3. Early Professional Development and Support

3.1 Introduction

The second year of teaching marks a major transition in teachers' experience of early professional development and the approaches schools take to providing support. The NQT induction process and formal mentoring are replaced by a more individualised or "personalised" approach to supporting development, where identification of professional development needs and access to support is via the performance management and continuing professional development processes that are in place for all teachers. In the second year of teaching there is a change in the types of support needs identified, with a much stronger emphasis on support needs relating to undertaking, or preparing to undertake, additional responsibilities. There is less emphasis on needs associated with developing classroom practice. Second year teachers are expected to be proactive in identifying and taking part in training opportunities. While they are encouraged to seek out professional development opportunities they are often expected to do this themselves.

This section begins by identifying the early professional needs of second year teachers. It presents an overview of the findings of our part 2 survey on the types of professional development opportunities and support SLs perceive is available to second year teachers and then focuses on types of professional development and support being offered to second year teachers in our case studies. The views of SLs, second year teachers and their previous NQT mentor on the adequacy of the support are also presented.

3.2 Early professional development needs

The professional development needs of second year teachers in our case study schools could be broadly divided into those concerned with developing their competence in the classroom and those focused on wider concerns and responsibilities.

3.2.1 Early professional development needs related to classroom practice

In 17 schools (two independent; two special; seven primary; and six secondary) at least one of the interviewees mentioned professional development needs related to classroom practice. There was considerable variation in the aspects of classroom practice that were identified as areas for further development. There were no patterns indicating links between professional development needs for developing classroom practice and type of school. Although more SLs (14) than second year teachers (nine) identified classroom practice development needs there were no discernable differences between SLs and second year teachers in their perceptions of the areas of classroom practice where further support was needed. The professional development needs which were identified in four or more schools are tabulated in table 3.1. The most frequently mentioned professional development need was related to subject knowledge or subject teaching, mentioned by SLs and/or teachers in eight schools. In one school this related to taking on a new subject. Classroom or behaviour management was the second most frequently mentioned development need, mentioned in six schools mainly by SLs or mentors. Teaching strategies or techniques were identified as a need for development in five schools and the need for support around assessment, marking and moderation was mentioned in four schools. Developing greater understanding of learning difficulties and appropriate teaching strategies was identified as a professional development need in two of the four special schools as well as one primary and one independent school. Other professional development needs identified were improving pupil performance, teaching key stage 4 and 5, time management, dealing with parents, planning, and meeting pupils' needs.

Table 3.1 Most frequently mentioned early professional development needs relating to classroom practice

Professional development need	Primary n=20	Secondary n=22	Special (n=4) / Independent (n=3)
Subject knowledge/ subject teaching	3	4	1 Special
Classroom /Behaviour management	2	2	1 Special 1 Independent
Teaching strategies and techniques	2	3	
Assessment		2	2 Special
SEN	1		2 Special 1 Independent

Note: Some schools mentioned more than one developmental need

3.2.2 Early professional development needs related to wider concerns and additional responsibilities

Early professional development needs beyond the immediate class teaching context were more frequently identified by both SLs and second year teachers than classroom related development needs. SLs and/or second year teachers in 29 schools (11 primary; 14 secondary; 3 special and 1 independent) mentioned at least one professional development need related to wider concerns and additional responsibilities, compared to interviewees in 17 schools mentioning classroom related professional development needs. Second year teachers particularly placed greater emphasis on support needs beyond classroom teaching; eight talked about needs related to classroom practice while 16 recounted development needs related to wider concerns and responsibilities.

