

### 5.3 NQT preparedness for role and their qualities

SLT members rated most highly NQTs' commitment to children and least highly their ability to deal with parents. Table 30 suggests that, with the exception of pupil assessment/assessment for learning SLT members see NQTs as better prepared for directly working with children than for other contributions to the school, for example working with non teaching colleagues or parents or doing administrative work. For all items in Table 30 most responses fall in the adequate and above categories, however.

**Table 30 Evaluation by SLT members of the quality of NQTs: SLT responses**

	Very good	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very poor	Total	Mean *
	%	%	%	%	%	n	
Commitment to children	36.0	54.7	9.1	0.3	0.0	673	1.7
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	20.3	64.0	15.1	0.6	0.0	681	2.0
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	16.2	63.6	19.3	0.9	0.0	678	2.0
Lesson planning	20.5	53.8	24.4	1.3	0.0	679	2.1
Awareness of what the job entails	16.0	60.4	20.7	2.8	0.1	676	2.1
Ability to deal with children	16.0	57.5	25.0	1.6	0.0	677	2.1
Subject/specialism knowledge	16.8	54.4	26.4	2.1	0.3	678	2.1
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	13.3	59.0	26.5	1.2	0.0	675	2.2
Contribution to the whole school	14.5	54.4	28.0	3.1	0.0	678	2.2
Stamina/resilience	10.5	52.4	32.4	4.4	0.3	678	2.3
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	12.7	44.6	35.5	7.2	0.0	679	2.4
Awareness of future professional standards for teachers	8.0	48.5	38.3	5.2	0.0	678	2.4
Commitment to parents	6.3	46.8	43.0	3.8	0.2	665	2.4
Administrative work	5.4	45.8	43.4	5.3	0.2	666	2.5
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	6.4	41.6	42.2	9.5	0.4	676	2.6
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	7.1	36.9	45.7	10.0	0.3	661	2.6
Ability to deal with parents	3.5	33.8	54.2	8.3	0.1	677	2.7

**\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response**

Table 31 indicates NQTs' ratings of their own abilities, against the same aspects used in the SLT survey. Although, as Table 31 indicates, NQTs generally rate themselves more highly than SLT respondents rate them, there is broad agreement between SLT and NQT respondents about the aspects for which NQTs are well prepared and those for which they are less well prepared. As with the SLT respondents, NQT respondents rate their abilities to deal with children more highly than they rate their abilities to deal with other aspects of the teaching role, such as administrative work and dealing with parents.

**Table 31 NQTs' evaluation of their own qualities: NQT responses**

	Very good	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor	Mean*	Total n
Commitment to children	52.1	39.3	8.6	0.0	0.0	<b>1.6</b>	<b>267</b>
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	53.6	35.6	9.7	1.1	0.0	<b>1.6</b>	<b>267</b>
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	50.4	40.7	8.6	0.4	0.0	<b>1.6</b>	<b>268</b>
Lesson planning	47.8	39.6	10.8	1.5	0.4	<b>1.7</b>	<b>268</b>
Awareness of what the job entails	42.2	43.3	12.2	2.2	0.0	<b>1.7</b>	<b>270</b>
Ability to deal with children	38.9	46.7	12.6	1.9	0.0	<b>1.8</b>	<b>270</b>
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	39.0	43.9	13.4	3.7	0.0	<b>1.8</b>	<b>269</b>
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	34.0	42.9	20.9	1.5	0.7	<b>1.9</b>	<b>268</b>
Subject/specialism knowledge	34.4	43.1	18.3	2.7	1.5	<b>1.9</b>	<b>262</b>
Contribution to the whole school	25.3	49.8	22.7	1.9	0.4	<b>2.0</b>	<b>269</b>
Awareness of future professional development needs	26.9	45.9	23.1	3.7	0.4	<b>2.0</b>	<b>268</b>
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	25.6	47.8	21.5	4.4	0.7	<b>2.1</b>	<b>270</b>
Stamina/resilience	29.6	37.8	26.6	6.0	0.0	<b>2.1</b>	<b>267</b>
Administrative work	18.4	41.6	30.7	8.6	0.7	<b>2.3</b>	<b>267</b>
Commitment to parents	14.6	42.7	31.8	9.4	1.5	<b>2.4</b>	<b>267</b>
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	17.2	35.2	32.6	13.1	1.9	<b>2.5</b>	<b>267</b>
Ability to deal with parents	11.9	37.8	35.6	12.6	2.2	<b>2.6</b>	<b>270</b>

