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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

In January 2019, the Education Achievement Service (EAS) commissioned a research team from Manchester Metropolitan University to evaluate the EAS model of support for Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs) in South East Wales. The region includes the five local authorities of Blaenau Gwent, Caerphilly, Monmouthshire, Newport and Torfaen. Statutory induction has applied to all teachers who gain Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) in Wales from 2003. NQTs must complete an induction period of three school terms or the equivalent. From September 2017, all NQTs are required to demonstrate how their practice meets the professional standards for teaching and leadership (WG, 2017a,b). In September 2018, as part of its commitment to raising educational standards, the EAS introduced a bespoke model of support for Newly Qualified Teachers employed in the region’s schools. An evaluation of the first iteration of this model was conducted between January and September 2019.

Objective

The purpose of the evaluation was to:
- Determine the quality, effectiveness and impact of the EAS’ existing professional learning provision and support for NQTs, delivered both centrally and by partner schools.
- Provide recommendations for future development.

Evaluation design & data sources

The evaluation used a mixed methods design. The first stage involved a review of research literature to establish what is known about effective teacher induction. This report presents an analysis of sixty-eight research papers addressing induction programme components; contextual conditions that help to support and sustain induction efforts; and, potential benefits of induction programs to the new teacher and their students, the mentor and employing schools. The empirical stage of the evaluation entailed thirteen focus groups convened at Professional Learning Days in all five local authorities between March and May 2019. The focus groups involved forty-six NQTs (22 newly qualified primary school teachers, 17 secondary school NQTs and seven NQTs employed at special schools). To gather insights from the wider participant pool, an online survey was administered through May to September 2019 to all Induction Mentors supporting NQTs (105 in total) and all NQTs registered for induction in the EAS region (257 in total) during 2018-19. Completed survey returns were received from 60 Induction Mentors (response rate 57%) and 42 NQTs (response rate 16%). Findings from the NQT survey should be approached with caution given the low response rate.

Key findings

Literature review
- More research is needed to establish rigorous impact measures for teacher induction. In particular, there is a lack of research linking induction to student achievement.
- At present, research designs are largely small-scale, qualitative and descriptive with few larger-scale, longitudinal or experimental designs.
- Research indicates that the development of mentorship skills is positively associated with new teacher retention.
- Evidence suggests mentoring builds teacher leadership skills among experienced teachers.
- Effective mentoring is constructivist-orientated and focused on pedagogical skills, not just emotional support. Impact is greater with subject/field-matched mentor and mentees.
• Induction is enhanced through the engagement of a supportive head teacher and the active involvement of senior staff in beginning teachers’ work.
• Insecurity of tenure disrupts professional learning. Supply and short-term teachers face particular challenges in maintaining professional growth.
• Quality induction programs that are equally available to all beginning teachers are more effective and cost efficient than replacing teachers leaving the profession.
• New teachers with some induction have higher job satisfaction, commitment and retention rates. New teachers who experience induction report higher levels of self-efficacy and exhibit lower rates of school switching.

