

**NQT Quality Improvement Study for the Training and  
Development Agency for Schools**

**Centre for Education and Inclusion Research  
and Division of Education and Humanities**

**Sheffield Hallam University**

**Report on Part 2 Phase 1 - NQT Quality Improvement  
Study: The NQT Year**

**Report Edited by Joanne Gledhill (Project Co-ordinator)**

**Project Leadership:** Mike Coldwell (Project Director)  
Colin McCaig (Project Director)  
Joanne Gledhill (Project Co-ordinator)

**Survey Analysis:** Anna Stevens (Research Associate)

**Qualitative Analysis:** Mike Coldwell (Project Director)  
Colin McCaig (Project Director)  
Joanne Gledhill (Project Co-ordinator)  
Ihsan Caillau (Research Fellow)

**Advisory Group SHU:** Terry Hudson  
Tricia Young  
Alison Hramiak

## Contents

|   | <b>Page</b> |
|---|-------------|
| 1 Executive summary                               | 4           |
| 2 Introduction                                    | 9           |
| 2.1 Project Overview                              | 9           |
| 2.2 Context                                       | 11          |
| 3 Methods   | 14          |
| 3.1 Timescale                                     | 14          |
| 3.2 Case Studies                                  | 14          |
| 3.3 Telephone Interviews                          | 15          |
| 3.4 Survey Data                                   | 16          |
| 3.5 Survey Analysis                               | 17          |
| 4 Findings  | 18          |
| 4.1 Getting into teaching                         | 18          |
| 4.1.1 ITT Providers                               | 18          |
| 4.1.2 ITT Routes                                  | 18          |
| 4.1.3 Previous Experience / Supply                | 23          |
| 4.1.4 Summary                                     | 24          |
| 4.2 Recruitment                                   | 25          |
| 4.2.1 Advertising                                 | 25          |
| 4.2.2 Recruitment via ITT Providers               | 26          |
| 4.2.3 The Application Process                     | 26          |
| 4.2.4 The Interview Day Process                   | 27          |
| 4.2.5 Difficulties                                | 28          |
| 4.2.6 Summary                                     | 28          |
| 4.3 Quality of NQTs                               | 30          |
| 4.3.1 Personal Factors                            | 30          |
| 4.3.2 Professional Factors                        | 31          |
| 4.3.3 Quality of NQTs                             | 33          |
| 4.3.4 Summary                                     | 34          |
| 4.4 Induction                                     | 35          |
| 4.4.1 In House Induction Process                  | 35          |
| 4.4.2 Local Authority Involvement                 | 39          |
| 4.4.3 Career Entry and Development Profile (CEDP) | 41          |
| 4.4.4 Monitoring and Evaluation                   | 44          |
| 4.4.5 Difficulties                                | 44          |
| 4.4.6 Summary                                     | 45          |
| 4.5 Retention                                     | 46          |
| 4.5.1 Retention of NQTs: a problem?               | 46          |
| 4.5.2 Retention strategies                        | 46          |
| 4.5.3 Reasons for leaving the schools             | 48          |
| 4.5.4 Plans for the future: NQTs views            | 48          |
| 4.5.5 Summary                                     | 49          |
| 5 Conclusion                                      | 50          |
| 5.1 Overall discussion                            | 50          |
| 5.2 Key issues emerging                           | 53          |
| References  | 56          |

# 1 Executive summary

This is the first report on Part 2 of a three year quality improvement study commissioned by the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) that aims to explore whether School Leadership Teams (SLTs) can recruit and retain enough quality Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs). Part 1 of this project was completed in April 2008 and provided an initial 'environment map' of NQT recruitment highlighting problem areas, mapping recruitment and retention issues nationwide and informing the second stage. Part 2 is currently ongoing and started with case studies and telephone interviews identifying issues relating to the recruitment, induction and retention of NQTs.

The first phase of Part 2 of this longitudinal study began with 50 case study school visits that were selected from the respondents to the 'environment map' survey based on geographical location and type of school. During April and May 2008 at least two members of staff in each school were interviewed including a member of the SLT and an NQT. In total, 125 interviews were carried out. In addition to the case studies, 250 telephone interviews were conducted with SLT members in 250 schools over a two month period. As with the case studies the schools were selected from the survey conducted in the first stage of the project. The schools were selected on geographical location and type of school and 50 of the schools were non respondents to the 'environment map' survey. The second phase of this part of the study included a quantitative survey to SLT and NQTs on the induction and progression of NQTs.

## **Key Findings:-**

### ***Getting into Teaching***

- The majority of schools that commented were in partnership with local ITT providers and many commented on how they had well established links and contacts with good working relationships. Secondary schools were more likely to be linked with several institutions than were primary schools.
- The data - both qualitative and quantitative - supports the findings from the environment map that illustrates that the PGCE seems to be the most popular route for many SLT and NQT interviewees. Primary schools seem to prefer the undergraduate route and PGCE route and secondary schools the employment based routes and PGCE as a route into the profession.
- A third of SLT members who took part in the telephone interviews indicated that their current or previous NQTs were known to the school prior to starting their NQT year; this may be because the NQT had previously undertaken a placement at the school, was employed as a teaching assistant or had previously done supply work at the school.

## **Recruitment**

- Timing of recruitment is important; for September starts some preferred to recruit in the spring term, while others preferred to wait until early summer when all candidates will have completed placements. Secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to offer NQTs a permanent contract in the first instance.
- In line with findings from the environment map survey, when schools place advertisements they are more likely to use the internet and, when looking for vacancies, trainees are even more likely to look online (e.g. far more NQTs prefer to use e-teach compared with the number of schools that use it). LA job bulletins, the LA pool and local press, as well as hardcopy advertisements in the TES, are still used widely.
- Schools overwhelmingly give preference to application forms written to the job specification, with personal accounts of experience, interest, future plans. They prefer to interview applicants who come across as enthusiastic, passionate (especially among primary candidates), and have a breadth of experience and interest in other extra curricular activities. Negative factors seem to include changing jobs regularly, an inability to sell themselves, and low standards of literacy which is consistent with the 'environment map' survey findings.
- According to our data, the selection event generally consisted of a tour of the school and teaching a lesson as well as an interview and sometimes presentation, with the event usually lasting a full school day. The interview process is reported by NQTs to be fairly rigorous. The interviewers look for evidence of ability to differentiate, creative teaching and behaviour management techniques. Many NQTs reported being surprised at how many applications they had to make to secure their first teaching post, suggesting that overall there is no shortage of trained teachers beyond specific subject and geographic areas or NQTs are concentrating their efforts on a limited number of schools.

## **Quality**

- Across secondary and primary schools the majority of SLT members who responded believed that the quality of NQTs had improved over time. Of a total of 25 SLT members, 17 believed that there had been an improvement; seven thought the quality was the same and only one believed that the quality of NQTs had worsened.
- The personal and professional characteristics that constitute variations in perceived quality among NQTs the overall picture is generally positive, with most of the concerns identified relating to the difficulty of adequately preparing NQTs within the one-year PGCE framework compared with ITT routes that offer more classroom experience.
- SLT members were positive about NQTs' commitment, enthusiasm and ability to handle the workload, although workload management was more of a concern for those from the PGCE route. On subject knowledge there was a balance among between those that believed NQTs were adequately prepared and those that thought that there was too much to be learned in one year.

- SLT and mentor interviewees were broadly satisfied with NQTs preparedness for assessment; however NQTs themselves were more concerned about this aspect of their ITT. NQTs in secondary schools and some SLT/mentors also thought classroom management and behaviour management were areas of concern.
- Differentiation was another area that was of more concern among in relation to secondary NQTs than primary, but that was highlighted by few interviewees. Most interviewees were also broadly satisfied with NQTs' ability to plan lessons and also to plan in the longer term, and with NQTs' ability to deal with parents, with the exception of some NQTs in primary schools when dealing with parents of children with special educational needs.

### **Induction**

- 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 example, primary NQTs found LA induction very supportive but one 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 Career Entry an Development Profile (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 in terms of too much and being repetitive, and visits to other schools.

## **Retention**

- It is difficult to make the case, based on the case study data analysed and presented above, that there is a serious, widespread problem with retention. Most schools felt that there was either no problem or that problems were related to a limited number of issues, and most saw that providing good quality support and development opportunities in a friendly environment was the key to retaining staff for the first few years of their careers. Beyond that, it is likely that most NQTs will look to move on (internally or externally) for promotion or other challenges. Also, many schools recognised that keeping staff in the longer term was not necessarily in the school's or teacher's interests.
- NQTs supported these views, in the main. Most intended to stay in teaching, and looked forward to promotion internally or externally at some point, in some cases to very senior positions. A very small number were considering leaving the profession, with two (out of 25 interviewed) fairly sure they would do so. Schools did not necessarily see this as a problem in itself: schools no more wanted to retain staff unsuited to the school or the job than the NQTs.
- In a minority of schools, there was a more or less serious problem with retention of NQTs, and these schools were some of those facing the most challenging circumstances. One of the two NQTs that were clear they wanted to move on was also working within a challenging environment. This supports other research which indicates that it is clear that it is more difficult to retain staff for such schools, yet it is also true – as we see from our study – that these schools often work very hard to develop innovative and thoughtful strategies to retain their most valuable resource. In the next stages of the study, we intend to investigate such strategies in more depth.

## **Key Issues Emerging**

### **For ITT providers**

- The usefulness of references from ITT providers was picked up both in this stage and Part 1 of the Study. ITT providers and TDA should work together to investigate this issue from the viewpoint of ITT providers.
- The importance of school links to ITT is emphasised again in this report. Given the particular issues facing schools in more challenging circumstances, providers should continue to make every effort to place trainees in a broad range of schools.

### **For TDA**

- It appears from the qualitative phase of our research and the TDA's NQT Surveys that secondary schools make more use of the CEDP and are more positive about it compared with primaries, and therefore the TDA may wish to consider investigating how to make it better fit primary phase needs.
- Continuing from the point above on ITT providers' role in supporting recruitment to schools in challenging circumstances, TDA should continue to support flexible and innovative practice within a clear policy of encouraging all trainees to experience a

broad range of schools. Evidence from this study and elsewhere indicates the importance of ensuring teachers experience schools in challenging circumstances as a strategy to reduce recruitment problems in such schools.

- Both this study and the environment map indicate that the experiences of NQTs regarding induction are less comprehensive than SLT members think, indicating that practice does not match policy, in all respects. TDA should recommend schools do provide at least a minimum level of induction and continue to emphasise the positive benefits of comprehensive induction to schools.

### **For schools**

- Induction is one of the most widely researched areas of teacher education and development, and there is a clear consensus that high quality, focussed induction with an induction tutor, time off timetable and a clear development plan for individuals reaps positive longer term benefits for schools and individuals. However, our study finds that even where schools believe they have in place comprehensive policies, in practice NQTs do not experience this same level of support. Schools should spend time investigating whether this is true of their schools: induction policies can only provide the benefits if they are implemented, of course.

### **For the study**

- Some schools identified they could not recruit until later in the year, and we speculate this may be a factor for SFCCs in particular. This needs to be investigated.
- There may be a mismatch between SLTs and NQTs on the value of different routes in to teaching. This should be followed up in future phases.
- The role of local authorities is key to some NQTs' induction – feedback from colleagues who are running induction sessions for the authority needs to be sought as part of the data collection.
- Subject knowledge was identified as an issue – what are schools doing to address weaknesses in NQTs knowledge – this could provide useful information for others who have the same issues?
- It has been suggested that the CEDP is covered differently by different providers. This could be followed up in future stages of the study.
- Reflections on the role of the induction tutor following the NQT year would be valuable.

### **Two recent issues to be followed up in the study:**

- There are a number of providers of ITT which are School Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT). Most of these train in the Primary sector. The quality and retention of teachers from these routes needs to be addressed in future studies. It may be that views of students who follow such routes, and SLT members that employ them, compare more similarly with those of GTP.



- The National Challenge Schools initiative may already be addressing the issue of retention in those secondary schools which are facing challenge. Such schools are receiving a range of support, some of which is or will be aimed at supporting staff development (e.g. MTL) and other elements that may impact on recruitment and retention. It may be opportune to investigate in future surveys to what extent such schools are experiencing and benefits in terms of recruitment and retention from such support.