**\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response**

Table 32 considers quality against the routes from which all or most candidates come. SLT respondents rate NQTs from employment-based routes most highly for most of the aspects, indeed the only aspect for which they do not receive ratings higher than or equal to the other two main routes is 'team working skills with teaching colleagues' (rated most highly for full time PGCE). There seems a discrepancy here with SLT preferences for routes (the full time PGCE is preferred overall, see Table 27 above) There is considerable agreement between the ratings of SLT and NQT respondents. NQT respondents from employment-based routes also rate themselves more highly than the other routes for many aspects (Table 33), with higher or equal ratings for all apart from 'team working skills with teaching colleagues' (this time rated most highly for undergraduate teaching courses), 'subject specialist knowledge' (rated most highly for full time PGCEs, but note that SLT respondents rated full time PGCE and employment-based routes equally here), 'lesson planning' (full time PGCE best here), 'awareness of future professional development needs' (undergraduate courses best here), and 'pupil assessment/ assessment for learning' (undergraduate courses best here).

**Table 32 Quality of NQT applicants by the routes from which ALL/MOST applicants come: SLT responses**

	<b>FT PGCE</b>	<b>UG Teaching</b>	<b>Emp- based</b>	<b>FT PGCE</b>	<b>UG Teaching</b>	<b>Emp- based</b>
	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Total n</b>	<b>Total n</b>	<b>Total n</b>
Awareness of what the job entails	2.1	2.3	1.8	316	103	32
Ability to deal with children	2.1	2.1	2.0	317	103	32
Commitment to children	1.7	1.7	1.6	315	103	32
Ability to deal with parents	2.7	2.8	2.5	318	103	32
Commitment to parents	2.4	2.4	2.3	312	102	31
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	1.9	2.1	2.0	318	103	32
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2.4	2.4	2.4	316	103	32
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.6	2.5	2.5	307	99	32
Subject/specialism knowledge	2.0	2.3	2.0	315	103	32
Contribution to the whole school	2.2	2.2	2.1	315	103	32
Stamina/resilience	2.3	2.4	2.2	316	102	32
Lesson planning	2.0	2.1	1.9	317	102	32
Administrative work	2.5	2.6	2.4	312	99	32
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	2.1	2.2	2.0	314	103	32
Awareness of future professional standards for teachers	2.4	2.5	2.2	317	103	31
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	2.0	2.2	2.0	316	103	31
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	2.5	2.7	2.3	315	103	32

***\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response***

**Table 33 NQTs' evaluation of their own qualities by route taken: NQT responses**

	FT PGCE	PT PGCE	UG Teaching	Emp- based	FT PGCE	PT PGCE	UG Teaching	Emp- based
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n	Total n	Total n
Awareness of what the job entails	1.8	2.3	1.6	1.5	156	13	59	32
Ability to deal with children	1.8	2.3	1.6	1.6	156	13	59	32
Commitment to children	1.6	1.9	1.4	1.4	156	12	59	31
Ability to deal with parents	2.7	2.5	2.5	1.9	156	13	59	32
Commitment to parents	2.6	2.2	2.3	1.9	153	13	59	32
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	1.9	2.3	1.6	1.7	156	13	59	32
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2.2	2.4	1.8	1.8	156	13	59	32
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.6	2.8	2.2	2.2	154	13	59	32
Subject/specialism knowledge	2.0	2.5	1.5	2.5	151	10	59	32
Contribution to the whole school	2.1	2.3	1.9	1.6	156	12	59	32
Stamina/resilience	2.0	2.8	2.2	1.9	155	13	59	32
Lesson planning	1.7	2.1	1.5	1.8	155	13	59	32
Administrative work	2.4	2.8	2.2	2.2	155	13	59	32
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	1.6	2.2	1.4	1.4	154	13	59	32
Awareness of future professional development needs	2.1	2.6	1.8	2.0	155	13	59	32
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	1.6	1.8	1.5	1.5	155	13	59	32
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	2.0	2.5	1.7	2.0	155	13	59	32

**\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response**

Although the differences between types of school are not great, Table 34 indicates that apart from being able to work with support staff and non-school colleagues, where NQTs in primary schools are rated more highly, ratings by SLT respondents for the two types of school are either the same or NQTs in secondary schools are rated more highly (e.g. for subject specialist knowledge, contribution to the whole schools, stamina/resilience, lesson planning).

