. Secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to start NQT induction in the June / July prior to the NQT starting the following September. In common with the Phase 1 report, we found a striking difference in experience of NQTs and the schools themselves on induction. In virtually all respects, the NQTs experienced a more limited induction than the SLT members told us they provided.

- LA induction was part of NQT induction for the majority of telephone interviewed schools and the most commonly used LA activity was specific courses for NQTs. Generally, the comments made by primary case study school SLT members were more positive than secondary regarding LA induction. Comments made by NQTs on LA induction were limited with mixed views on the induction support available. For

A study commissioned by the Training and Development Agency for Schools
Carried out by the Centre for Education and Inclusion Research, PCASO and Primary Subject Groups
Sheffield Hallam University

example, primary NQTs found LA induction very supportive and another NQT from the qualitative study stated that LA induction was a repetitive exercise. These findings are consistent with the data from the SLT and NQT surveys.

- Overall, the majority of SLTs and NQTs indicated that they used CEDP Transition Point (TP) one, although fewer used TP2 & 3. Over half of SLT survey respondents indicated that they found the transition points useful, although many felt that they were adequate and some not useful at all. A higher proportion of NQTs stated that although they did use the CEDP they did not find it useful. The CEDP was used by the majority of telephone interview schools, although a fifth did not use the file at all. These findings were also consistent with the data from the case study schools with secondary school SLT indicating that they use the CEDP more than primary schools. Overall secondary school SLT members were much more positive about that file than primary SLT members, and the comments made by NQTs were similar to those from SLTs. Secondary NQTs use the file more than primary NQTs and find the file helpful.

- There was limited data available on NQT induction monitoring and evaluation, although the comments made by SLT members suggested that secondary schools are more likely to use evaluation forms with their NQTs as part on their monitoring process. Generally, comments on difficulties experienced with NQT induction processes suggest that time and tailoring induction for individuals is an issue for SLTs taking part in the telephone interviews and case studies. Other difficulties included paperwork, and visits to other schools.