## 2 Introduction

### 2.1 Project Overview

The Training and Development Agency for Schools' (TDA's) Corporate Plan 2007-10 (TDA 2007) includes as a key strategic aim the development of an effective school workforce by promoting teaching as an attractive career and assuring the quality of initial teacher training.

Sheffield Hallam University has been commissioned by the TDA to explore whether school leadership teams (SLTs) are able to recruit and retain enough quality Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs). An NQT is a teacher in their induction year following the completion of their initial teacher training (ITT). The study will run for three years and aims to identify:-

- the factors that impact on recruitment and retention of NQTs;
- SLT needs in relation to high quality NQTs;
- how far NQTs meet these needs; their preparation for their role; their integration into schools and performance over time; how these are affected by the ITT route taken;
- how schools measure the performance and progress of NQTs.

The study is in two parts. Part 1, completed in April 2008, provided an initial 'environment map' of NQT recruitment highlighting problem areas and informing the second stage of the project which is currently ongoing. Part 2 is a longitudinal study which will track attitudes of SLTs and their members to NQT recruitment, retention and performance via case studies, telephone interviews and surveys over a three year period. This report focuses on the case studies and telephone interviews conducted in the first stage of part 2 of this study, the research for which was conducted between April 2008 and July 2008. The first stage of this longitudinal project is seen as providing a basis for the team's subsequent research. Its findings will provide a starting point for the study as a whole and an evaluation of its methods will contribute to the iterative development of the team's research methods.

Part 2 of this study aims to track attitudes of school leadership teams from recruitment processes to assessment of their recruits over a 3 years period, key research questions are as follows:-

- What do schools need from NQTs? What is a 'good' quality NQT?
- Are NQTs appropriately prepared for their roles: does the preparation meet the schools' needs?
- What are the key retention issues?
- How do schools measure performance and progress over time?
- How well do NQTs perform and integrate, over time, into schools?

Work on the first stage of the 3 year longitudinal study consisted of 50 case studies and 250 telephone interviews with schools that responded to the 'environment map' to identify issues relating to the recruitment, induction and retention of NQTs.

This phase of the study also consisted of a quantitative survey to SLTs and NQTs. The survey was sent to 700 respondents from the previous survey and an additional booster sample. The survey focused on NQT induction and progression.

## 2.1 Context

The literature suggests that the following issues need to be addressed in respect to improving NQT recruitment and retention;

- adequacy of preparation provided by ITT, both for the classroom and for wider school roles such as dealing with parents;
- ensuring that, once qualified, NQTs progress to teaching posts and are able to remain in these posts;
- the support NQTs receive during induction and in addition to the induction process;
- the reasons that teachers leave the profession;
- ensuring that retention of teachers is quality retention; that they continue to undertake CPD and to feel engaged with the job;
- attracting those who have left teaching to return to the profession.

Further key points emerging from the literature are;

### Recruitment

- The issue is not only about recruiting numbers of teachers but about recruiting appropriate teachers.
- The status of the school in terms of performance, standards and pupil intake is important when potential recruits are considering applying
- Previous experience of working in challenging schools reduces negative views of these schools

### Retention

- Retention of teachers per se is not the major issue facing schools, it is retaining motivated, committed teachers.
- As with recruitment, pupil intake is associated with increasing turnover (reducing retention) in schools with low socio-economic status intakes.
- Reasons given for leaving schools include pressure, workload, pupil behaviour, lack of senior support, working in non-specialist subjects; and what are perceived to be devalued subjects.
- Conversely, factors associated with reducing turnover are dominated by providing adequate support, development opportunities, high quality leadership, and seeing the school as a learning environment.

## Factors influencing teacher recruitment

The 2007 edition of the OECD's *Education at a Glance* identifies that disadvantaged schools, particularly in poorer neighbourhoods or with large proportions of students speaking other languages, are likely to have most trouble attracting teachers and are consequently more likely to employ those with least experience (OECD, 2007).

A recent Jigsaw research project (Lack and Johnston, 2008) that sought to understand the barriers and motivations to teach and stay teaching at schools facing challenging circumstances (SfCC) found approximately 1 in 10 teachers and 1 in 8 headteachers stated they were very likely to apply to a SfCC within the next 5 years. The likelihood of staff applying to a SfCC was strongly linked to the amount of previous experience they

had acquired in similar schools. This was particularly the case for trainees who cited prior experience at a SfCC as being a key factor behind applying for such schools or not. Other key reasons for contemplating applying to a SfCC were broadly similar across trainees, teachers and heads, with variations around relishing the challenge, a desire to make a difference and helping to change a school around all stated. Trainees often took a more pragmatic view about applying to a SfCC school because they felt it would increase their likelihood of getting a job. Reasons stated for being reluctant to apply to a SfCC included concerns regarding pupil behaviour and their own ability to manage that, fear of school closure, as well as anxieties about the level of support they would receive.

Smithers and Robinson (2004) found that teachers tend to move away from schools in more challenging circumstances, particularly as a result of turnover (staff moving to other schools) rather than wastage (staff leaving the profession). The continuation stage of this project identified feeling valued and being supported as a strong factor in retaining staff (Smithers and Robinson, 2005). Noyes (2004) found that teachers were likely to gravitate towards the types of schools they themselves had attended, particularly in relation to socio-economic status.

Bush (2005) argues that not enough is being done to specifically target trainee teachers who are motivated to teach in schools facing challenging circumstances. One scheme being run at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) attempts to meet precisely this need through offering a 'specialised approach to urban teacher preparation that is sensitive to the context of high-poverty communities' (Quartz et al., 2001). The scheme was praised by the Commons Education and Skills Committee (2004) who claimed challenging schools have particular problems with recruitment and retention. They believe the most beneficial way to address retention is to identify trainees who have some interest in working in such challenging schools and provide them with individual training and post qualification support (*cited in* Bush, 2005:36):

## **Factors influencing teacher retention**

Rhodes et al. (2004) identified 5 most commonly raised factors likely to lead to retention in the next five years including: higher pay, feeling valued by stakeholders in education, desire to help children learn, less administration and more non-contact time for planning and preparation. Conversely, they acknowledged the five most likely factors to contribute towards leaving the teaching profession in the next five years were increases in administration, increases in overall work load, poor pupil discipline and behaviour issues, worsening work/life balance and constant change and initiative overload.

Budgetary concerns run through the issues of recruitment and retention. Castagnoli and Cook (2004) highlight headteachers' need for money to attract the right people to their schools, while a number of studies have indicated that budgetary constraints often mean that schools are unable to offer permanent contracts, and instead use fixed-term contracts, which tends to affect NQTs disproportionately (Williams 1997, cited in Bird, 2003). Smithers and Robinson (2004) found that an increasing number of teachers leave the profession due to non-renewal of fixed term contracts. Hobson et al (2007) found that secondary school NQTs were more likely to initially secure a permanent post than primary ones (76% compared to 58%); primary teachers were much more likely to have had difficulty securing a post (32% compared to 12%). Hobson et al's (2007) study further found that 24% of those intending to secure a post at a different school at the end of their

NQT year were doing so because their present contract was ending, and the majority of those not intending to teach in the coming year had been unable to find a teaching post (24%). The status of teachers may also have some relevance to retention problems.

Teachers' positive attitudes towards the subject, workload and working with non-specialist teachers were all seen as crucial factors in determining retention in Dadley and Edward's (2007) study of RE teachers. Hargreaves et al.'s study (2007) also found attitudes towards students and workload as positive catalysts for teacher satisfaction and teacher retention. They realised that the perception of teachers' status was similar to that of social workers in the eyes of schools' staff and the public. They noted variations in the perception of status between better and poorer performing schools and between some more marginalised groups of teachers (such as BME teachers or those with SEN - Special Educational Needs - responsibility).

School standards as well as socio-economic characteristics of pupils appear to be significant factors in teachers' preferences for particular schools and therefore this has a large effect on retention rates. Dolton and Newson's (2003) study based on six London LAs found that a group of schools characterised by an 'economically deprived intake and low academic attainment' had considerably more difficulty in retaining teachers than did other schools. Consequently, a 'vicious circle' situation was said to have emerged whereby 'low attainment and high levels of social deprivation cause higher than average teacher turnover' which in turn leads to a 'rapid turnover of teachers' and 'continued low attainment and ongoing staffing problems'(p.139).

Sammons et al.'s study (2007) identifies the need for more targeted CPD provision in schools to reflect the needs of teachers at various career stages, and the need for provision that reflects teachers' commitment, resilience and health needs. This was found to support pupil learning and achievement and represents what Sammons et al describe as quality retention. Bubb and Earley (2006) describe the reasons that prevent teachers, particularly those early in their careers, from undertaking CPD as 'educational vandalism', which is insidious and far-reaching. This, in their view, has various causes: policy changes to remove ring fencing for CPD budgets, poor leadership and management of CPD in schools and teachers themselves, who do not take their personal responsibility for development seriously (Bubb and Earley, 2006). They recommend increased investment, increased emphasis on the CPD coordinator role and viewing the schools as a learning environment for adults as well as children (Bubb and Earley, 2006).

### 3 Methods

#### 3.1 Timescale

The timescales for the quantitative and qualitative studies was as follows:-

| Month        | Qualitative Study   | Survey  |
|--------------|---|---|
| March 08     | Case study schools selected and visits arranged.<br>Interview schedule developed.                         |   |
| April 08     | Case study visits.  |   |
| May 08       | Case study visits.<br>Telephone interview schools selected and arranged.<br>Interview schedule developed. |   |
| June 08      | Telephone interviews conducted,   |   |
| July 08      | Telephone interviews conducted.   |   |
| August 08    |   |   |
| September 08 | Incentives sent to each participating school.   | NQT & SLT surveys designed and agreed.  |
| October 08   | Qualitative analysis.   | NQT & SLT surveys designed and agreed.  |
| November 08  | Qualitative analysis.   | NQT & SLT surveys dispatched.   |
| December 08  | Qualitative analysis.   | Reminders via email, post & telephone.  |
| January 08   | Report writing.   | Reminders via email, post & telephone.<br>Additional survey sent to booster SLT sample. |
| February 08  |   | Further reminders via email, post & telephone.<br>Both surveys closed for analysis.     |
| March 08     |   | Analysis and report writing.  |

#### 3.2 Case Studies

In part 1 of this project, respondents to the survey were asked if they would like to take part in the project further either via being a case study school or a telephone interview school for the duration of the project. During March 2008 a case study interview schedule was developed and covered the following areas:-

- ITT routes and strengths and weaknesses of NQTs;
- recruitment selection and processes;
- induction and the use of the Career Entry and Development Profile (CEDP);
- retention issues.

In total, 200 out of 706 schools were prepared to be a case study school. Fifty schools were selected from this list based on geographical location and type of school. Once selected all 50 schools were sent a letter informing them they had been selected. During April and May 2008, 50 school visits were undertaken and in each school at least two members of staff in each school were interviewed including a member of the SLT and an NQT. In total 125 interviews were carried out (50 with members of the SLT, 50 with NQTs and 25 with NQT mentors). The case study selection was based on getting a wide geographical spread covering all regions with a mix of rural and urban schools from the schools that wanted to participate.

**Table 1 Geographical Spread - Case Studies**

| Region             | Total     |
|--------------------|-----------|
| Yorkshire & Humber | 13        |
| East               | 5         |
| East Midlands      | 5         |
| London             | 6         |
| North East         | 2         |
| North West         | 8         |
| South East         | 2         |
| South West         | 5         |
| West Midlands      | 4         |
| <b>Total</b>       | <b>50</b> |

**Table 2 Type of School - Case Studies**

| Type            | Total     |
|-----------------|-----------|
| Secondary       | 24        |
| Primary         | 19        |
| Special Schools | 4         |
| Independent     | 3         |
| <b>Total</b>    | <b>50</b> |

Each case study school received £150 cash to cover staff time once the interviews had been completed.

### **3.3 Telephone Interviews**

In addition to 50 case study schools, 250 telephone interviews were conducted over a two month period. As with the case studies schools, the telephone interview schools were selected from the survey conducted in the first stage of the project (see below). During May 2008 interim analysis was carried out on the case study school data to help inform and develop a telephone interview schedule. The telephone interview schedule comprised of open and closed questions allowing qualitative and quantitative data to be collected. The interview schedule covered the following areas:-

- numbers of NQTs in previous two years;
- quality of NQTs;
- ITT routes taken;
- recruitment;
- induction.