As already indicated, there were few respondents from independent schools, however Table 36 shows that the SLT respondents from independent schools rated the quality of NQTs more highly than did respondents from non-independent schools against every item but one ('commitment to children'), where it was rated equally. Table 37 indicates considerable agreement by NQT respondents with the SLT ratings, but just as with the breakdowns by route, NQTs' views varied more than did those of SLT. NQTs in independent schools rated themselves more highly (or equally) than did those in the non-independent sector against all items apart from 'commitment to parents' and 'stamina/ resilience'. This may imply that the environment in non-independent schools is more demanding and that there may be differences in the requirements of working with parents.

**Table 34 Evaluation of the quality of NQTs by SLT members, by type of school: SLT responses**

	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n
	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary
Awareness of what the job entails	2.2	2.0	471	189
Ability to deal with children	2.1	2.2	471	189
Commitment to children	1.8	1.7	472	184
Ability to deal with parents	2.7	2.7	471	189
Commitment to parents	2.5	2.4	464	184
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	2.0	1.9	475	189
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2.3	2.5	474	188
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.6	2.7	463	182
Subject/specialism knowledge	2.3	1.8	473	188
Contribution to the whole school	2.2	2.1	474	187
Stamina/resilience	2.4	2.2	473	189
Lesson planning	2.1	1.9	473	189
Administrative work	2.5	2.4	461	188
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	2.2	2.1	471	187
Awareness of future professional standards for teachers	2.4	2.4	474	187
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	2.1	2.0	474	188
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	2.6	2.4	471	188

**\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response**

**Table 35 NQTs' evaluation of their own qualities by route taken: NQT responses**

	Primar y	Secondar y	Primar y	Secondar y
	Mean*	Mean*	Total N	Total N
Awareness of what the job entails	1.8	1.7	161	97
Ability to deal with children	1.8	1.8	161	97
Commitment to children	1.5	1.6	161	94
Ability to deal with parents	2.6	2.5	161	97
Commitment to parents	2.4	2.3	159	96
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	1.9	1.8	161	96
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2.0	2.2	161	97
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.5	2.5	159	96
Subject/specialism knowledge	2.0	1.8	153	97
Contribution to the whole school	2.1	1.9	160	97
Stamina/resilience	2.1	2.1	160	95
Lesson planning	1.7	1.6	161	95
Administrative work	2.3	2.3	160	95
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	1.6	1.6	160	95
Awareness of future professional development needs	2.1	2.0	161	95
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	1.7	1.5	161	95
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	2.0	1.8	161	95

**\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response**

**Table 36 Evaluation of the quality of NQTs by SLT members, by independent and non-independent schools: SLT responses**

	Non-Ind	Ind	Non-Ind	Ind
	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n
Awareness of what the job entails	2.1	1.8	641	32
Ability to deal with children	2.1	1.8	641	33
Commitment to children	1.7	1.7	637	33
Ability to deal with parents	2.7	2.4	641	33
Commitment to parents	2.5	2.2	630	33
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	2.0	1.7	645	33
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2.4	1.9	643	33
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.6	2.1	627	31
Subject/specialism knowledge	2.2	1.7	642	33
Contribution to the whole school	2.2	1.8	643	32
Stamina/resilience	2.3	2.3	643	32
Lesson planning	2.1	1.8	643	33
Administrative work	2.5	2.2	630	33
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	2.2	2.0	639	33
Awareness of future professional standards for teachers	2.4	2.1	642	33
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	2.1	1.8	643	32
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	2.6	2.2	640	33