Table 3.2 Most frequently mentioned early professional development needs relating to concerns beyond immediate classroom practice and additional responsibilities

Professional development need	Primary n=20	Secondary n=22	Special (n=4) / Independent (n=3)
Subject leadership	6	2	3 Special
Cross-curricula leadership and stage leadership	5	1	
Generic leadership and management skills for future promotion		6	1 Independent
Gaining an understanding of the 'bigger picture'	1	4	1 Special
Pastoral role		2	

Note: Some schools mentioned more than one developmental need

There was less diversity in the types of wider professional development needs identified than classroom practice development needs. As table 3.2, which summarises the most frequently mentioned needs, illustrates wider development needs were perceived to be different in primary and secondary schools. In primary schools both SLs and second year teachers identified subject, cross-curricula and stage leadership as the main areas needing support through professional development. This reflects the early leadership responsibilities placed on second year primary teachers discussed in section 2 on quality and performance. Both SLs and teachers saw this as an immediate need to enable teachers to cope with their new responsibilities. Teachers were expected to develop skills in areas such as liaising with colleagues, leading meetings and developing curriculum plans as well as developing understanding related to their particular area of co-ordination. Subject leadership was also identified as a development need in three of the four special schools.

Unlike primary and special schools the wider professional development needs identified in secondary schools were mostly focused on two areas: developing awareness of the 'bigger picture' and generic leadership and management development as a preparation for future leadership roles. Gaining awareness of the 'bigger picture' was only identified as a need by SLs and mentors but not second year teachers. Leaders pointed to the importance of second year teachers seeing their role in a wider context, understanding why certain decisions were made, and developing greater understanding of the school improvement plan, school results, Ofsted, and the national picture.

3.2.3 Overview -professional development activities and support available to second year teachers

Table 3.3 summarises the responses from SL respondents on the types of support available to second year teachers in our part 2 survey. As the data from our cases in the following sections show, it is important to note that generally we would expect that these are activities available to all teachers in the school and not specifically designed for second year teachers.

Table 3.3 Support available to teachers in their second year of teaching. Part 2 Survey - Senior leader responses (n=807)

Activity	Total
	%
Training/workshops	97.5
Being observed by others	87.7
Observing others	82.0
Team work with experienced teachers	75.6
One to one meetings	68.2
Visits to other schools	41.9
Other	18.6

From the list of potential support activities given in the questionnaire the most frequently mentioned by SLs was formal training in the form of internal or external courses or workshops, mentioned by 97.5% of respondents. Other activities available to support second year teachers in over three quarters of the schools in the survey were being observed by others (in 87.7% of survey schools), observing others (82.0%) and team work with experienced teachers (75.6%). Other types of support available to second year teachers were one to one meetings (in 68.2% of schools) and visits to other schools (41.9%). In 18.6% of the survey schools there were other types of support available not included in the categories in table 3.3. The table represents potential opportunities for second year teachers. Our case studies, reported below, indicate that for some types of support, particularly observing others and visits to other schools, constraints such as workload and time mean that the take up of these support opportunities may be significantly lower than their availability.

Table A1.1 (Appendix 1) presents the availability of different types of support by school type. With the exception of formal training and workshops which were available in nearly all survey schools, fewer secondary schools than primaries provided second year teachers with access to each of the support activities. There was a statistically significant difference (using the chi square test) in second years teachers' access to visits to other schools (available in 23.8% secondary schools and 48.0% of primary schools p<0.001); team work with experienced teachers (secondary 65.1%; primary 79.1%; p<0.001); and one to one meetings (secondary 54.5%; primary 72.7%; p<0.001).

Table A1.2 (Appendix 1) presents the availability of different types of support by the free school meal deprivation indicator. For all types of support there were more opportunities to access that support in schools in the most deprived areas than in schools in the least deprived areas. This was particular marked and statistically significant (using the chi square test) in relation to one to one meetings (least deprived 63.5 %; most deprived 76.3%; p<0.01) and visits to other schools (least deprived 37.6%; most deprived 48.5%; p<0.05).

3.3 Targeted professional development opportunities and support

There were few examples in our case studies of support being put in place specifically for second year teachers. The only two mechanisms for targeted support were specific CPD and mentoring. While formal mentoring was rarely provided, around half of second year teachers continued to receive informal mentoring from their NQT induction tutor. Time off the teaching timetable, in recognition of support needs, only continued for two of the second year teachers, a 5% reduction in one independent school and one day per half-term in one primary school.