In total 364 out of 706 schools were prepared to be a telephone interview school. 200 schools selected from the previous survey were sampled on geographical location and type of school. The additional 50 schools were randomly sampled from the non

respondents from the survey and were selected randomly by type of school. In total 250 interviews were conducted in 250 schools and for taking part each school received a £25 Marks and Spencer.

**Table 3 Type of School - Telephone Interviews**

| Type            | Total      |
|-----------------|------------|
| Secondary       | 100        |
| Primary         | 115        |
| Special Schools | 20         |
| Independent     | 15         |
| <b>Total</b>    | <b>250</b> |

**Table 4 Staff Interviewed - Telephone Interviews**

| Type                    | Total      |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Head                    | 122        |
| Deputy / Assistant Head | 103        |
| NQT Mentor              | 5          |
| NQT Coordinator         | 13         |
| Head of Department      | 7          |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>250</b> |

### 3.4 Survey

Between September 2008 and March 2009 a quantitative study was also carried out as part of this phase of the study. A survey was sent out to SLT and NQTs who responded to the previous 'environment map' survey. The aim of this survey was to explore the induction, progress and performance of NQTs. As with the previous survey, SLTs were offered the opportunity to be entered into a prize draw to win £500 worth of school equipment and NQTs the opportunity to win an iPod.

A hard copy questionnaire was posted to all respondents from the environment map survey with a link on the front of the questionnaire giving the option to complete the survey online. In addition a hard copy NQT survey was posted out to all schools and SLTs were asked to distribute this to their NQTs again with the option to complete the survey online. To boost the response rate a reminder hard copy was posted out to non-respondents followed by an email reminder and telephone chase ups. Following this a booster survey was posted out to increase survey respondents to over 800.

Once both surveys had been closed, the paper questionnaires were electronically scanned and the resulting data were combined with those from the online responses. Each dataset was cleaned using a standard procedure, namely checks to ensure that any routing instructions had been followed, range checks on all appropriate variables and logic checks to highlight any inconsistencies in the data. The datasets were then analysed using SPSS version 16. Each questionnaire has some open-ended questions. The responses were transcribed and manually coded.

In total, 827 SLTs and 465 NQTs responded to the survey. Survey responses for SLTs and NQTs are broken down below.

**Table 5 Responses from follow up survey and booster sample SLTs**

| Type      | Paper | Online | Total returns | Total sample | Response rate |
|-----------|-------|--------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| Follow up | 378   | 47     | 425           | 706          | 60%           |
| Booster   | 289   | 113    | 402           | 3844         | 10%           |



**Table 6 Type of School- SLT Survey Respondents**

|              | <b>Total n</b> | <b>Total %</b> |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| Primary      | 566            | 68.7           |
| Secondary    | 193            | 23.4           |
| Independent  | 38             | 4.6            |
| Special      | 27             | 3.3            |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>824</b>     | <b>100.0</b>   |

**Table 7 Type of School - NQT Survey Respondents**

| <b>Type</b>  | <b>Total n</b> | <b>Total %</b> |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| Secondary    | 253            | 54.4           |
| Primary      | 212            | 45.6           |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>465</b>     | <b>100.0</b>   |

**Table 8 ITT Route - NQT Survey Respondents**

| <b>Type</b>             | <b>Total n</b> | <b>Total %</b> |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| PGCE                    | 293            | 63.0           |
| Undergraduate           | 99             | 21.3           |
| Employment based routes | 67             | 14.4           |
| Other                   | 6              | 1.3            |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>465</b>     | <b>100.0</b>   |

**Table 9 Outcome of NQT year - NQT Survey Respondents**

| <b>Type</b>                        | <b>Total n</b> | <b>Total %</b> |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Successfully completed             | 427            | 91.8           |
| Still undertaking                  | 37             | 8.0            |
| Withdrew from post during NQT year | 1              | 0.2            |
| <b>Total</b>                       | <b>465</b>     | <b>100.0</b>   |

### **3.5 Survey Analysis**

The questionnaire was divided into three sections, the first section gathered information about the school, information about the NQTs in the school and the routes from which they came. The second section asked questions around the induction of NQTs and the third section contained questions on the progress and performance of NQTs.

Questionnaire responses were merged with data from the DCSF national database of schools. Variables merged in were percentage of pupils eligible for free schools meals (FSM) and percentage of pupils of White British ethnic origin. The percentage of pupils on free school meals was used as a proxy measure for deprivation of the school. The percentage of pupils of White British origin was used as an indication of the ethnic mix of the school.

The percentage of pupils eligible for FSM was broken down into quartiles. Those in the lowest quartile were described as, "least deprived" whilst those in the upper quartile were described as, "most deprived". The two middle quartiles were termed as, "lower middle" and "upper middle". The percentage of pupils of White British origin was broken down into four categories; 0-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, 76-100%.

Initially overall frequencies were produced for all questions. Following this responses were broken down by the following factors;

- School type (i.e. primary, secondary, independent, special)
- Free school meals quartiles (as explained above)
- Percentage of pupils of White British origin (as explained above)
- Route from which NQTs came

This analysis highlighted some differences by school type and by route however little differences were found between free school meals quartiles (aside from between routes (table 18)) and between the ethnic mix of the school hence breakdowns for these variables have not been included in the report.

## 4 Findings

The findings presented in this section are based on the survey data from SLTs and NQTs and case study interviews with SLT members and NQTs; and telephone interviews with SLT members. Both the case study and interview data should be treated with caution as the responses are subjective with SLT members giving their impression of NQTs. Also, note that not all those interviewed and responding to the survey answered all the questions / topics / issues outlined in the surveys and interview schedules therefore numbers will vary throughout this analysis. Survey data is presented in sections where relevant and available, there was no data available from the survey on recruitment, quality and retention as this was not covered in the surveys.

### 4.1 Getting into teaching

#### 4.1.1 ITT Providers

There were no data available on ITT providers from the telephone interviews or survey, and limited data from the SLT members and NQTs from the case study schools. A summary of the findings is presented below.

The majority of schools were in partnership with one institution or a group of institutions with established links and contacts. Schools used local institutions and providers for placements and recruitment. In total, 21 schools commented on local ITT providers they use. Twelve of the 21 schools were secondary schools and all commented on how they tend to get NQTs from one particular local institution or a group of institutions local to the area when recruiting NQTs. Reasons for this included: being able to ask the university directly about an individual NQT; knowing the NQTs because they had been on placement in the school; and awareness of ITT particular courses and structures. Two of the 12 secondary schools stated that, although they use local ITT providers, they do not have a preference. In total, seven primary schools commented on ITT providers they partnered, however, unlike secondary schools the majority of these tend to be one specific institution rather than a group of local institutions. Independent schools (two) were very specific about the providers they used and reasons why. For example, one independent school used their local ITT provider and a prestigious non-local university because of the standard and competitiveness of the PGCE course at both institutions.

#### 4.1.2 ITT Routes

##### Overall

Over half (55.5%) of the survey respondents stated they had 1 or 2 NQTs. Almost a fifth (19.9%) had no NQTs at the time the survey was distributed<sup>1</sup>. Overall 24.6% had 3 or more NQTs in school. SLT responses indicated that the PGCE is the most common and preferred route when employing NQTs (Table 10 below). Almost two thirds of NQTs responding to the survey did their initial teacher training via the PGCE route; over a fifth completed an undergraduate teaching course (Table 11 below). These findings are consistent with the 'environment map' survey from part 1 of this study.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that it is likely also that many non-respondents also had no NQTs, but we have no way of knowing how many. We intend to modify our methodology to take this into account in the next stages of the study.

**Table 10 Most common and preferred routes all survey respondents (SLT Responses)**

| Route   | Most Common Route | Preferred Route |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|
|   | Total %           | Total %         |
| PGCE  | 53.5              | 38.8            |
| PGCE & Undergraduate                          | 13.5              | 11.4            |
| Undergraduate                                 | 12.4              | 25.0            |
| PGCE & Employment Based Routes                | 9.8               | 8.5             |
| Employment Based Routes                       | 4.6               | 7.8             |
| PGCE, Undergraduate & Employment Based Routes | 4.2               | 3.6             |
| Undergraduate & Employment Based Routes       | 1.5               | 3.3             |
| Other   | 0.4               | 1.6             |
| <b>Total n</b>                                | <b>734</b>        | <b>577</b>      |

**Table 11 ITT Route taken - survey respondents (NQT Responses)**

|  | Total %    |
|--|------------|
| PGCE                                       | 62.9       |
| Undergraduate teaching course e.g. BA, BSc | 21.3       |
| Employment base route e.g. GTP RTP         | 14.5       |
| Other                                      | 1.3        |
| <b>Total n</b>                             | <b>465</b> |

In addition to the survey data, large amounts of data were collected from the telephone interviews and case studies on ITT routes including preferred route and differences between routes. Data from the telephone interviews shows that, for this sample, employment-based routes were more popular than for the overall survey sample, although the broader picture of the PGCE route being most popular was the same (see Table 12 below).

**Table 12 NQTs ITT Routes into Teaching - Telephone Interviews (SLT Responses)**

| Type             | All NQTs          | Mature NQTs       | Young NQTs        |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                  | Total %           | Total %           | Total %           |
| PGCE (Full time) | 47                | 43                | 48                |
| Employment Based | 30                | 33                | 29                |
| Undergraduate    | 14                | 14                | 14                |
| OTTP             | 7                 | 8                 | 7                 |
| PGCE (Part time) | 2                 | 2                 | 2                 |
| <b>Total n</b>   | <b>100 (250n)</b> | <b>100 (250n)</b> | <b>100 (250n)</b> |

### Differences between school types

Table 13 and 14 below suggests that the sample of majority of SLTs responding to the survey from secondary schools recruit and prefer NQTs from the PGCE route followed by employment based routes. Over two thirds of primary SLTs recruit from the PGCE route although almost half stated they prefer the undergraduate teaching routes. These findings are consistent with the 'environment map' survey.

**Table 13 Most common route by school type - Survey Responses (SLT Responses)**

|                  | PGCE    | Undergrad teaching route | Emp based route | Total      |
|------------------|---------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------|
|                  | Total % | Total %                  | Total %         | n          |
| <b>Primary</b>   | 68.5    | 24.9                     | 6.6             | <b>349</b> |
| <b>Secondary</b> | 96.0    | 0.0                      | 4.0             | <b>124</b> |
| <b>Other</b>     | 77.8    | 8.9                      | 13.3            | <b>45</b>  |

**Table 14 Preferred route by school type - Survey Responses (SLT Responses)**

|           | PGCE    | Undergrad teaching route | Emp based route | Total |
|-----------|---------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------|
|           | Total % | Total %                  | Total %         | n     |
| Primary   | 43.3    | 48.1                     | 8.7             | 289   |
| Secondary | 83.5    | 0.0                      | 16.5            | 91    |
| Other     | 69.7    | 15.2                     | 15.2            | 33    |

Turning to the qualitative data, none of the 21 case study secondary schools said that intake was restricted to only one route, though most only made comparisons between the PGCE and employment based routes (EBRs). Seventeen secondary schools reported that PGCE was either the most common route or that intake was as likely to be from each of these two routes; seven indicated that EBRs such as GTP (or variants such as overseas TPs for MFL teachers) were the most common routes or that intake was equally from PGCE and EBRs. When it came to expressing preference for one route or none, eleven of the 21 schools expressed no preference; five expressed a preference for PGCE (of which four cited PGCE as most common route); four expressed a preference for the EBRs (of which only one cited GTP as its most common route). Few mentioned undergraduate or supply routes in either context (see Table 15 below). This picture was, of course, broadly consistent with the survey sample as outlined above.

**Table 15 Most common and preferred routes by case study secondary schools (1 in more than one column indicated roughly equal intake)**

| Route         | Most Common Route | Preferred Route |
|---------------|-------------------|-----------------|
|               | Total             | Total           |
| PGCE          | 21                | 5               |
| EBRs          | 11                | 4               |
| Undergraduate | 2                 | 0               |
| No Preference | N/A               | 4               |

Secondary SLT members in the qualitative sample gave several reasons for choosing and preferring a particular route when employing NQTs. For example, the majority of secondary SLT members who preferred the PGCE over the EBRs gave the following reasons:-

- EBRs stressful and pressurised;
- PGCE more strategy and theory based;
- PGCE good because it is shorter than other routes;
- PGCE trainees get a better understanding of the profession.