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

**Table 37 NQTs' evaluation of their own qualities, by independent and non-independent schools: NQT responses**

	Non-independent		Independent	
	Mean*	Total n	Mean*	Total n
Awareness of what the job entails	1.8	247	1.6	19
Ability to deal with children	1.8	247	1.5	19
Commitment to children	1.6	244	1.4	19
Ability to deal with parents	2.6	247	2.3	19
Commitment to parents	2.4	244	2.5	19
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	1.8	246	1.6	19
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2.1	247	1.9	19
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.5	245	2.4	18
Subject/specialism knowledge	1.9	239	1.9	19
Contribution to the whole school	2.0	246	1.9	19
Stamina/resilience	2.1	244	2.2	19
Lesson planning	1.7	245	1.5	19
Administrative work	2.3	244	2.3	19
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	1.6	244	1.4	19
Awareness of future professional development needs	2.1	245	2.0	19
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	1.6	245	1.4	19
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	1.9	245	1.7	19

*\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response*

In Appendix 1 Table 3 indicates no great differences in SLT respondents' ratings of the quality of NQTs against the indicator ('free school meals') of deprivation for the school. However, Table 38 below, indicates that NQTs who work in schools that are in the upper middle quartile for deprivation rate themselves differently from those in the other bands. Schools in the upper middle quartile may have the most equal mix of children from deprived and less deprived homes. They rate themselves more lowly (or in some cases equally) on all aspects and do not rate themselves more highly for any aspects. Table 39 shows a few small differences in relation to the ethnicity of the school population, particularly for schools falling into the band of 25-49% white pupils and it might be hypothesised that this relates to those schools having a more equal mix of ethnicities than the do the other schools: the items for which quality is judged to be lower by SLT respondents all relate to relationships with adults, 'commitment to parents', 'ability to deal with parents' and 'team working skills with non school colleagues'; the items where they are rated more highly are 'awareness of what the job entails', 'awareness of future professional standards'. This pattern is even more pronounced for NQT respondents' own scores (Table 38). NQTs working in the 25-49% white pupils band rate themselves lower (sometimes equal) against all items apart from 'team working with teaching colleagues', 'stamina/resilience' and 'lesson planning'. Table 4 in Appendix 1 indicates no great differences between the four geographical regions in the ratings of NQT qualities.

**Table 38 NQTs' evaluation of their own qualities, by eligibility for free school meals: NQT responses**

	Most deprived	Upper middle	Lower middle	Least deprived	Most deprived	Upper middle	Lower middle	Least deprived
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n	Total n	Total n
Awareness of what the job entails	1.6	1.9	1.7	1.6	67	65	52	54
Ability to deal with children	1.8	2	1.7	1.7	67	65	52	54
Commitment to children	1.5	1.8	1.5	1.5	66	65	51	53
Ability to deal with parents	2.4	2.8	2.6	2.4	67	65	52	54
Commitment to parents	2.2	2.6	2.5	2.3	67	64	52	54
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.9	66	65	52	54
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2	2	2.2	2.1	67	65	52	54
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.4	66	64	52	54
Subject/specialism knowledge	1.8	2.1	1.9	1.8	64	64	52	52
Contribution to the whole school	2	2.1	2	2	67	64	52	54
Stamina/resilience	2	2.4	1.9	2.1	66	64	51	54
Lesson planning	1.6	1.9	1.5	1.6	66	65	51	54
Administrative work	2.3	2.5	2.1	2.3	66	64	51	54
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	1.5	1.8	1.4	1.5	66	65	51	54
Awareness of future professional development needs	1.9	2.2	2	2	66	65	51	54
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.5	66	65	51	54
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	1.9	2.1	1.9	1.8	66	65	51	54

**\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response**

**Table 39 Evaluation by SLT members of the quality of NQTs, by school ethnicity: SLT responses**

% of white pupils	0-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%	0-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Mean*	Total n	Total n	Total n	Total n
Awareness of what the job entails	2.1	2.0	2.2	2.1	57	32	80	497
Ability to deal with children	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.1	57	31	80	498
Commitment to children	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.7	57	31	81	493
Ability to deal with parents	2.7	3.0	2.6	2.7	57	31	81	497
Commitment to parents	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.4	55	31	79	489
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	57	32	82	499
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	2.6	2.6	2.3	2.4	57	32	81	498
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.6	55	32	82	481
Subject/specialism knowledge	2.4	2.2	2.1	2.1	56	32	82	497
Contribution to the whole school	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.2	56	32	83	497
Stamina/resilience	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	57	32	81	497
Lesson planning	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.1	56	32	82	498
Administrative work	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.5	56	30	80	489
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.1	57	32	81	494
Awareness of future professional standards for teachers	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.4	57	31	82	497
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	2.2	2.0	2.1	2.0	57	32	82	496
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.5	57	31	81	496
Other (please specify)	2.0	2.3	2.9	2.8	1	3	10	29