3.3.1 Mentorship

The formal mentorship provided in the NQT year by the induction tutor ceased for nearly all the second year teachers in the case study schools. A designated mentor remained in place in only one primary school and one secondary school. In the primary school although the role of mentor was designated by the SLT, the nature of the relationship changed from a formal to an informal basis. In the secondary school the role is regarded as formal and undertaken by the Head of Department or Deputy Head. Usually this role is undertaken by the person who previously undertook the mentorship of the NQT.

While second year teachers' formal relationships with induction tutors ceased, support from the NQT induction tutor continued informally in around half of all primary schools (11) and half of all secondary schools (11). Informal mentorship continued in three of the four Special Schools and in one of the three independent schools. In a few instances (three primary; two secondary, one special) the continuation of the relationship was due to the NQT mentor having a designated line management role or co-ordination role in relation to the second year teacher. Usually this was happenstance, but in one special school the SLT deliberately appointed NQT mentors as performance managers for second year teachers to ensure continuity of the relationship. They intended to maintain this continuity for early career teachers for a few years. In one primary school the decision to set up an informal mentoring relationship was an outcome of transition point 3 (completed near the end of the induction year) in the teacher's Career Entry and Development Profile (CEDP). One secondary teacher specifically asked to continue being able to go to her mentor. However, most often the continuation of the relationship between the second year teacher and the trainee was not deliberately planned, but was facilitated by the frequent informal contact the second year teachers had in their everyday work with their NQT mentor. In a few instances the NQT mentor observed that the basis of the relationship had changed. The NQT mentor in one primary school recounted how the relationship had become "more personal and social - a listening ear", while a secondary NQT mentor felt that the relationship had become more equal and two-way as they worked closely together. In the same secondary school the Professional Tutor talked about the NQT mentor as a "proud parent who never lets go", while the NQT mentor in a separate interview talked of being "proud" of the second year teacher and of taking a closer interest in his progress than that of other colleagues.

Second year teachers continued to value the qualities in their NQT mentors that they had found in their NQT year, such as approachability (Primary second year teacher) or direct advice "she tells you how it is; if you've done something wrong she will tell you but also

take steps to put it right" (Secondary second year teacher). For one NQT mentor, who became the second year teacher's performance manager, having established a good relationship during the NQT year was perceived as a benefit to the new relationship as they can talk freely and "off the record" (Special).

Our findings on mentorship mirror similar trends to those found in the DCSF Becoming a Teacher survey of second year teachers (Tracey et al., 2008). The reduction in formal mentorship support was more marked in our cases than in the Becoming a Teacher Study where 34% of second year teacher survey respondents reported having a mentor during their second year of teaching, of which 77% had been allocated by their school. The teachers in our case studies, like those in the Becoming a Teacher case studies, often received informal mentor support and like the Becoming a Teacher survey respondents had good relationships with their mentors.

3.3.2 Targeted professional development activities for second year teachers

Only four schools, all secondaries, had a discrete training programme for second year teachers, and a further two secondary schools were intending to put this in place during the current school year. In two of the schools this took the form of conferences. One day early career teacher conferences were held three times a year in one school, focusing on areas such as career progression, working with others and making the move to coaching and leadership roles. In the other school all second year teachers, together with NQTs, attended a weekend away at a "posh" hotel with the senior leadership team at the beginning of the year. Separate programmes were provided for the NQTs and second year teachers, with the aim of "inducting them into our way of doing things" (SL).