Focus groups
• The effectiveness of the Professional Learning Days was positively endorsed across all 13 focus groups. NQTs spoke highly of the benefits of networking, the opportunity to meet NQTs from other schools and curriculum areas, and to observe live practice.
• Locating Professional Learning Days in a local hub school removed new teachers from the immediate demands and work culture of their own school, while retaining an explicit focus on practice enhancement.
• Skilled facilitators made effective use of reported and observed experience to make explicit connections to the Standards and/or curriculum change.
• Access to professional learning at Pioneer Schools gave new teachers confidence and a sense of professional agency as potential change leaders, particularly in regard to curriculum change.
• Directed tasks at Professional Learning Days encouraged a cycle of planning, action and reflection.
• The e-portfolio is not highly regarded as a tool to support professional growth. The Passport was often regarded as serving an accountability function rather than a developmental function. There were reported examples of accomplished teachers’ use of the e-portfolio as a valued tool for career-long professional learning.
• According to NQTs the key qualities of an effective mentor are empathy, trust, a commitment to professional learning, accomplishment as a practitioner, strong communication skills, awareness of the needs of adult learners, and the capacity to offer constructive feedback and exemplification.
• NQTs valued a good fit between mentee and mentor, especially in regard to availability and curriculum areas/AoLE. A significant minority of NQTs in primary schools expressed concern about accessing mentor support. This was not a criticism of mentor capability, but of the capacity of mentors - especially senior staff - to fulfil the important role of induction mentor alongside the many other pressing demands on their time.
• A minority of NQTs reported judgemental rather than developmental mentoring.
• *Induction support appears strongest where there are larger numbers of NQTs in school and the development of an informal mentoring culture.*
• Other sources of support for professional learning included social media such as closed Facebook groups, Twitter, YouTube and teacher blogs. Some NQTs were active users of communications technology to extend opportunities for support.
• Some NQTs benefited from maintaining strong links with peers graduating from their ITE programmes and continuing contact with school-based and university-based teacher educators. Secondary teachers were able to draw on the resources of their national subject associations.
• Three general challenges not related to specific components of the induction programme were reported: (1) many NQTs believed they were treated as experienced teachers when they joined schools; (2) some believed they were assigned more challenging classes; and, (3) a small minority of secondary NQTs reported teaching outside the areas they were qualified to teach.
- NQTs who started induction later in the academic year had a less positive experience of the transition from ITE. NQTs employed on temporary contracts experienced most difficulty in accessing and understanding the model of support. Several NQTs without permanent posts reported feeling isolated outside Professional Learning Days and questioned whether they were receiving an equitable induction experience.
- Attitudes towards masters-level learning and research engagement at an early career stage were mixed. While demonstrating an enquiry disposition, many NQTs struggled to envisage a time when they would have the time and skills to engage in systematic pedagogic and curriculum enquiry. There was little evidence in the accounts offered by NQTs that most of the schools in which they worked were currently rich environments.
- NQTs raised concerns about workload pressures and particularly the amount of time spent on marking and planning. NQTs in primary schools most frequently referred to handling the volume of marking as a major difficulty. NQTs appreciated practical strategies such as sampling, peer assessment and self-marking. In strong professional learning communities, new teachers developed their practice through collaborative planning.

**Online survey**

- The top three development areas identified by NQTs and their mentors on taking up a first post are working with parents, completing Individual Education Plans, and working in culturally diverse settings. Fifty-five per cent of NQTs felt that their top three development needs had been fully met during their induction period and 40% reported that their development needs had been partially met.
- At least 50% of mentors reported that they provided a great deal of feedback to NQTs in relation to classroom management, teaching strategies and assessment practices.
- Over 50% of NQTs reported that mentors provided a great deal of feedback on classroom management, inclusive pedagogy and teaching strategies.
- Over 85% of NQTs receive day-to-day support from their induction mentor. Sixty-five per cent of NQTs reported spending less than four hours a month with their assigned mentors. The majority of Mentor respondents spent less than four hours a month with their mentee (75%).
- Mentors reported that seven NQTs do not receive protected NQT time, whereas 16 of the 42 NQTs who responded to the survey report they do not receive protected time.
- Over 40% NQT survey respondents reported that the Professional Learning Days had a large impact on their development as a teacher, especially in relation to the opportunity to work with peers from other settings (68%), time away from school/co-workers for reflection (48%) and focused profession reflection for practice development (43%).
- Only 30% of mentors were positive about the use of the Career Entry Profile to set NQT development priorities. A significant proportion of NQTs who responded to the survey indicated that are unlikely to continue to use their Professional Learning Passport (19, 45%).
- Mentors consistently reported that NQTs had a higher level of development need across all areas of development areas compared with NQTs’ own assessment of their high-level development needs.
- In terms of job satisfaction, NQTs are least satisfied with their salary (24%) and their work-life balance (19%).
- The majority of NQTs would highly recommend teaching as a career to others (27, 67%); Seven (17%) NQTs would not recommend teaching, and seven (17%) do not know if they would recommend teaching.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for NQTs