***\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response***

**Table 40 NQTs' evaluation of their own qualities by school ethnicity: NQT responses**

<b>% of white pupils</b>	<b>0-24%</b>	<b>25-49%</b>	<b>50-74%</b>	<b>75-100%</b>	<b>0-24%</b>	<b>25-49%</b>	<b>50-74%</b>	<b>75-100%</b>
	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Mean*</b>	<b>Total n</b>	<b>Total n</b>	<b>Total n</b>	<b>Total n</b>
Awareness of what the job entails	1.6	1.9	1.7	1.8	23	16	38	176
Ability to deal with children	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.8	23	16	38	176
Commitment to children	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.6	22	16	38	174
Ability to deal with parents	2.5	2.9	2.5	2.5	23	16	38	176
Commitment to parents	2.2	2.8	2.2	2.4	23	16	37	174
Team-working skills with teaching colleagues	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.9	22	16	38	176
Team-working skills with support staff colleagues	1.9	2.1	2.1	2.1	23	16	38	176
Team-working skills with non school colleagues	2.4	2.6	2.5	2.5	22	16	38	174
Subject/specialism knowledge	1.8	1.8	2.0	2.0	21	16	36	172
Contribution to the whole school	2.0	2.1	1.9	2.1	23	16	37	176
Stamina/resilience	2.0	1.9	2.1	2.1	22	16	38	174
Lesson planning	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.7	22	16	38	175
Administrative work	2.1	2.4	2.2	2.4	22	16	38	174
Working with a full class/in charge of a whole class	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.6	22	16	38	174
Awareness of future professional development needs	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.1	22	16	38	175
Meets the QTS/core professional standards for teachers	1.8	1.6	1.5	1.6	22	16	38	175
Pupil assessment/assessment for learning	1.9	1.9	1.8	2.0	22	16	38	175
Other	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.5	1	2	2	2

***\*The lower the mean score, the more positive is the response***

Table 41 indicates that, overall, most SLT respondents consider that the quality of NQTs has either stayed the same or improved over the last 5 years (i.e. since September 2002). Table 42 suggests that SLT respondents consider that NQTs from employment-based routes have most improved over that period, Table 43 that SLT members in primary schools are less positive than those in secondary schools and Table 44 that SLT respondents in independent schools are more positive about improvements in the quality of NQTs (although the number of SLT respondents in independent schools is small and again there are more NQTs from the full time PGCE route in independent schools).

**Table 41 Quality of NQTs over the last 5 years (since September 2002): SLT responses**

Increased	Slightly increased	Stayed the same	Slightly decreased	Decreased	Total
%	%	%	%	%	n
15.7	35.7	35.6	11.3	1.7	655

**Table 42 Quality of NQTs over the last 5 years, by the routes NQT applicants come from: SLT responses\***

	FT PGCE	UG Teaching	Emp-Based
	All/Most	All/Most	All/Most
	%	%	%
Increased	17.0	15.2	19.4
Slightly increased	36.3	36.4	38.7
Stayed the same	34.1	34.3	29.0
Slightly decreased	10.9	12.1	9.7
Decreased	1.6	2.0	3.2
<b>Total n</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>31</b>

\*Figures calculated from those who said all or most come from the above routes only. Part-time PGCE and supply work not included as fewer than 10 respondents for all or most.

**Table 43 Quality of NQTs over the last 5 years (since September 2002), by type of school: SLT responses**

	Primary %	Secondary %
Increased	15.5	16.2
Slightly increased	33.5	41.1
Stayed the same	37.4	30.8
Slightly decreased	12.0	9.7
Decreased	1.5	2.2
<b>Total n</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>185</b>

**Table 44 Quality of NQTs over the last 5 years (since September 2002), by independent and non-independent schools: SLT responses**

	Non-independent	Independent
	%	%
Increased	15.9	13.3
Slightly increased	35.6	36.7
Stayed the same	34.8	50.0
Slightly decreased	11.9	0.0
Decreased	1.8	0.0
<b>Total n</b>	<b>623</b>	<b>30</b>

SLT respondents in the most deprived schools are more likely to consider that the quality of NQTs over the last 5 years has decreased (Table 45). Table 46 indicates that more SLT respondents in the schools with the highest proportions of children from ethnic minorities consider that quality has decreased (it may be that there are overlaps between schools where there are indications of high deprivation and where there are high proportions of children from ethnic minorities). However, SLT respondents from schools that may have more equal mixes of white and non white pupils are least likely to consider that the quality of NQTs has decreased.