The other two of the four schools providing targeted training delivered this in a series of sessions over the academic year. One school ran a recently qualified teachers course which was more open-ended than support for NQTs, and focused on new areas of research that the school is building on, for example by engaging in learning communities via the Teaching and Learning Observatory. In the other school there is a designated Early Professional Development (EPD) coordinator, the only example in our cases. The EPD coordinator negotiated with second year teachers to devise a programme of half - termly meetings covering: things that went well in the classroom; classroom management; developing tutor skills; differentiation- meeting the needs of all learners; and career development. Some meetings are led by the EPD coordinator, some by second year teachers and some by other staff with only a few years more experience than the second year teachers. There is an emphasis on reflection, sharing experiences and coaching as opposed to instruction. The programme established this year will, with consultation with next year's second year teachers, form the basis for next year's programme. The EPD Coordinator facilitates the addressing of needs that arise from the programme sessions.

There are two notable commonalities across the schools that have put in place specific professional development programmes for second year teachers. Firstly, they appear to place a high value on supporting second year teachers. As highlighted above one school has designated an EPD coordinator, another is one of the few schools that allocate a formal mentor to second year teachers, and in another school second year teachers discuss their personal development plan monthly with their Head of Department. Secondly; they are all high performing schools. One school in a deprived area and another with a mixed catchment are both graded outstanding by Ofsted. Another of the four schools is graded good with an outstanding sixth form and the fourth school is good and improving.

In another secondary school all second, third, fourth and fifth year teachers were given dedicated time to observe other teachers.

Only two schools, both primaries, mentioned the availability of Local Authority (LA) led professional development designed specifically for second year teachers. The SL in one school reported that the Borough had recognised the lack of support for second year teachers and had arranged two days of training to provide additional support. In the LA of another of our case study schools there was an option to buy in to part, or all, of a programme specifically for second year teachers. However, the school chose not to participate, although it did use the LA programme for NQTs.

3.4 General professional development opportunities and support

For most teachers support was provided through the processes applied to all teaching staff. The main mechanisms for the formal support of second year teachers were performance management, observations of teaching and school-led professional development, supplemented for some second teachers with professional development (not specifically targeted at second year teachers) provided the LA or external providers. Both SLs and second year teachers drew attention to the importance of informal support and there were frequent blurrings of the distinction between formal and informal support, for example where a Head of Department responsible for performance management also provided informal day-to-day support.

3.4.1 Line management, performance management, and observations

Most SLs identified line management, together with performance management which was usually undertaken by their line manager, and the associated observations of teaching[2] as the main or one of the key support mechanisms for all teachers. This was mentioned by SLs in all the independent and special schools, 14 of the 21 primary schools and 19 of the 20 secondary schools. Secondary schools SLs placed particular emphasis on formal and informal line manager support through departmental structures and performance management processes operated through departments. In primary schools SLs placed less emphasis on the structural aspects of support, and performance management and associated support was frequently provided by SLs. In a few instances (one primary, two secondary) second year teacher performance targets were linked directly to transition point 3 in the CEDP.

Far fewer second year teachers (four primary teachers; four secondary teachers and one special school teacher) identified performance management as a support mechanism than SLs. While this indicates an important difference in perceptions of the value of performance management as a support mechanism between SLs and second year teachers, it may also partly reflect the wider view SLs take of the whole performance management system compared to the teachers' more limited experience of performance review meetings. Two primary second year teachers and five secondary teachers mentioned observations as important aspects of support. They referred both to formal observations and more informal observations such as 'corridor walks' by SLs.

3.4.2 In-school professional development activities for all teachers

Second year teachers had the same access to the range of in-school professional development activities as more experienced teachers. SLs in all types of school most frequently identified in-school training sessions and workshops as the main professional development activity available to teachers (ten primary; nine secondary; one independent; three special). These were most often led by school staff, including some of the second year teachers, or occasionally by LA staff or other external training providers or

---

[2] Statutory regulations provide for a maximum of three hours of observation of a teacher per performance management cycle (S.I. 2006.2661). Guidance indicates that the actual amount of observation should be proportionate to a teacher's needs (DfES, 2006).