1. Access and understand the statutory arrangements for induction in Wales, the Professional Standards, and the role of the Professional Learning Passport as a development tool.
2. Maintain connections with initial teacher education provider (ITE) through alumni networks.
3. Explore specialist and subject associations for high quality resources and networking opportunities.
4. Access e-resources for professional learning and develop research literacy to be a discerning consumer of pedagogical research.
5. Ensure that NQT time is used constructively to reflect on progress and review learning. Be proactive in identifying possible learning opportunities.
6. Commit to a mentoring relationship that is not just a ‘check in’ conversation. Ask for feedback on a regular basis and set smart development goals. Establish respectful mutual accountability at an early stage in the mentoring relationship: discuss ground rules, confidentiality safeguards, and set boundaries.
7. Seek support in identifying impactful PLEs that demonstrate progress and achievement.
8. Use Professional Learning Days and the External Verifier to communicate individual needs, issues of concern and to broker additional support, where necessary.
9. Work with your formal and informal mentors to set learning goals that extend professional growth beyond the induction period and into the early career stage. Consider how you will record and share your learning with others.

Recommendations for schools

10. Ensure every NQT has access to a mentor who is suitably skilled and experienced to support the NQT and has the time and commitment to provide appropriate day-to-day support. Safeguard time for mentor meetings and interactions between mentor(s) and new teachers.
11. Ensure that all mentors are familiar with the EAS induction programme and the requirements of their role, including mutual accountability.
12. Review the process (and create protocols) for matching mentors and mentees to ensure strong support for professional learning.
13. Consider the training and development needs of mentors, and allocate sufficient resources/support, to build capacity in peer mentoring so that every school has a strong mentoring culture. Create and maintain a mentor pool.
14. Value, recognise and reward mentoring as a professional skill and educational priority. Ensure visible support for new teacher development from senior leaders.
15. Make all staff aware of the needs of NQTs as early career stage teachers and develop strategies for supporting those needs, including demonstration of effective teaching practice, common preparation times, and strategies for reducing unnecessary workload.
16. Consider how the school as a learning organisation can support the development of NQTs research literacy through small-scale and collaborative practitioner research and reading.
17. Articulate and share the school policy on financial support for professional development for NQTs via masters-level learning.

Recommendations for the EAS

18. Review the operation of the model to ensure that all NQTs have equitable access to high quality induction that addresses their professional learning needs. This may require development of bespoke strands within the induction program to address the specific needs of different groups of teachers, or specific teaching areas/context. Target funding to programme components that need development.
19. Clearly articulate rigorous criteria for mentor selection and evaluation. Support professional learning communities of mentors, and additional professional learning opportunities that exceed compliance with statutory requirements.

20. Improve communication to ensure all NQTs understand the developmental purpose of the PLP and intervene to reduce strategic behaviour and superficial engagement. Review support systems to ensure that portfolio building is a mentored experience that is used as a basis for ongoing professional conversations, rather than as a summative evaluation tool.

21. Introduce the e-portfolio platform at an earlier stage and provide sufficient support for NQTs to learn how to become confident users of the system.

22. Provide explicit guidance and exemplification to help NQTs understand how they can share professional learning experiences aligned with the Standards.

23. Promote the further development of NQT networks (digital and face-to-face) aligned with school cluster and curriculum networks.

24. Enhance the level of research literacy among lead practitioners facilitating Professional Learning Days, and draw on the expertise of University faculty within collaborative planning and delivery (to strengthen the transition from ITE to first post).

25. Continue to celebrate the achievements of NQTs and their mentors in high profile dissemination events and via digital media, including a possible NQT e-journal.

26. Consider how m-level learning can be more closely aligned with the needs of early career teachers so that it is both academically challenging and professionally relevant.