In contrast, secondary schools that employ EBR NQTs over other routes did so because they felt that EBR NQTs:-

- gain good experience;
- show commitment;
- are hard working;
- build up a significant amount of confidence.

Undergraduate routes are less popular with secondary schools' SLT members, and no comments were made via the case study interviews regarding this route. Amongst the 20 case study primary schools, respondents were more likely (than secondary schools) to state that they did not consider applicants from the EBRs: 19 of the schools employed NQTs from the PGCE and 18 from the Undergraduate (BA, B.Ed) route compared to only

ten that reported employing NQTs via the EBRs. When it came to expressing preferences, five each favoured PGCE and Undergraduate routes; eight schools did not express a preference and two preferred the EBRs. Analysis of preference by route reveals that where NQTs are employed from all three routes (five schools), two each preferred both the EBR and Undergraduate routes and one the PGCE route. Where PGCE and Undergraduate were the two routes employed from (four schools), preferences were evenly split at two for each route (see Table 16 below).

**Table 16 Most common and preferred routes by case study primary schools (1 in more than one column indicated roughly equal intake)**

| Route         | Most Common Route | Preferred Route |
|---------------|-------------------|-----------------|
|               | Total             | Total           |
| PGCE          | 19                | 5               |
| GTP           | 10                | 2               |
| Undergraduate | 19                | 5               |
| No Preference | N/A               | 8               |

Overall, primary SLT members employed and preferred NQTs from the PGCE or Undergraduate route. In many cases members of the SLT commented that they prefer the Undergraduate route but the PGCE is becoming increasingly popular. Reasons for preferring the Undergraduate route:-

- ITT trainees gain a better understanding of children's learning;
- covers SEN in much more detail than the PGCE;
- trainees experience longer teaching placements;
- deeper knowledge and awareness.

The EBRs are less common amongst the primary case study schools, although two schools preferred the EBRs because they viewed this route as the hardest route which is better for mature trainees due to the financial aspect.

All three independent case study schools employed NQTs from the PGCE route, two from the EBRs. Two schools had no preference regarding route, one preferred PGCE. All independent schools rated their NQTs from the PGCE route very highly, particularly from specific universities i.e. Oxford, Cambridge and Exeter. Although two schools did employ NQTs from the EBRs, one of these schools commented on how disappointing the route is because it is much less organised than the PGCE route.

All four Special case study schools employed NQTs from the EBRs, three from PGCE and three from Undergraduate. Three schools had no preference for a particular route; one school preferred the EBRs. Three out of the four Special School SLT members did not specify a particular preference for a specific route because the majority of NQTs train in mainstream education and do not specifically have SEN training / experience. One school commented on the advantages of the EBRs stating that "*the advantage of the GTP is that when you have a member of staff that you think has potential you can identify this and encourage them....another advantage of the GTP route is that they NQT has good knowledge of the special school context and is better placed to teach a class*" (Special School SLT member).

In total, 45 responses were received by NQTs on the ITT route they had taken. Consistent with the telephone interview data, the PGCE was the most common route taken by NQTs (32) followed by Undergraduate routes (ten) - see Table 17. Reasons given for choosing a specific route varied, although for primary and secondary NQTs the main reasons for choosing the PGCE was because they had already completed a three year degree, the route was quicker and more academic. Two NQTs from independent

schools chose the PGCE route because they wanted to train at a reputable institution and liked the idea of undertaking placements alongside academic work, unlike GTP trainees who are expected to go straight into the classroom. One NQT working in an Special School had completed the GTP route having previously been employed as a teaching assistant in the school and wanted to continue with a 'hands on' role within the school.

**Table 17 ITT Routes into Teaching - Case Studies (NQT Responses)**

| Type          | Primary   | Secondary | Independent | Special School |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|----------------|
|               | Total     | Total     | Total       | Total          |
| PGCE          | 12        | 15        | 3           | 2              |
| GTP           | 0         | 1         | 0           | 1              |
| Undergraduate | 7         | 2         | 0           | 1              |
| SCITT         | 0         | 1         | 0           | 0              |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>19</b> | <b>19</b> | <b>3</b>    | <b>4</b>       |

#### Other differences

In table 18 below although the differences are not great, there are indications that survey schools in the most deprived areas are slightly more likely to recruit NQTs from employment based routes and undergraduate teaching routes.

**Table 18 Most common route by FSM - Survey Responses (SLT Responses)**

|                       | PGCE | Undergrad teaching route | Emp based route | Total      |
|-----------------------|------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------|
|                       | %    | %                        | %               | n          |
| <b>Least deprived</b> | 54.8 | 33.3                     | 11.8            | <b>93</b>  |
| <b>Lower middle</b>   | 56.1 | 35.5                     | 8.4             | <b>107</b> |
| <b>Upper middle</b>   | 57.1 | 30.6                     | 12.2            | <b>98</b>  |
| <b>Most deprived</b>  | 49.0 | 38.2                     | 12.7            | <b>102</b> |

#### 4.1.3 Previous Experience / Supply

In total, almost a third of the respondents from the SLT telephone interviews indicated that their current or previous NQTs were known to the school (this was not covered in the survey). The majority (24%) were known via a previous school based placement whilst undertaking initial teacher training (see Table 19 below).

**Table 19 NQTs known to School - Telephone Interviews (SLT Responses)**

| Type                      | Total %           |
|---------------------------|-------------------|
| On school based placement | 24                |
| Teaching assistant        | 5                 |
| Supply                    | 1                 |
| Not known to school       | 70                |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>100 (250n)</b> |

SLT responses from the case study interviews mainly focused on supply work NQTs had previously done either in their school or another school. In total, 17 schools commented on previous experience of NQTs and or supply work. Three out of the five primary schools would not take NQTs with previous supply work experience, questioning why such NQTs had not got permanent posts after completing ITT; one school noted that they "have had applications from NQTs with supply experience but these applicants do not make the

*shortlists as an applicant in this position would raise questions as to why they had not gone straight onto their NQT year"* (Primary SLT member). One school commented that they would only use supply for maternity or sick leave and the remaining schools were happy to take NQTs who have done supply with them. Our environment mapping study (Part 1 of this research) also found resistance to the recruitment of NQTs that had experience as supply teachers.

Unlike primary schools, secondary schools (ten responses) were more positive towards NQTs who had previous experience either via a placement in the school or supply in any school. Five schools preferred NQTs to have gained some supply or placement experience in the school prior to starting their NQT year and one secondary school commented on how supply can 'sharpen them up a bit' as NQTs have to learn to cope under pressure in different environments. In contrast, one secondary school SLT member commented on how they would not use NQTs who had previous experience of supply work and view these NQTs as suspicious "*the school does not use supply NQTs and we are very suspicious of NQTs applying for supply work or NQT posts as it infers that they have not been successful at previous interviews*" (Secondary SLT member). Three secondary school SLT members commented that they have used NQTs with previous supply experience or as supply teachers; however they are reluctant to do: "*In the past I have recruited NQTs who have done supply work before their NQT year, but this is not a common occurrence. There is a feeling that they might perhaps not be as committed to the job*" (Secondary SLT member). One independent school and one Special school were happy to use supply and have appointed NQTs with previous supply experience either in the school or from elsewhere.

Surprisingly, only special and primary school NQTs commented on previous experience they had gained. In total three NQTs from special schools had previous experience in the school prior to starting their NQT year. For example, one NQT previously had a daughter who attended the school, one NQT worked as a teaching assistant and the other did voluntary work. Two special school NQTs have previously done supply work. Primary school NQTs (five) commented on previous experience/supply. One NQT had previously been a teaching assistant within the school and three NQTs did supply work after completing their ITT whilst looking for a permanent NQT post.

#### **4.1.4 Summary**

- The majority of schools that commented were in partnership with local ITT providers and many commented on how they had well established links and contacts with good working relationships. Secondary schools were more likely to be linked with several institutions than were primary schools.
- The data - both qualitative and quantitative - supports the findings from the environment map that illustrates that the PGCE seems to be the most popular route for many SLT and NQT interviewees. Primary schools seem to prefer the undergraduate route and PGCE route and secondary schools the employment based routes and PGCE as a route into the profession.
- A third of SLT members who took part in the telephone interviews indicated that their current or previous NQTs were known to the school prior to starting their NQT year; this may be because the NQT had previously undertaken a placement at the school, was employed as a teaching assistant or had previously done supply work at the school.



## 4.2 Recruitment

The survey did not address recruitment, since this was covered in some depth in the environment map report. The data below is based on the case studies and telephone interviews.

### 4.2.1 Advertising

Data about how and where schools chose to advertise teaching posts was derived from interviews with SLT members in 250 schools. In general, responses to advertised teaching vacancies varied by where and when the advert is placed. Depending on school's budget, job openings tended to primarily be advertised on the LA job bulletin or via the LA job pool, especially among secondary schools (79 out of 100 secondaries, and three of ten special schools, but only ten of 115 primaries). Among those that mentioned using their LA's website, three were primaries, three secondaries, and one special school; four secondaries and one special school advertised by word of mouth; one primary and one secondary hosted advertisements on their school website. Among other websites used to advertise teaching posts, two Catholic secondaries used the *Catholic Teachers Gazette's* website (e-ctg.co.uk); five primaries and two secondaries used eteach.com; and two further secondaries used jobshop.com.

Where resources allowed, ten primaries, 19 secondaries, four independent and three special schools reported advertising nationally in Times Educational Supplement (TES), and three primaries, four secondaries, four independent, and two special schools used their local newspaper/s.

Data from the 'environment map' survey was similar to the qualitative findings. The 'environment map' reported that SLT respondents most commonly advertise for posts appropriate for NQTs in local authority web sites or bulletins, followed by the TES and local press. Primary and secondary schools have different practices in placing advertisements, as do independent schools and non-independent schools and there are regional differences. The proportions of NQTs using each source differed from the proportions of SLTs advertising in them.

Among the 50 NQTs interviewed as part of the case study element of the research themselves, the majority (43) told us they prefer to use searchable websites when looking for teaching posts to looking at physical newspapers or school bulletins. Whilst most schools seem to prefer the TES, nearly half of the NQTs (20) interviewed in this study told us they prefer the eteach.com site to TES because it allows them to filter out information and specify whether schools takes on NQTs (presumably, the TES website has less functionality). In response to various types of adverts, interviewed NQTs reported that they prefer those that stipulate that the vacancy is open to NQTs, and provide enough information about the school and catchment area.

Whilst all schools agreed that the timing of adverts is crucial, there was no overall agreement on the best time to advertise for September recruitment. For example, around a fifth of the 50 case study school schools (seven primaries and four secondaries) preferred to advertise early in the summer term "*to get the best applicants but not too early because some NQTs may be still embedded in teaching practice and they may not be looking for jobs*" (primary school). A further quarter of case study schools (4 primaries, 7 secondaries, 1 independent, and 1 special school) preferred to advertise in spring term (May) to ensure they are "*fairly early in the field.*" One headteacher commented:

*“All the strong NQTs... get jobs straight away and so we need to be putting adverts out at the beginning of spring in order to get good quality NQTs. If recruitment starts in the summer or autumn term, this has an effect on quality of applicants as the(y) tend to be the ones that have not been successful elsewhere.”* (Primary Headteacher).

A smaller number of schools (five secondaries, one primary and one special school) chose to advertise at different times in the year, preferring to wait until they knew the numbers of students on roll, and how many teachers have either handed in their notices for maternity leave, sick leave or have resigned in-year.

Nearly half of the case study schools (three primaries, 10 secondaries, three independent, and two special schools), reported that all advertised teaching posts are permanent unless they have doubts in their NQTs' teaching capability (a caveat noted by one primary and one secondary school), are uncertain about student numbers (three primaries) or the post is covering a staff on maternity (one primary, four secondaries), sick leave, or sudden teacher resignation/s (three primaries and two secondaries). It is worth noting here that secondary schools were more likely than primary to offer permanent posts as primary school intake varied each year therefore temporary posts more appropriate due to budgets.