consultants. SLs pointed to the relevance of in-house training and the benefits in terms of time and cost. The mode of delivery of in-school training and workshop professional development varied. Some schools had a fixed programme, others organised opportunities into core and option activities, others targeted particular groups of staff or departments. Other professional development activities available in the case study schools spanned: coaching (one primary; three secondary; one independent); peer observation (three secondary); participation in school development meetings; and joining working parties. Observing others in our cases, mentioned in only four schools, all secondary, did not seem to have as much importance in practice as a support mechanism as was indicated in the survey data (Table 3.3), where 82% of all SLs (primary 83%;secondary 78%) identified observing others as a support opportunity for second year teachers. This may indicate that although observing others may be seen as important for development, and is notionally available for all teachers, it may be more difficult within the constraints of teaching for this to take place.

While SLs clearly valued the in-house professional development activities available to all staff as a support mechanism for second year teachers, the second year teachers themselves less often made reference to these activities as central to their development.

3.4.3 External training and support available to all staff.

Second year teachers were subject to the same school policies for accessing external professional development activities and support as other teachers. Most second year teachers in our case study schools had participated in some external training open to all teachers. Most frequently this was LA-led courses, mentioned in six primary schools, six secondary schools and all four special schools. SLs views of LA courses were mixed; some perceived them as good and useful, others perceived them as "too repetitive"; and "too vague and generic" (Secondary). All the SLs in special schools highlighted that while some LA course were good, others were "too mainstream" and lacked relevance to special schools. Nonetheless, all the second year teachers we interviewed had been on at least one LA course. Other external courses that second year teachers in our case study schools attended were provided by exam boards, private providers, the Specialist schools and Academies Trust (SSAT) and the National College.

Second year teachers also received direct LA support. Two primary teachers and four secondary teachers received direct support from LA advisors. In one school both the Head and the second year teacher emphasised the extensive and beneficial support given to the teacher for implementing changes to the Foundation Stage. In addition in one special school the School Improvement Advisor had supported the second year teacher, and had conducted observations.

Other external professional development opportunities taken up by second year teachers were visits to other schools and networking opportunities, such as attending cluster meetings. While some SLs emphasised the importance of visiting other schools, again, like peer observation, in our case study schools fewer teachers were undertaking this activity than would appear to be indicated in the survey.

3.4.4 Support from senior leaders and other staff

There was a noticeable difference in who provided support between primary and secondary schools, probably reflecting the difference in numbers of staff, organisation of teaching, organisational structures and cultures.

SLs in primary and special schools played a more direct role in supporting second year teachers than in secondary schools. Formal support in primary schools was often provided though performance management and observations conducted by SLT members,

and in one instance through coaching by the Head. Informal support by SLT members was mentioned as a strategy by SLs and/or as a part of their experience of support by second year teachers in nine primary schools (eight SL interviews; seven second year teacher interviews). Interestingly informal support by SLs was mentioned by both the SL and the second year teacher in only four of the cases. The importance of senior leadership support was emphasised by one second year primary teacher:

> "I have realised how important the Head and SLT are to [recently qualified] teachers' happiness. They can stress you out but the ones at this school are very supportive."

In three of the four special schools SLs and or second year teachers mentioned informal support by SLs.

In contrast to primary and special schools, both formal and informal support in secondary schools was primarily located within departments. Heads of Department, or in some instances experienced staff within departments, were generally responsible for performance management, although SLs undertook some of the associated observations of teaching performance. Thirteen of the 21 second year teachers in secondary schools named their Head of Department as a key source of support, usually providing an account of experiencing a mixture of formal and informal support. Likewise, the Head of Department was identified as the main or a key support by both SLs and second year teachers in all the independent schools. In a few instances in secondary schools Heads of Year (two), or Heads of Faculty (three), were also mentioned as key sources of formal or informal support in addition to Head of Department support. A SL in one secondary school pointed to the work done by the pupil support team in supporting second year teachers by helping in classrooms, and sharing their knowledge and expertise of children and resources.