27. Review employment data to identify which schools have a consistently positive record of retaining NQTs within the profession, and conversely where retention rates are low.


1 INTRODUCTION

In January 2019, an evaluation team from Manchester Metropolitan University was commissioned to evaluate the EAS model of support for Newly Qualified Teachers. A multi-method evaluation was completed between January and October 2019. This report presents key messages from a review of 68 research publications, and summarises the key findings from thirteen focus group discussions conducted with 46 Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs) between March and May 2019, and survey responses from 60 Induction Mentors and 42 Newly Qualified Teachers.

Objective
The purpose of the evaluation was to:
- Determine the quality, effectiveness and impact of the EAS’ existing professional learning provision and support for NQTs, delivered both centrally and by partner schools.
- Provide recommendations for future development.

Rationale & context
New entrants to the teaching profession are a significant part of the future success of Welsh education (Waters, 2018). Support for new teachers is vitally important in enhancing teaching quality, promoting teacher well-being, and reducing rates of attrition. A world-class education system cannot rely on initial training to meet the development needs of the teaching profession. Teacher learning in Wales is a professional responsibility that continues across the career course: through initial teacher education, induction, peer mentoring, in-service professional development and professional collaboration (Furlong, 2014).

Induction is mandatory in Wales. An induction period starts once an NQT is registered with the Education Workforce Council (EWC) as a school teacher. All NQTs must complete an induction period of three school terms or the equivalent. NQTs who are not employed on a full-time basis must complete 380 school sessions. All NQTs should have a comparable induction experience irrespective of their employment status i.e. full time permanent, part time, short-term supply, or working across more than one school. All NQTs are entitled to access high quality support from an assigned Internal Mentor (usually working at the same school) (IM), an External Verifier (EV) and the regional consortium/Local Authority who hold responsibility for quality assuring induction arrangements in schools. A teacher serving an induction period should not teach for more than 90 per cent of the time that a teacher at the school would normally be expected to teach, plus a further ten per cent reduction in their remaining teaching timetable for planning, preparation and assessment (PPA).

The EAS model of support for NQTs includes induction sessions facilitated by the EAS, followed by a twilight and four full Professional Learning Days hosted at Professional Learning Schools (See Appendix 1). These sessions include elements of live practice and cover the Teaching and Leadership Standards (WG, 2019). Since 2017, NQTs undertaking induction use the new professional Standards for Teaching and Leadership, which reflect five essential elements of effective teaching and learning: Pedagogy, Leadership, Professional learning, Innovation and Collaboration. Professional standards are intended to: set clear expectations about effective practice; enable practitioners to reflect on their practice, individually and collectively, against nationally agreed standards of effective practice and affirm and

---

3 https://hwb.gov.wales/professional-development/professional-standards/
celebrate their successes; support practitioners to identify areas for further professional development; and are used within the performance management process. The Standards are accessed online via the EWC website and Professional Learning Passport online platform. During Professional Learning Days, time is given to support completion of Professional Learning Experiences (PLEs) for inclusion in the Professional Learning Passport (using the Pebble Pad digital platform). Evidence of meeting the relevant descriptors is required by NQTs at the end of induction to become a fully registered teacher in Wales.

While induction has been mandatory in Wales since 2003, research tells us it is not the provision of support per se but the quality of the programme that enhances new teacher effectiveness (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). This evaluation draws on NQT and mentor perspectives to review the effectiveness of different components of induction support, and identifies areas for further development.

Data sources

The evaluation used a mixed methods design. Data were generated using the following methods:

1) **Review of literature** on effective induction practice – rapid evidence synthesis.
2) **Online census survey** to all induction programme participants in South East Wales, linked to the Professional Standards – NQTs registered for induction and internal induction mentors.
3) **Non-participant observation** and **focus groups** with a sample of mentees (new teachers) attending school-based Professional Learning Days.
4) **Semi-structured interview** with a key informant involved in the design and delivery of the EAS model of support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Key stakeholders included in the evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online survey</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQTs registered for induction in South East Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction Mentors (IM) supporting NQTs in South East Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAS personnel with induction role: design or delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structure of the report

The report is structured in four sections. The first presents a review of the research literature on support for NQTs. The second outlines the main findings from the focus groups and observation of Professional Learning days. The third sections presents the analysis of NQT and mentor survey data. The final section draws on the main findings to offer a set of recommendations for NQTs, schools employing NQTs, and the regional consortium, EAS.