**Table 45 Quality of NQTs over the last 5 years (since September 2002), by indicators of deprivation: SLT responses**

	Pupils eligible for free schools meals			
	Most deprived	Upper middle	Lower middle	Least deprived
Increased	19.9	16.7	16.4	11.3
Slightly increased	30.1	41.3	36.8	33.8
Stayed the same	32.9	32.0	32.9	41.7
Slightly decreased	14.4	10.0	11.2	11.9
Decreased	2.7	0.0	2.6	1.3
<b>Total n</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>152</b>

**Table 46 Quality of NQTs over the last 5 years (since September 2002), by school ethnicity: SLT responses**

% of white pupils	0-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-100%
	%	%	%	%
Increased	17.9	18.8	13.9	16.0
Slightly increased	30.4	34.4	38.0	35.7
Stayed the same	33.9	43.8	36.7	34.7
Slightly decreased	14.3	3.1	10.1	12.0
Decreased	3.6	0.0	1.3	1.7
<b>Total n</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>476</b>

There do seem to be regional variations, with SLT respondents in the North most likely to consider that quality of NQTs has decreased and those in London least likely to think so. SLT respondents in London have the most positive views of improvements in the quality of NQTs. However, across all regions the majority of respondents consider that quality has remained the same or improved.

**Table 47 Quality of NQTs over the last 5 years (since September 2002), by region: SLT responses**

	North	Midlands	South	London
	%	%	%	%
Increased	17.1	12.4	16.2	18.8
Slightly increased	29.9	43.3	33.1	38.8
Stayed the same	35.9	32.0	39.4	36.5
Slightly decreased	15.4	10.3	9.2	5.9
Decreased	1.7	2.1	2.1	0.0
<b>Total n</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>85</b>

#### **Comments by SLT members: perceptions of the quality of NQTs**

Most respondents were generally happy with the standard of the NQTs they have recruited, or were happy with some. There was a general feeling that standards are very varied but many respondents seem to consider themselves as fortunate in the NQTs that they have employed.

NQTs generally appear to have improved with regard to record keeping, standards, targets, assessment, etc. Some respondents consider that their lesson planning has improved others that it has declined.

Several negative comments were made about aspects not been included in the items to be rated in the questionnaire. NQTs seem more standards driven, quite rigid with regard to the National Curriculum, and less able to think creatively and to respond to children's needs,

indeed creativity was mentioned frequently as lacking in NQTs. NQTs seem inflexible in their approaches and are unable to differentiate in lessons and effectively teach varying abilities (this is reflected in the ratings provided in relation to deprivation and ethnicity). There is less focus on children's enjoyment and wider learning and more on core subjects: literacy and numeracy.

Some SLT respondents have a sense that NQTs are less committed to the profession, seeing teaching less as a vocation, and are less inclined to engage with the broader school community and extra-curricular activities (this is reflected in the ratings provided). However, some see those NQTs that have been successful at interview as motivated, engaged and eager for progression, bringing fresh enthusiasm to the school. Many respondents indicate that the support required and expected by NQTs can be high.

Respondents referred to NQTs' inability to deal with others within the school environment, such as the SLT, colleagues (particularly regarding team working), teaching assistants and parents. Managing behaviour and classrooms are issues. Some NQTs are not prepared for the difficulty of the NQT year, in particular for dealing with stress, workload and paperwork.

NQTs may not always be up to date with current school issues: national policies and measures change frequently and there are some concerns that ITT providers do not provide up to date training here. Particular concerns are about lack of awareness of national strategies other than those dealing with school subjects, e.g. extended day, healthy schools. NQTs may lack knowledge in some areas, and there was specific mention of SEN and addressing diversity. There are some problems with subject knowledge, particularly in the shortage areas of maths and science.

A small number of comments suggest a tendency for male NQTs to be regarded as less able than female NQTs.