Direct support from SLs was only mentioned in three of the secondary schools. In one secondary school the second year teacher talked enthusiastically about the Head regularly asking how things were going and giving 'lots' of support. In another secondary school a nominated SL was responsible for NQTs and RQTs and could be approached for support, while the Deputy Head in another secondary was available to give support.

Informal support from other staff was both an intentional strategy highlighted by SLs, and a common and important aspect of the support as experienced by second year teachers in all types of school. Informal support of second year teachers arose primarily through their day to day interactions with other staff. Most reference was made to support from other teachers. Only one secondary teacher mentioned that support staff had provided support, in this case a member of the library staff who had previously been a drama teacher.

Sources of informal support in primary schools were widely distributed - for example the second year teacher in one primary school talked about getting support from 'everywhere'. Teams were a key focus for support (five) - more experienced teachers supporting less experienced ones as they engaged in routine practices such as joint planning and moderation of work, specific projects and problem solving. SLs in one school relied on teams to support needy teachers- "The trust is there and we go to each other ...for advice". Second year teachers also drew on key stage and subject co-coordinators for support. Pairing or 'buddying' of primary teachers for support occurred both as a formal support mechanism put in place by SLs in four schools, and more spontaneously as colleagues worked together. Usually pairings were with staff teaching parallel classes, or the same key stage, although one school set up pairings with staff in different key stages to provide a 'critical friend' relationship. It is interesting to note that the new Head in one primary

school where there had been particular problems with staff communication and team working was placing particular emphasis on pairing staff for support, and in the following year was intending to implement a 'family system' for groups to work together and share support. The SL in another primary school identified that the potential for support between teachers was restricted due to the school being a single entry school.

Informal support in secondary schools was primarily located within departments. In 13 of the secondary schools second year teachers identified informal support as an important support mechanism. Support arose either from everyday practices, or the second year teachers seeking out advice. In one school there was a policy for teachers in all departments to experiment and share their practices.

The importance of support from school staff in aiding early career professional development found in our cases resonates with the DCSF Becoming a Teacher second year teacher survey findings (Tracey et al., 2008: p. 98) where four of the five most frequent responses from second year teachers, when asked who or what had helped them in their development during the year were: colleagues at school/college (mentioned by 49%); Head of Department (14%); contact with other teachers with a similar amount of experience (10%) and Head Teacher/Principal (10%). For comparison the fifth most frequently mentioned response in the Becoming a Teacher survey was additional training, mentioned by 10% of respondents.

3.5 Training and support for promotion

Providing support that could ultimately lead to promotion was mentioned as a school strategy by nearly two-thirds of the SLs interviewed - 29 in total (12 primary; 13 secondary, one independent, three special). Generally there was a sense from both SLs and mentors that developing second year teachers for future roles was both "important" and a "responsibility" for the school, requiring "good quality" professional development (Primary SL), even if that eventually meant that the teacher moved to another school for promotion. Some SLs and mentors talked about "investing quality time" in second year teachers (one primary; three secondary) in preparation for future promotion:

> "Investing time in developing "promising" second year teachers not only benefits the teacher but the school as a whole as they are equipped to take on more responsibility and fulfil more high profile "influential" roles." (Secondary Mentor)

The four targeted CPD programmes for second year teachers in secondary schools described in section 3.2.2 all had a strong focus in preparing for career progression, and seven of the second year teachers had participated in leadership and management courses (four secondary teachers and one each from primary, independent and special schools).

The need to provide support and training and for anyone who had already embarked on a promoted role was highlighted by three secondary SLs:

> "It is important that anyone you promote gets the right kind of training. Induction into the new positions is not always good enough, you have to look after them and support them." (Secondary SL)

Second year teachers, too, recognised that their school supported their career development, although this was mentioned less frequently by second year teachers than SLs or mentors. Fifteen of our case study second year teachers mentioned that their school had supported their, and other early career teachers', CPD ambitions. These responses came from second year teachers in all four types of schools in our sample: three primary; seven secondary; two independent and three special schools. As discussed

in section 3.6.2 below, most second year teachers were satisfied with the support they received. However, the main area of need for training and support identified by those second year teachers who would have liked more support were related to career progression and additional responsibilities. This is discussed in more detail in section 3.6.2.