#### **4.2.2 Recruitment via ITT providers**

A quarter of case study schools (six primaries, ten secondaries, and one independent) reported actively using teaching practice to aid recruitment, particularly if they had difficulties recruiting. Of course this *“does not..... guarantee them a job”* especially when the *“NQTs are in a competitive school and the governors and the school are committed to employing the best candidates for the job.”* (SLT member, primary school)

In addition, a handful of schools (five secondaries and three independent) said they preferred to use their contacts with their local ITT providers to advertise their vacancies (using either the institution's Blackboard site or bulletin board). A small number of schools involved in this study reported that they preferred to recruit from within their unqualified GTP trainees who have hands-on experience of their school's specification (three out of the 11 secondaries that mostly recruit from the EBRs). Only one school mentioned the possibility of recruiting from within their temporary or supply teaching workforce.

#### **4.2.3 The application process**

SLT members from the case study interviews noted that because *“applications ... can all look similar, and it is hard to short-list on a very standard form,”* (Secondary SLT member) some schools (2 primaries and 3 secondaries) look for an application that gives them *“a flavour of ... things the candidates have done (e.g., travelled, have done some school teaching or similar experience”* (Secondary SLT member). For many schools -particularly primaries - interview panels also sought applications that: show evidence of candidate's passion and interest in teaching (noted by ten primaries, three secondaries, two independent and one special school); refer to the candidate's academic qualifications by level, subject and grade (six primary schools, two secondaries, one independent).

Prospective employees also looked for application forms that show evidence of candidates' having worked with children (noted by one primary, one secondary and two

special schools) or evidence of having engaged in voluntary work with children (one primary). A primary head teacher noted that:

*“We chose someone who can talk about strategies, up-to-date policies, positive behaviour management, and sometimes you get a feel for somebody about whether they are going to respect children/ how they are going to interact, if they can talk about experiences with children- we often ask that, them mentioning their enthusiasm, and wish to work with children.”* (Headteacher, primary)

SLT members were often attracted to someone or something different in applications, and some indication that applicants have thought about how they can impact on the school. As one primary headteacher noted:

*“We don’t like applications that use the phrase ‘I have.’ We are more interested in what they are going to do- not what they have done. Have they looked at the school information and can they suggest how they can help. We want people who are looking forward rather than back. We are also put off by people who think that that have nothing to learn and feel that they are doing the school a favour by applying...”* (Headteacher, primary)

Supporting information in the form of references from placement mentors were considered crucial to NQTs’ job application for a significant minority of our case study schools (six primaries, six secondaries, one independent, and two special schools); however ITT providers’ references are not considered reliable, being either too generic or too positive (two special schools, Four primary and one secondary). Elaborating on this, one headteacher explained: *“They (the ITT providers) may not know them (trainees) well enough,”* or as another deputy headteacher (primary) explained, they are *“Too positive and don’t give a picture of the full person.”* However, as one headteacher noted, *“Occasionally, they (ITT references) might help to filter out someone who would be completely unacceptable”* (Headteacher, primary).

#### **4.2.4 The interview day process**

Job interview panels usually involved the headteacher and deputy head and sometimes a head of department and/or a senior member of teaching staff. This was consistent amongst both primary and secondary schools. On the interview day, almost all case study schools (47) stated they offer their candidates a tour of the grounds and the opportunity to meet the student council, and/or chat with other members of staff and pupils. Candidates for primary posts typically sit through a rigorous one-day assessment process that can involve some or all of the following: presenting a topic of their choice; teaching a short lesson to a group of pupils (either in their placement school or their prospective school) (19 primaries and 21 secondary schools).

Schools expected their successful candidate to have reflected on the components of the lesson and not, as one headteacher said, *“just say it was a good lesson because at the end of it everyone went away happy or whatever.”* They expected them to *“dissect it (the observed lesson) and say why it turned out like that”* (Secondary SLT member). The importance given to the lesson in the overall interview process depended on the school’s philosophy and whether the candidate was known to the school prior to the interview day. Three schools (two secondaries and one primary) reported that they are happy to offer the post to someone who has taught a good lesson rather than to someone who did an average interview and vice versa. Four schools (two secondaries, one primary and one independent) based their decision on a balance of teaching and the interview.

Unlike other types of schools, the four special schools in this study do not require their candidates to teach a lesson on the interview day. Instead, they may be asked to respond to a short written task (two special schools) or sit through a long interview that is scenario based (one primary and two special schools).

Among the factors highlighted by SLT members as constituting a successful interview were evidence of candidate's: good subject knowledge (noted by ten secondaries and five primaries); confidence; communication skills; enthusiasm for the catchment area; understanding of the demands of the post; ability to build some connection with students (two secondaries, four special schools, and ten primaries noted this); genuine interest in developing their career as a teacher; and desire to work in the school. Schools prefer someone with a degree of professionalism, and commitment; with a range of skills, flexible, ambition and that are receptive to advice but also have some ideas of their own and is willing to lead.

#### **4.2.5 Difficulties**

Our telephone and case study visits appear to show that, unsurprisingly, special schools struggle the most to find suitable teachers who have adequate understanding and training in teaching children with moderate to significant learning difficulties. Headteachers of special schools believe this is down to ITT providers concentrating their bulk of their training on mainstream teaching and learning.

Our data also shows despite large number of applicants applying to teaching posts in secondary schools across the country, many secondary schools seem to continue to encounter some difficulties in recruiting suitable subject specialists in English (six secondaries), sciences (13 secondaries and four independent), mathematics (13 secondaries and two independent), D&T (six secondaries and one independent), ICT (four secondaries), humanities (one secondary), MFL (eight secondaries and one independent), RE (three secondaries), and geography (one secondary). Despite this, "*rarely*," claimed one headteacher, do schools "*take on just anyone*" (Headteacher, secondary). They prefer to generally adopt the attitude that "*nobody's better than [just] somebody*" (Secondary SLT member).

From the perspective of NQTs, difficulties in securing teaching posts were mostly related to their lack of teaching experience. Many NQTs (40) in this study claimed they had felt concerned about the prospect of ever finding a teaching post. Other concerns highlighted were: the prospect of applying against colleagues from their ITT course; the fact that the emphasis on the interview day meant that it "*was just a matter of how you performed on the day.*"

#### **4.2.6 Summary**

- Timing of recruitment is important; for September starts some preferred to recruit in the spring term, while others preferred to wait until early summer when all candidates will have completed placements. Secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to offer NQTs a permanent contract in the first instance.
- In line with findings from the environment map survey, when schools place advertisements they are more likely to use the internet and, when looking for vacancies, trainees are even more likely to look online (e.g. far more NQTs prefer to use e-teach compared with the number of schools that use it). LA job bulletins, the LA pool and local press, as well as hardcopy advertisements in the TES, are still used widely.

- Schools overwhelmingly give preference to application forms written to the job specification, with personal accounts of experience, interest, future plans. They prefer to interview applicants who come across as enthusiastic, passionate (especially among primary candidates), and have a breadth of experience and interest in other extra curricular activities. Negative factors seem to include changing jobs regularly, an inability to sell themselves, and low standards of literacy which is consistent with the 'environment map' survey findings.
- According to our data, the selection event generally consisted of a tour of the school and teaching a lesson as well as an interview and sometimes presentation, with the event usually lasting a full school day. The interview process is reported by NQTs to be fairly rigorous. The interviewers look for evidence of ability to differentiate, creative teaching and behaviour management techniques. Many NQTs reported being surprised at how many applications they had to make to secure their first teaching post, suggesting that overall there is no shortage of trained teachers beyond specific subject and geographic areas or NQTs are concentrating their efforts on a limited number of schools.

## **4.3 Quality of NQTs**

NQT quality in broad terms was picked up in the environment map, and therefore not covered in the surveys reported here.

### **4.3.1 Personal Factors**

When schools were asked to list NQTs' qualities and strengths, SLT members highlighted NQTs' personal characteristics in relation to their ability to manage the workload and display commitment and enthusiasm. Well over half of SLT and Mentor interviews referred to these characteristics.

#### **Hard working**

Of the 22 secondary schools that provided interview data three specifically mentioned that willingness to work hard was a characteristic of their NQTs and of those they would wish to employ. The SLT from one such school reported that the school looks for staff that are *"properly qualified, committed, enthusiastic, competent, not afraid of hard work, resilient and who will 'buy into' the ethos of the school"* (Assistant Headteacher, secondary). However, two SLT members noted that NQTs can have problems managing the workload expected of them. One school that recruited mainly from the PGCE route noted that NQTs *"would be better prepared if they had a fuller timetable and workload in marking and management toward end of their final placements, so as NQTs they had a realistic approach rather than trying to operate at the level they did for their planning etc on ITT course"* (Assistant Head and NQT mentor, secondary).

#### **Commitment**

NQTs' commitment to the profession was strongly evidenced by four of the 21 secondary schools, two primary (from 20) and one (of four) special school SLT members. One SLT member noted that the school had employed *"about 15 NQTs in the last 5 years and found them all to be very talented and committed to teaching"* (Deputy Head, secondary faith school). One primary interviewee noted that *"they [NQTs] are full of new ideas about teaching and are well versed in new initiatives such as the PNS"* (NQT mentor, primary faith school). For one special school interviewee, some strengths of NQTs in the school included open-mindedness, keenness and willingness to learn (senior staff member, special school).

#### **Enthusiasm**

Seven of the 21 secondary interviews noted the importance of their NQTs' enthusiasm, a term associated with: freshness and openness to new ideas (three schools mentioned this); energy or stamina (two schools); motivation; vibrancy; dedication and a passion for learning. Such NQTs can display ambition, a thirst for knowledge and an absence of cynicism (all cited by one school each). Among primary SLT members, NQTs' enthusiasm was manifested by: willingness to learn and try new things (two schools); building a good rapport with staff and pupils; and excitement (one each). One special school found that strengths of their recent NQTs have included enthusiasm, their desire/thirst for knowledge and the fact that they have brought new and innovative ideas into the school. Among the NQTs interviewed, six noted that they were enthusiastic and committed while two others (both in secondary schools) lacked confidence (though of course it would be difficult to isolate the effect of their ITT on these characteristics).

### **4.3.2 Professional factors**

Professional factors highlighted by SLT members included: subject knowledge; assessment; classroom management skills; ability to work with pupils at different ability levels; and dealing with parents, though it unclear from our interview data whether these are issues for the schools mentioned because of a lack of them in the NQTs.

#### **Subject knowledge**

Four of the 21 secondary school SLT members reported NQTs' subject knowledge as a strength; two of these schools recruited mainly from the PGCE route. The importance of subject knowledge for SLT members encompassed: NQTs' broader understanding of educational issues (a mainly PGCE school); teaching practice; ability to use ICT in the classroom (two noted this). Use of ICT was also highlighted by all five primary school SLT members who also reported good subject knowledge as a strength of their NQTs (three primary NQTs interviewed also cited their ICT skills as a strength). One school noted that in applicants they are looking for an 'extra dimension'; *"not just someone who can deliver their subject, but people who have other useful experiences, for example people who have done unpaid voluntary work with youngsters, people who have completed the Duke of Edinburgh award, etc"* (NQT mentor and Assistant Headteacher, secondary).

However, three secondary and three primary schools cited subject knowledge as a weakness of their NQTs. One secondary school that recruited mainly from the PGCE route believed that ITT courses could/should do more to fill in gaps in subject knowledge and knowledge of how to teach the subject (e.g. a chemist arriving in school will be expected to teach 'Science' and they need to be prepared for this). The school's NQT mentor noted that *"this might be a big ask for a one year course, but they have to be ready"* (Assistant Head, secondary school coming out of Special Measures). Another PGCE-recruiting school with above average GCSE 5 A-Cs cited sciences and modern foreign languages (MFL) as subjects where NQTs were not confident enough to teach at appropriate levels in a secondary environment (Deputy Head, secondary). Among primary SLT members the teaching of reading was identified as a weakness among NQTs for three interviewees. Among NQTs only three of 38 interviewees (two secondary and one primary) felt their PGCE programmes did not adequately prepare them with subject knowledge.