3.6 Perceptions of the appropriateness of early professional development and support

SLs, NQT mentors and second year teachers had mixed views of the appropriateness of support. Broadly two views were evident in each of these staff groups. The first is that second year teachers need to immerse themselves in teaching, and the current level and type of support is adequate. The second is that the transition from the high level of support in the NQT year to a much lower level of support, being primarily provided through the mechanisms available to all staff, is too great and that more specific, but largely informal, support needs to be put in place for second year teachers. Overall second year teachers expressed more positive views of the support they received than SLs.

3.6.1 Views of senior leaders and NQT mentors

The majority of SLs did not express an opinion on the appropriateness of the support. Of the seven SLs who expressed a direct view on the reduced level of support in the second year of teaching one felt it was appropriate as they needed to "get on with teaching and getting experience" (Primary), and another emphasised that second year teachers need to become more self-sufficient and "find themselves as a teacher" (Primary), although when further prompted they were uncertain whether more formal support was needed. SLs in seven schools (two primary; three secondary; one independent; one special) felt that second year teachers in their school were well supported - most frequently referring to high levels of informal support.

In contrast five SLs (four primary; one secondary), felt that the gap between high levels of support in the NQT year and support in the second year of teaching was too large and early career teachers needed greater support - "perhaps we need to learn you don't suddenly become 'it' when you are an RQT" (Primary SL). A range of ways of improving support in their own schools were identified by SLs, some of which were in already in place in other schools- more formal mentoring (Primary SL); adapting performance management to second year teachers mirroring the CEDP Transition Point target approach (Primary SL); visits to other schools (Primary SL); setting out the expectations of the school and of the second year teacher (Primary SL); pairing and buddying both within the school and the federation (Primary SL); and being part of a network or having an external mentor (Primary SL).

Mentor views on the appropriateness of support for second year teachers followed a similar pattern to SL views, with most not making a comment on the appropriateness of support. Of those that did four were confident that second year teachers were receiving good support in their school (two independent; one primary; one secondary), whereas another four NQT mentors thought that transition required more support (two primary; two secondary). Suggestions for improving support for second year teachers in their schools made by NQT mentors were: providing scheduled time for support (Primary mentor); direct support with skills and tasks (Primary m entor); courses (Primary m entor); gaining experience of other schools (Primary m entor); coaching (Secondary m entor); structured meetings for all year two teachers to address concerns (Secondary m entor); having a mentor for observations and meetings but with less paperwork than the NQT year (Secondary m entor).

3.6.2 Views of second year teachers

Generally second year teachers, particularly those in secondary schools and special schools, were satisfied with the support they received. Twenty of the teachers (six primary; ten secondary; one independent; three special) mentioned that overall the support they received was good. There was recognition that there were different expectations on them as second year teachers and it was their responsibility to ask for support and be proactive in their own development (seven second year teachers).

Second year teachers fell into three groups in terms of their views on whether they thought the level of support they had received was sufficient. The two main groups were those who felt that they did not need any additional support (six primary; three secondary; one independent), and those that identified areas where they would have liked additional support, but nevertheless were not dissatisfied with the overall support they received (five primary; five secondary; one independent). Predominately these teachers would have liked a continuation of formal and structured support. Mentoring, particularly through the transition at the beginning of year two, and in a less intensive format, was thought important (one independent; two primary). Other types of support wanted were: more observations and the opportunity to observe others (Secondary second year teacher); having support meetings and time to reflect (Secondary second year teacher); being part of a buddy system (two secondary second year teachers): and more emotional support, in particular being told they were doing a good job (Secondary second year teacher). The third and smallest group felt the support they received was inadequate. In one primary school early support from the Deputy Head with planning fell by the wayside as other priorities took over the Deputy Head's time. Potentially this lack of support could impede the teacher's development as they had not been provided with support to address an issue with their approach to assessment, uncovered in their NQT year. A secondary teacher claimed that there was no support in place, but clearly equated support with formal mechanisms such as courses, and did mention the availability of informal support. In the other two cases in this group, both secondary schools, the teachers felt they lacked support for the new responsibilities they were undertaking - a Head of Year role and setting up a drama group. In addition two other primary teachers, while stressing that they did not want any additional support with classroom teaching, would have valued more support in undertaking their new responsibilities, and a secondary teacher would have liked more specific support regarding what career routes were open to them.

The second year teachers' overall views of support in our case studies followed a similar pattern to those found in the DCSF Becoming a Teacher study second year teacher report (Tracey et al., 2008: p117), where 76% of survey respondents rated support in their second year as either 'very good' of 'good' and only 7% rated support as 'poor' or 'very poor'.

3.7 Summary

The second year of teaching marks a major transition in the types and levels of support offered to early career teachers, with a major reduction in targeted structured support, and integration of second year teachers into the monitoring and support systems applied to all teachers.

Our case studies identified two types of early career development needs: those related to classroom practice and those focused on wider concerns and responsibilities. Both SLs and second year teachers more frequently drew attention to needs connected with wider concerns and responsibilities. In primary schools these needs focused on subject, cross-curricula or stage responsibilities, which the second year teachers were already undertaking. In contrast, in secondary schools the SLs emphasised the importance of gaining an overview of the "bigger picture" and both SLs and second year teachers

identified needs in relation to generic leadership and management development in preparation for future roles. Early professional development needs related to classroom practice were more diverse and there was no pattern that could be related to difference in school type. The most frequently mentioned needs were in relation to subject knowledge and pedagogy, classroom and behaviour management and further development of teaching strategies and techniques.

Targeted, structured support, in the form of mentorship, professional development activities or time off timetables was only provided in a few of our case study schools. However, in around half of the schools NQT induction tutors continued to provide informal support for second year teachers. While specific programmes of support for second year teachers were found in only a few schools, the schools where they were provided also provided high levels of other support and were high performing schools.

Generally second year teachers in our case studies gained support through the processes open to all staff. Formal support was provided through line management, performance management and associated observations; school-led professional development, and in a few cases LA or external courses. SLs placed a stronger emphasis on line management and performance management as support mechanisms than second year teachers. Our survey of SLs indicated that the most frequently available support for early career professional development was participation in formal training, in the form of internal or external courses or workshops. Generally, the survey found that more support was available in schools in the most deprived areas that in the least deprived areas, and less support was available in secondary schools than primary schools.

There was a notable difference in who provided support in primary and secondary schools. SLs in primary and special schools played a more direct role in supporting second year teachers than in secondary schools, where departments were the main location for support, and Heads of Departments played a key role in providing both formal and informal support.

Informal support from other staff was both an intentional strategy highlighted by SL, and a common and important aspect of the support experienced by second year teachers. Support in primary schools was more widely distributed than in secondary schools. In primary schools second year teachers drew on informal support from their immediate teams, SLs and others in key roles such as subject coordinators and key stage leaders. Informal support in secondary schools was primarily located in departments.

There were mixed views amongst SLs, NQT mentors and second year teachers about the appropriateness of the support provided; some feeling it was time for teachers to become more independent and others that the reduction in support from the NQT year was too large and too sudden. On balance the second year teachers were more positive than the SLs about the support provided. Second year teachers fell mainly into two groups: those who felt they did not need any additional support and those who would have liked more formal structured support but were satisfied with the support given. A small group of second year teachers felt that they had not received sufficient support, in some of these cases support was thought to be lacking in respect of new responsibilities, rather than classroom teaching.