#### **Assessment**

Surprisingly little was said about NQTs' preparedness for assessment of pupils by SLT members and mentors in either primary or secondary schools (though it is a concern of NQTs, see below). SLTs require *"an understanding that there is more to the job than academic achievement, but with a good understanding of assessment and high aspirations for the children"* from their NQTs and in this respect *"the quality of NQTs in recent years has improved"* (Headteacher, primary). Among secondary school SLT members there were three positive and no negative comments in relation to assessment. A significant minority of NQTs themselves however feel themselves unprepared by their ITT experience; four of the 19 in secondary schools (all from the PGCE route) and seven of 19 primary NQTs (mostly PGCE-recruiting) felt that their ITT did not prepare them or assessment.

## Classroom management

Classroom and behaviour management is an identified weakness in almost half of secondary school interviewee comments; six interviewees specifically mentioned NQTs lack of experience in this area though there was some understanding that this has always been a problem, though one that recruits mainly from the PGCE route noted that the general awareness of classroom management issues that the NQTs have are at a lower level than they used to be (induction co-ordinator, suburban school with above average GCSE 5 A-Cs). One interviewee stressed that this is an area where, understandably, NQTs need effective support (Deputy Headteacher, secondary). Specifically, the ability to deal with SEN pupils and inclusion issues generally was highlighted by one interviewee, who believed that a one-off session at university was not enough to prepare them adequately for the pastoral side of the job (Deputy Headteacher, secondary).

One NQT mentor believed that all ITT routes could do more on behaviour management, and that *"the emphasis ITT places on Teaching and Learning leads to an assumption that if you design the lesson well everything will go well, but there is also a need to develop the necessary skills to manage the class"* (NQT mentor, school with High Performing Status). Among primary school interviewees there was a more positive assessment of the classroom management skills of NQTs; one interviewee (school in deprived area) believed behaviour management skills had improved in recent years (Deputy Headteacher and NQT mentor, secondary) while another, from a school that preferred the EBRs believed that NQTs strengths *"have something to do with their experience in managing classes they have acquired both from university placement and from their previous experience prior to commencing their ITT"* (Headteacher, secondary).

Four primary interviewees (recruiting from all routes) saw classroom behaviour management as a weakness of ITT, one of whom thought that NQTs often arrive preoccupied with concerns about behaviour management; *"they may lack the confidence to walk straight into a class and 'deliver' straight away and that this can be remedied by in-school training"* (Headteacher, faith primary).

Among interviewed NQTs there was also a clear difference between primary and secondary schools: a third of those based in secondary schools noted that they felt unprepared by their ITT in relation to behaviour management (almost all from PGCE route); but a similar proportion of primary NQTs noted this as a strength of their ITT (equally split between PGCE and Undergraduate routes).

## Differentiation

Closely related to classroom management is the issue NQTs' ability to understand and deal with differentiation in the classroom (pupils working at different ability levels). Two secondary and three primary interviewees highlighted this as an area of weakness. For one interviewee from a secondary school that mainly recruits from the PGCE route, the context was the differentiated curriculum (having to meet the needs of gifted and talented cohorts and new vocational subject areas); *there was a need for ITT to focus less on subject content and more on new approaches to teaching* (Headteacher, secondary). Amongst primary interviewees, one school inclusion leader specifically mentioned the GTP route as better preparation because such NQTs would have already benefitted from staff development in this area. In addition, planning problems were highlighted by three other primary interviewees. Among NQTs interviewed, those in secondary schools were more likely to struggle with differentiation.

Planning is important in the context of working with pupils at different levels of ability. One interviewee noted that as the school works on the cross-curricular 'theme of enquiry'



system, some NQTs have initially struggled to adapt to this having been trained to plan lessons around Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) units (Headteacher, 'outstanding' large primary). Other interviewees noted that planning is one of the difficulties faced by some NQTs, depending on the individual, while another interviewee believed this was *"part of trend caused by increased expectations and demands made of NQTs over the last five years"* (Acting Assistant Headteacher, secondary). NQTs themselves believed that lesson planning was a strength of their ITT, and this was especially so for primary interviewees (one third expressed this view) and those from the PGCE route.

### Dealing with parents

Dealing with parents is an issue only of note to those in primary schools. One primary interviewee thought NQTs were often unprepared by their ITT for dealing with parents of children with emotional and behavioural difficulties (school inclusion leader, primary); another in relation to the changing expectations of parents (Headteacher, primary). Interviewed NQTs were not unduly concerned about this aspect; only two of 19 secondary and two of 19 primary NQTs found that they were unprepared for dealing with parents by their ITT.

### 4.3.3 Quality of NQTs

Across secondary and primary phases the majority of interviewees who responded to this question believed that the quality of NQTs had improved over the last 5 years. Of a total of 25 interviewees (none of which were from special schools) 17 believed that there had been an improvement; seven thought the quality was the same and only one believed that the quality of NQTs had worsened. Of 13 secondary school interviewees, nine believed that there had been an improvement, two thought the quality was the same and one believed that the quality of NQTs had declined (Deputy Headteacher, small secondary in deprived urban area, 40% Asian intake); among the nine primary interviewees six thought that quality had improved and the other three that quality had stayed the same. Two of the three independent school interviewees believed that quality had improved and the other that it had stayed the same (see Table 20 below).

**Table 20 Has NQT quality improved over time, by school type**

| School type  | Better    | Same     | Worse    | Total n   |
|--------------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Secondary    | 9         | 3        | 1        | 13        |
| Primary      | 6         | 3        | 0        | 9         |
| Independent  | 2         | 1        | 0        | 3         |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>17</b> | <b>7</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>25</b> |

When we look in more detail at the personal and professional characteristics that constitute variations in perceived quality among NQTs the overall picture is generally positive, with most of the concerns identified relating to the difficulty of adequately preparing NQTs within the one-year PGCE framework compared with ITT routes that offer more classroom experience.

Among personal factors, interviewees were positive about NQTs' commitment, enthusiasm and ability to handle the workload, although workload management was more of an issue for those from the PGCE route. On subject knowledge there was a balance among between those that believed NQTs were adequately prepared and those that thought that there was too much to be learned in one (PGCE) year. SLT and mentor interviewees were broadly satisfied with NQTs preparedness for assessment; however

NQTs themselves were more concerned about this aspect of their ITT. NQTs in secondary schools and some SLT/mentors also thought classroom management and behaviour management were areas of concern. Differentiation was another area that was of more concern among in relation to secondary NQTs than primary, but that was highlighted by few interviewees. Most interviewees were also broadly satisfied with NQTs' ability to plan lessons and also to plan in the longer term, and with NQTs' ability to deal with parents, with the exception of some NQTs in primary schools when dealing with parents of children with special educational needs.

#### **4.3.4 Summary**

- Across secondary and primary schools the majority of SLT members who responded believed that the quality of NQTs had improved over the last 5 years. Of a total of 25 SLT members (none of whom were from special schools) 17 believed that there had been an improvement; seven thought the quality was the same and only one believed that the quality of NQTs had worsened.
- The personal and professional characteristics that constitute variations in perceived quality among NQTs the overall picture is generally positive, with most of the concerns identified relating to the difficulty of adequately preparing NQTs within the one-year PGCE framework compared with ITT routes that offer more classroom experience.
- SLT members were positive about NQTs' commitment, enthusiasm and ability to handle the workload, although workload management was more of a concern for those from the PGCE route. On subject knowledge there was a balance among between those that believed NQTs were adequately prepared and those that thought that there was too much to be learned in one year.
- SLT and mentor interviewees were broadly satisfied with NQTs preparedness for assessment; however NQTs themselves were more concerned about this aspect of their ITT. NQTs in secondary schools and some SLT/mentors also thought classroom management and behaviour management were areas of concern.
- Differentiation was another area that was of more concern among in relation to secondary NQTs than primary, but that was highlighted by few interviewees. Most interviewees were also broadly satisfied with NQTs' ability to plan lessons and also to plan in the longer term, and with NQTs' ability to deal with parents, with the exception of some NQTs in primary schools when dealing with parents of children with special educational needs.

## 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:<br>Always<br>Include |            | NQTs:<br>actually<br>received |            |
|---|---------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|------------|
|   | Total %                   | Total<br>n | Total %                       | Total<br>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        |

#### 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)**

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

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 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.

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

|  |           |      |            |
|--|-----------|------|------------|
| Being supported to work effectively with teaching assistants | Primary   | 42.2 | <b>249</b> |
|  | Secondary | 19.8 | <b>207</b> |
| Being supported to work effectively with other support staff | Primary   | 34.5 | <b>249</b> |
|  | Secondary | 23.2 | <b>207</b> |

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 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)**

|            | <b>SLT<br/>Total<br/>n (%)</b> | <b>NQT<br/>Total<br/>n (%)</b> |
|------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 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).

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).

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.



#### 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                         |                      |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
|                    | Total SLT<br>(n = 670)<br>% | Total (n = 345)<br>% |
| 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<br>% | Total NQT<br>% | Total SLT<br>% | Total NQT<br>% | Total SLT<br>% | Total NQT<br>% | SLT<br>n | NQT<br>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<br>Use |       | Transition point 2<br>Use |       | Transition point 3<br>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   |

**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 |       |
|             | SLT %              | NQT % | SLT %    | NQT % | SLT %      | NQT % |
| 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 |       |
|             | SLT %              | NQT % | SLT %    | NQT % | SLT %      | NQT % |
| 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 on 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    |

**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. One 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 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)**

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

#### 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).

**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 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.

## **4.5 Retention**

### **4.5.1 Retention of NQTs: a problem?**

It appears that retention is perceived as an issue for very few of the schools we spoke with in the Case Studies. In fact, over half stated categorically that there was no problem at all, and only one (11-18 secondary, above average performing) school explicitly noted that there was a serious issue, although – as we go on to explore – schools did mention particular problems in some areas.

Well over half of the schools in all sectors noted that NQTs leaving for promotion was the main reason for their moving on. Around a quarter of schools in all sectors noted that it was normal and welcomed for staff to move on for promotion in the medium term (after 3 to 5 years was a typical response), and in fact several noted that they felt it was more problematic to stay for too long.

For many schools in our sample, then, appropriate retention of NQTs might typically mean keeping them long enough to feel that time and effort spent on development is to some extent 'paid back' but this didn't mean staying in the school for longer than around 2 years. Of course, for a small number of schools - perhaps 2 or 3 this led to some degree of resentment, having spent effort on providing support and development. Others however had a more philosophical view, since of course every school benefits from the training and support provided by others: *"There is some turnover but this is seen as something healthy, a form of renewal. There is a 'danger' that good induction and CPD will lead to training the new staff 'up and out' of the school, but that is not something to be scared of."* (Secondary SLT member).

### **4.5.2 Retention strategies**

Unsurprisingly, the single most often mentioned retention strategy was to provide appropriate development opportunities, mentioned in one form or another by the majority of schools across all sectors. This meant providing high quality induction (3 schools: see also section 4.4), being given opportunities to take on responsibility or engage in longer term CPD and providing specific opportunities, such as described here:

*"A high proportion of NQTs stay in the school. They are very well supported and the CPD process continues to support them in their early years of teaching. There are training days designed to discuss relevant issues and NQTs are involved in both being coached and later coaching others. They have access to software for evaluating teaching and make good use of this which helps them to see their progression. The school makes creative use of their Recruitment and Retention allowance to enable staff to be involved in innovative projects and this encourages them to take the initiative"* (secondary SLT member).

One primary school made the point that whilst high quality induction was essential, this sometimes dropped off in the post-induction year, and this could lead to some early career teachers moving on. The school that said there were some retention problems, linking it to induction issues:

*"Over the last four years, NQTs have left in rather greater numbers than [the deputy head] would have expected or wished... This had led to a questioning of whether the induction programme is right. The general feeling is that it is, overall. For someone who is failing an NQT year, the induction process is very rigorous. It*

*throws up questions not only about the ability of the trainee but also about the quality and appropriateness of the induction programme."*

These opportunities did not necessarily mean providing paid promotion in the short term, although one secondary school specifically mentioned providing progression linked to training, and in fact at least 12 schools – interestingly all but one of which were secondaries – did mention explicitly providing promotion opportunities as being important. One of these noted that this was becoming easier due to the ageing workforce increasing natural turnover.

Related to development was providing appropriate support, mentioned by seven schools. Two schools picked up the important point that providing development opportunities and support made staff feel valued, and this was the crux of retaining them, and two others noted that not getting on with the SLT was an issue for some staff who decided to leave.

The other major dimension, alongside support and development, was the school's character. Around a quarter of schools noted that NQTs stay because the school provided a positive, friendly, happy environment. In a slightly different vein, two secondary and one independent school SLT members noted that teachers understood their schools were professional and well run, and stayed for that reason, and one special school and one independent school noted that individuals stayed due to personal rewards for teachers working in those particular sectors.

Two primary schools specifically mentioned work life balance, one SLT member noting that *"Within school all members of the SLT try to ensure that all members of staff and NQTs have the right work / life balance by limiting the number of meetings, avoid out of hours working and make sure NQTs have evenings free"* (Primary SLT member). The other primary school related his more to additional staff benefits such as *"people in to wash staff cars, a staff yoga group and someone who comes in to do Indian head massage"* (Primary SLT member). In a similar vein, one independent school outlined the additional benefits they could provide compared with state schools including health insurance, subsidised accommodation and subsidised education for teachers' own children.

Other aspects of the wider context of the work of the school were mentioned by some. For example, five schools noted that relationships with pupils were important, and one mentioned relationships with parents. Whilst these issues are to some extent related to factors outside the schools' control, it is certainly not the case that they cannot put in place strategies to address them, as this example powerfully demonstrates: *"Retention of staff is part of the School Improvement Plan ... the reasons that people have left predominately relate to pressures from outside – aggressive parents. To tackle this ... NQTs (and other staff) are not expected to meet with parents alone, conflict management is part of the school's CPD and the SLT will take on any issues that staff have"* (primary mentor). Linked to this, one primary school NQT mentor noted that having a positive Ofsted report reduced pressure on new staff (we return to pressure on NQTs in the next subsection).

Finally, one school made the point that if the recruitment process (see section 4.2) works well, then retention is easier since there is a good match between the school and the teacher.

### **4.5.3 Reasons for leaving the schools**

The factors mentioned in the sub-section above can reduce the likelihood of NQTs leaving in the near term; so for example, if teachers are well supported, provided with development and perhaps promotion opportunities and feel they work in a happy environment then they are likely to stay for an appropriate time (which as we note above is perhaps three to five years). After this period, as we note above, promotion is a driving influence for many staff, and if it not available in the school then the vast majority of schools recognised that NQTs will eventually move on for this reason. The interviews with NQTs themselves concurred with this view, with the majority saying they would like to be promoted, and at least 15 stating that they would move for promotion, in some cases only if they were not offered promotion at their current schools.

In addition to leaving promotion, seven schools, five primary and secondary, noted that a reason for leaving that was often inevitable was where an NQT was on a temporary contract. One secondary SLT member explained: *"All NQTs are recruited on a one-year contract. The majority of them complete the NQT year, but very few are retained ... Some NQTs are lucky and are made permanent but this depends on the subject and there tend to be more permanent appointments made for core subjects"* (Secondary SLT member).

But there are other factors, some of which are less clearly within the schools' remit. The most common of these was leaving due to relocation (mentioned by 14 schools), often linked to a partner's job. The next most common personal reason was to travel (four schools).

Factors related to the location were mentioned: if NQTs were happy and settled in the locale of the school, they were more likely to stay (three schools). However, if they were not settled or – a problem mentioned by four schools – the cost of housing was prohibitively high, then this tended to push some into leaving.

Seven schools mentioned that NQTs moved on if they felt stressed or pressured, finding the work too difficult, the workload too high, even if provided with adequate support. SLT members stated that for some of these teachers, and others, it may well be the case that leaving the school is sometimes in everyone's interests: it is just not the job for them (either teaching more generally or in the particular school). When we examined the characteristics of schools where leaving due to pressure was mentioned, however, all but one were in challenging circumstances (five had some combination of high deprivation and/or high unemployment; and two had recently left special measures).

Finally, three schools gave examples of individuals leaving to change career or return to their previous career.

### **4.5.4 Plans for the future: NQT views**

The vast majority of the NQTs with whom we spoke intended to stay in teaching for at least the next three to five years. For a significant minority – 18 of the 50 NQTs we spoke to in all sectors – teaching was seen as a long term career, and six used the term "career for life". For the rest, teaching was something they planned to stay in for the foreseeable future (at least ten more) or at least for the time being (most of the rest).

Only two (both primary teachers) felt they were likely to leave teaching. One of these was feeling the pressure of working in a school in with significant levels of deprivation, the other felt underpaid compared with comparable professions (this issue was not mentioned by other NQTs).



There were seven others who felt they may leave, to travel (two NQTs), to change career (three) to teach abroad (one), or to escape the pressure (one, working in an independent school).

In the medium to longer term, most – perhaps 80 per cent – had goals, or more or less developed plans to advance via some sort of promotion. As we noted in the previous subsection, most of the NQTs were prepared to move on for promotion opportunities, although three were unsure they wanted to move out of the classroom for promotion. Related to this, there was a group of perhaps six to ten who were clear that whether promoted or not, they did not want to get too far from the classroom, so perhaps a Head of Department or Head of Year role, or a Key Stage coordinator role in primary schools - or in three cases an AST role - would be possible, but certainly not a senior management role.

About half of the secondary NQTs harboured a medium term goal to become a Head of Department or Head of Year. Five NQTs (four primary, one secondary) expressed a desire to move to a very senior position in a school, either Deputy Head or Headteacher (although two schools were clear they did not want this). Three female NQTs stated they would be likely to want to work part time in the future as they planned on having a family.

Of the remaining few NQTs, medium and longer term goals were simply expressed as “staying for a while” in the school or teaching, then moving on or deciding later on. This group consisted of around 7-10 NQTs across all phases.

#### **4.5.5 Summary**

- It is difficult to make the case, based on the case study data analysed and presented above, that there is a serious, widespread problem with retention. Most schools felt that there was either no problem or that problems were related to a limited number of issues, and most saw that providing good quality support and development opportunities in a friendly environment was the key to retaining staff for the first few years of their careers. Beyond that, it is likely that most NQTs will look to move on (internally or externally) for promotion or other challenges. Also, many schools recognised that keeping staff in the longer term was not necessarily in the schools or the individual NQT / teacher’s interests.
- NQTs supported these views, in the main. Most intended to stay in teaching, and looked forward to promotion internally or externally at some point, in some cases to very senior positions. A very small number were considering leaving the profession, with two (out of 25 interviewed) fairly sure they would do so. Schools did not necessarily see this as a problem in itself: schools no more wanted to retain staff unsuited to the school or the job than the NQTs wished to remain.
- In a minority of schools, there was a more or less serious problem with retention of NQTs, and these schools were some of those facing the most challenging circumstances. One of the two NQTs that were clear they wanted to move on were also working within a challenging environment. This supports other research which indicates that it is more difficult to retain staff for such schools, yet it is also true as we see from our study – that these schools often work very hard to develop innovative and thoughtful strategies to retain their most valuable resource. In the next stages of the study, we intend to investigate such strategies in more depth.

## 5 Conclusion

In this section, we reflect on the findings as a whole drawing out key questions and issues, and relating this work to the Part 1 report and other research.

### 5.1 Overall discussion

The first striking finding is the increasing predominance of the internet as a prime source of advertising posts for schools, and finding appropriate jobs for teachers. It is clear even from this limited study that using well-selected websites such as TES or eteach.com appeals to most potential recruits, and there are in our sample some discrepancies (e.g. far more NQTs prefer to use e-teach compared with the number of schools that use it).

Many schools tried to advertise as early as possible, weighing up the likelihood of students being on teaching practice against the benefits of having the pick of the crop (timing was also noted as a key issue in relation to recruitment in Part 1 of the Study). But a minority had to leave it until later if they were unsure about student numbers or staff leaving. It is possible to speculate that these issues are more likely to affect schools in challenging circumstances, but this would need to be followed up in later stages of the study.

Our findings are in line with the most recent TDA NQT Survey (TDA, 2008) which showed that permanent jobs were more commonly available in the secondary sector.

Discussing what they looked for in a written application, schools mentioned bringing out enthusiasm for the role and teaching, and qualifications. These were stressed particularly by primary school SLT members. Other comments from SLT members in all schools included writing to the specification (reflecting a finding of the Part 1 report) and showing evidence of researching the school prior to interview. Interestingly, whilst school placement references were seen as being important by a number of schools, ITT references were regarded with a degree of suspicion, either due to having too little knowledge of the teaching capability of the individuals, being too bland and generic or even being overly positive. If these views reflect a more general feeling amongst schools - and they are certainly in line with Part 1 of the Study - then it does imply that ITT providers need to reflect on the quality of their references. Overall, for the few schools that expressed a preference, the PGCE was the route preferred by SLT members, although primary schools tended to also favour the undergraduate route, and secondary schools also favoured the GTP route. The NQTs themselves were not asked about their views on the value of each route. The most recent TDA NQT Survey (TDA, 2008) indicates that NQTs themselves favour the GTP route, so it may be worth following this up in future stages of the NQT quality study, to see if there is a mismatch between SLT and NQT views, and if so why.

Our data gives a picture of a typical selection event. Almost always involving a tour of the school and teaching a lesson as well as an interview and sometimes presentation, these events are generally rigorous and intensive, usually lasting a full school day. The intensive nature of the typical selection event led most of our NQT sample to reflect that they found the events pressured and sometimes very unpleasant. Of course, this does not necessarily mean that these kinds of events are not the right way to go in terms of selection – they are tried and tested – but that it is important for schools to acknowledge that they are particularly stressful for NQTs and this needs to be taken into account.

The 4 special schools in the Case Study sample did not include teaching a lesson. It would be interesting to pick up whether this is more widespread amongst special schools.

These schools all mentioned finding it difficult to attract candidates with the right skills to teach in their circumstances, noting the mainstream nature of ITT provision.

A number of secondary schools also mentioned subject specific difficulties – particularly sciences and mathematics, followed by MFL and D and T (these four were also mentioned by independent schools, underlining the difficulties), as well as English ICT and the odd other subject. From the environment map and other studies, we note that this is of course a fairly widespread problem. At this stage we cannot say much more; it will be helpful in the final phases of the study to return to this point to see how the picture in 2008 compares with that in the future, particularly in the light of the changed economic environment.

However, the experience of our NQTs, in general, was that it was certainly not a seller's market – they found themselves filling out numerous applications (reportedly up to 70), and many discussed the intense competition, particularly for schools in the local area. This underlines the points made by previous research (summarised by Ashby et al, 2008: 33) that whilst there may be either a close match or even an oversupply of teachers in some subjects in the country as a whole, NQTs congregate in pockets of the country typically around ITT institutions, and of course would like to work in what they perceived as the best or most conducive schools. Thus for SLT members in 'unpopular' schools there maybe a problem, whereas NQTs – jostling for places in fewer schools – will not sense this. This perceived competition meant that NQTs did feel pressured to take a job if offered; and this of course has subsequent ramifications for retention should this initial decision prove to be wrong for both the school and the individual. As we will go on to note, however, in our sample there was little evidence of a widespread problem with NQT retention.

Once NQTs are appointed, SLT members identified a number of key issues regarding what we refer to here as the 'quality' of NQTs, by which we mean the personal and professional qualities, skills and knowledge that the NQTs arrive in the school with.

Key personal factors mentioned were being resilient/hard working, committed and enthusiastic. These last two – as we note above – are demonstrable in applications and interview; the first is apparent only via references (and we have seen that schools do not always feel these are reliable) or on the job. Among these personal factors, SLT members were positive about NQTs' commitment, enthusiasm and ability to handle the workload, although workload management was more of an issue for those from the PGCE route. (The related quality of resilience was seen to be neither a strength nor a particular weakness of NQTs, on the whole in the Part 1 Study).

Key professional factors seen as important for beginning teachers included subject knowledge; assessment; classroom management skills; ability to work with pupils at different ability levels; and dealing with parents. On subject knowledge, there was a balance among SLT members between those that believed NQTs were adequately prepared and those that thought that there was too much to be learned in one (PGCE) year. SLT and mentor interviewees were broadly satisfied with NQTs preparedness for assessment (unlike in Part 1 of the Study, where it was a problem), however NQTs themselves were more concerned about this aspect of their ITT. NQTs in secondary schools and some SLT members/mentors also thought classroom management and behaviour management were areas of concern (this also emerged from comments made in the Part 1 study).

Once NQTs started, then they of course required induction. Induction programmes tended to have common elements, with most including observations, NQT mentors and regular meetings. Secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to start NQT

induction the June / July prior to the NQT starting the following September. The majority of NQTs who took part in the case study visits commented on their induction processes within school, with comments overall that were very positive with many NQTs stating that their NQT induction was helpful and supportive. This is broadly consistent with TDA NQT Survey (TDA, 2008). The role of the induction tutor in particular, of course, is especially important. Other research (Barrington, 2000; Heilbronn et al, 2002; Yusko and Feiman-Nemser, 2008; plus others discussed in Ashby et al, 2008: 43-45) discusses the tension inherent in a mentor role (being both a support and in a sense a monitor of quality of NQT work). It will be interesting to pick up in later stages of the study whether these tensions are discussed as NQTs look back on the first year.

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. This was particularly apparent with regard to the provision of a personal or even school-level induction plan. Given that these differences have been noted in two separate phases of our research now, we suggest the issue needs to be followed up by TDA and schools (see suggestions for action, below).

LA induction was part of NQT induction for the majority of telephone interviews 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 example, primary NQTs found LA induction very supportive and another NQT stated that LA induction was a repetitive exercise.

The CEDP was used by over 80% of schools at transition stage one, although this gradually reduced to around two thirds by transition point three. These figures were in line with what NQTs reported. The majority of schools using it felt it was useful at all three points, although this was a slim majority by transition point three. Fewer NQTs - 43-47% - felt it was useful at all points. Overall, we found no clear patterns in differences between primary and secondary school in terms of uptake, unlike the latest TDA NQT Survey (TDA, 2008), although we did find that special schools were much less likely to use the CEDP at all points. We also could not discern clear patterns in perceived usefulness in regard to school type and SLT/NQT views.

Overall the comments made by NQTs interviewed as part of the case studies were similar to those from SLTs. Secondary NQTs use the file more so than primary NQTs and find the file helpful. Other research reviewed and discussed by Ashby et (2008: 45-48) presents a more mixed picture of CEDP, but much of it indicated that where used well it can be effective so long as development opportunities are treated broadly and not restricted to becoming 'assessment-led' via too narrow a focus on completion of documentation (Tickle, 2001; Williams, 2003, both cited by Ashby et al, 2008).

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 of their monitoring process. Generally, comments on difficulties experienced with NQT induction processes suggest that time and tailoring induction for individuals is an issue for SLT members taking part in the telephone interviews and case studies. Other difficulties included paperwork, and managing visits to other schools.

It is difficult to make the case, based on the case study data analysed and presented above, that there is a serious, widespread problem in all schools of retention of good

quality staff. This key finding is in line with Part 1 of the Study and other studies we have carried out, but seems potentially out of line, at least, with one of the most often quoted claims that "of those who become teachers [in England] about 40 per cent are no longer teaching five years later" (Kyriacou, 2005; cited in Ashby et al, 2008: 68). Most of those schools surveyed / involved in case studies felt that there was either no problem or limited issues, and most saw that providing good quality support and development opportunities in a friendly environment was the key to retaining staff for the first few years of their careers. The focus on support was key in Part 1 of the Study too, although the link to development opportunities was less clearly made. The focus on development and induction may well be one of the reasons why, for our group of schools and NQTs, there did not appear to be a major retention problem in general, since both of these are associated with positive NQT experiences and therefore retention by studies discussed by Ashby et al (2008).

Beyond this point, it is likely that most NQTs will look to move on (internally or externally) for promotion or other challenges. And many schools recognised that keeping staff in the longer term was not necessarily in the school's or teacher's interests.

Our group of NQTs supported these views, in the main. Most intended to stay in teaching (in line with the Part 1 Study), and looked forward to promotion internally or externally at some point, in some cases to very senior positions. A very small number were considering leaving the profession, with two fairly sure they would do so. Schools did not necessarily see this as a problem in itself: schools no more wanted to retain staff unsuited to the school or the job than the NQTs.

However, there are some caveats to add to this broadly positive picture. In a minority of schools, there was a more or less serious problem with retention of NQTs, and these schools were some of those facing the most challenging circumstances. One of the two NQTs clear they wanted to move on was also in a challenging environment. This supports other research in the UK and elsewhere which indicates that it is clear that it is more difficult to retain staff for such schools (Boyd et al, 2007; Smithers and Robinson, 2005; Johnson, 2004 - all cited by Ashby et al 2008:69-72), yet it is also true – as we see from our study – that these schools often work very hard to develop innovative and thoughtful strategies to retain their most valuable resource. In the next stages of the study, we intend to investigate in more depth such strategies. Where such schools are successful, they may constitute the most valuable transferable learning that will emerge from this study as it progresses.

It is worth noting at this point that we gathered additional survey data on post-induction year support and issue in progression of NQTs to becoming established teachers. These findings will be integrated with the qualitative findings from the next stage of the study when we can follow them up with NQT and SLT views on the second year of teaching.

## **5.2 Key Issues Emerging**

### **For ITT providers**

- The usefulness of references from ITT providers was picked up both in this stage and Part 1 of the Study. ITT providers and TDA should work together to investigate the quality of references to investigate this issue for the viewpoint of ITT providers.

- The importance of school links to ITT is emphasised again in this report. Given the particular issues facing schools in more challenging circumstances, providers should continue to make every effort to place trainees in a broad range of schools.

#### **For TDA**

- It appears from the qualitative phase of our research and the TDA's NQT Surveys that secondary schools make more use of the CEDP and are more positive about it compared with primaries, and therefore the TDA may wish to consider investigating how to make it better fit primary phase needs.
- Continuing from the point above on ITT providers' role in supporting recruitment to schools in challenging circumstances, TDA should continue to support flexible and innovative practice within a clear policy of encouraging all trainees to experience a broad range of schools. Evidence from this study and elsewhere indicates the importance of ensuring teachers experience schools in challenging circumstances as a strategy to reduce recruitment problems in such schools.
- Both this study and the environment map indicate that the experiences of NQTs regarding induction are less comprehensive than SLT members think, indicating that practice does not match policy in all respects. TDA should ensure schools do provide at least a minimum level of induction and continue to emphasise the positive benefits of comprehensive induction to schools.

#### **For schools**

- Induction is one of the most widely researched areas of teacher education and development, and there is a clear consensus that high quality, focussed induction with an induction tutor, time off timetable and a clear development plan for individuals reaps positive longer term benefits for schools and individuals. However, our study finds that even where schools believe they have in place comprehensive policies, in practice NQTs do not experience this same level of support. Schools should spend time investigating whether this is true of their schools: induction policies can only provide the benefits if they are implemented, of course.

#### **For the study**

- Some schools identified they could not recruit until later in the year, and we speculate this may be a factor for SFCCs in particular. This needs to be investigated.
- There may be a mismatch between SLTs and NQTs on the value of different routes in to teaching. This should be followed up in future phases.
- The role of local authorities is key to some NQTs induction – feedback from colleagues who are running induction sessions for the authority needs to be sought as part of the data collection.
- Subject knowledge was identified as an issue – what are schools doing to address weaknesses in NQTs knowledge – this could provide useful information for others who have the same issues?
- It has been suggested that the CEDP is covered differently by different providers. This could be followed up in future stages of the study.

- Reflections on the role of the induction tutor following the NQT year would be valuable.

**Two recent issues to be followed up in the study:**

- There are a number of providers of ITT which are School Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT). Most of these train in the Primary sector. The quality and retention of teachers from these routes needs to be addressed in future studies. It may be that views of students who follow such routes, and SLT members that employ them, compare more similarly with those of GTP.
- The National Challenge Schools initiative may already be addressing the issue of retention in those secondary schools which are facing challenge. Such schools are receiving a range of support, some of which is or will be aimed at supporting staff development (e.g. MTL) and other elements that may impact on recruitment and retention. It may be opportune to investigate in future surveys to what extent such schools are experiencing and benefits in terms of recruitment and retention from such support.

## References

- Ashby, P et al (2008) *Beginning Teachers' Experiences of Initial Teacher Preparation, Induction and Early Professional Development: a review of literature* DCSF Research Report RW076 London: DCSF
- Barrington, R (2000) An investigation into the induction period which considers the perspectives of newly qualified teachers *paper presented at the BERA conference, Cardiff*
- Bird, E. (2003). "To What Extent Can Diversification of Routes to Qualified Teacher Status Contribute to the Supply of Mathematics Teachers? In *Shortage of Mathematics Teachers - What Progress?* Proceedings of a National Day Conference, pp. 71-106. Milton Keynes: The Open University.
- Boyd, D et al (2007) *Who leaves?: Teacher attrition and student achievement* NBER Working Papers
- Bubb, S and Earley, P. (2006). "Induction Rites and Wrongs: The 'Educational Vandalism' of New Teachers' Professional Development." *Journal of In-service Education*, 32(1): 5–12.
- Bush, A. A. (2005). *Choice and Equity in Teacher Supply*. London: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Castagnoli, P. and Cook, N. (2004). *Growing Your Own Leaders: The Impact of Professional Development on School Improvement*. Full Practitioner Report, Nottingham: National College for School Leadership.
- Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (2007). *Education at a Glance 2007*. OECD.
- Dadley, E.M. and Edwards, B. (2007) "Where have All the Flowers Gone? An Investigation into the Retention of Religious Education Teachers." *British Journal of Religious Education*, 29(3): 249-271.
- Dolton, P. and Newson, D. (2003). "The Relationship between Teacher Turnover and School Performance." *London Review of Education*, 1 (2): 131-40.
- Hargreaves, L., Cunningham, M., Hansen, A., McIntyre, D., Oliver, C., and Pell, T. (2007). *The Status of Teachers and the Teaching Profession in England: Views from Inside and Outside the Profession*. Final Report of the Teacher Status Project. DfES Research Report, 831A.
- Heilbronn, R et al (2002) School-based induction tutors – a challenging role *School Leadership and Management* 22:4 pp.371-88
- Hobson, A.J., Malderez, A., Tracey, L., Homer, M., Mitchell, N., Biddulph, M., Giannakaki, M.S., Rose, A., Pell, R.G., Roper, T., Chambers, G.N., and Tomlinson, P.D. (2007). *Newly Qualified Teachers' Experiences of Their First Year of Teaching: Findings from Phase III of the 'Becoming a Teacher' Project*. London, Department for Education and Skills.
- Johnson, S (2004) *Finders and Keepers* San Francisco: Wiley



- Kyriacou, C et al (2003) Student Teachers' Expectations of Teaching as a Career in England and Norway *Educational Review* 55:3 pp. 255-263
- Lack, A. and Johnston, A. (2008) *Schools Facing Challenging Circumstances: Quantitative Findings*. Jigsaw Research. TDA.
- Noyes, A., (2004) "Where have All the Maths Teachers Gone?" *Proceedings of the British Society for Research into the Learning of Mathematics* 24 (3): 21-26.
- Qurtz, K. H., Thomas, A., Hasan, L., Kim, P., and Barraza-Lawrence, K. (2001) *Urban Teacher Retention: (Phase One:1998-2001) Technical Report of the Center X/TEP Research Group UCLA: Institute For Democracy, Education and Access*
- Rhodes, C. et al. (2004). "Valuing and Supporting Teachers: a Survey of Teacher Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction, Morale and Retention with an English Local Education Authority." *Research in Education*, 71: 67-80
- Sammons, P., Day, C., Kington, A., Gu, Q., Stobart, G., and Smees, R. (2007). "Exploring Variations in Teachers' Work, Lives and their Effects on Pupils: Key Findings and Implications from a Longitudinal Mixed-Method Study." *British Educational Research Journal - Special Issue*, 33(5): 681-701.
- Smithers, A and Robinson, P (2005) *Teacher turnover, wastage and movements between schools* Nottingham: DfES
- Smithers, A. and Robinson, P. (2004). *Teacher Turnover, Wastage and Destinations*. Nottingham, Department for Education and Skills.
- TDA (2008) *Results of the newly qualified teacher survey 2008* London: TDA
- Tickle, L (2001) Professional qualities and teacher induction *Journal of in-service Education* 27:1 pp. 51-64
- Williams, S (2003) Informal learning in the workplace: a case study of new teachers *Educational Studies* 29: 2&3 pp.207-219
- Yusko, B and Feiman-Nemser, S (2008) Embracing contraries: Combining assistance and assessment in new teacher induction *Teachers College Record*