---


2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Summary

- More research is needed to establish rigorous impact measures for teacher induction. In particular, there is a lack of research linking induction to student achievement.
- At present, research designs are largely small-scale, qualitative and descriptive with few larger-scale, longitudinal or experimental designs.
- Research indicates that the development of mentorship skills is positively associated with new teacher retention.
- Evidence suggests mentoring builds teacher leadership skills among experienced teachers.
- Effective mentoring is constructivist-orientated and focused on pedagogical skills, not just emotional support. Impact is greater with subject/field-matched mentor and mentees.
- Induction is enhanced through the engagement of a supportive head teacher and the active involvement of senior staff in beginning teachers’ work.
- Insecurity of tenure disrupts professional learning. Supply and short-term teachers face particular challenges in maintaining professional growth.
- Quality induction programs that are equally available to all beginning teachers are more effective and cost efficient than replacing teachers leaving the profession.
- New teachers with some induction have higher job satisfaction, commitment and retention rates. New teachers who experience induction report higher levels of self-efficacy and exhibit lower rates of school switching.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

A review of research on new teacher induction was undertaken to identify and evaluate the evidence on approaches to induction in contexts comparable to Wales. The intention of the review was three-fold: to establish what is known about teacher induction (the knowledge base); to highlight effective practice (what has worked well); and to assess the extent to which current practice in South East Wales aligns with international good practice. Data sources were drawn from research articles reporting results from program evaluation in teacher induction programmes published in peer-reviewed journals in the last fifteen years; together with research reports from national and regional quality assurance agencies (e.g. education inspectorate). The literature search strategy used the following keywords: beginning teacher induction, new teacher support, mentoring programmes, teacher mentors; in conjunction with program evaluation, teacher quality, teacher improvement, effectiveness, retention, student achievement, and teaching practice. Two bibliographic databases, the British Education Index (BEI) and the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) were used to identify 873 items, which were screened for relevance and research quality. Retained items needed to be empirical research that addresses issues of first-year teachers learning to teach, and induction program components that promote beginning teachers’ learning. Sixty-eight items were retained and reviewed using the following three categories.

- Induction programme components;
- Conditions that help to support and sustain induction efforts; and,
- Potential benefits of induction programs to the new teacher and their students, the mentor and employing schools.

The research base on new teacher induction is emerging. Much evidence is qualitative and descriptive rather than quasi-experimental. Research designs typically involve the following case study methods: focus groups and semi-structured interviews with new teachers and school leaders. There are few experimental designs given the complexity of random assignment in education settings (Lorenz et al., 2013; Bastian and Marks, 2017; Helms-Lorenz and Maulana, 2016), and relatively few large-scale
surveys (Algozzine et al., 2007; Richter et al., 2013; Blömeke et al., 2015; Fletcher and Barrett, 2004; Kang and Berliner, 2012; Ronfeldt and McQueen, 2017; Gerrevall, 2018). The review suggests that more research is needed to establish rigorous impact measures. In particular, there is a lack of research linking induction to student achievement (outcomes measures) (Fletcher and Strong, 2009; Ingersoll and Strong, 2011). It is, of course, difficult to control for all the potential variables that may influence student outcomes, including those that are beyond the control of the education system. Understanding how different forms of teacher induction influence student outcomes is problematic. Establishing a chain of causation is challenging with difficult-to-measure attributes. There are few studies that consider the characteristics of new teachers, their students and the schools where they take their first posts. Consequently, there are few larger and longitudinal studies tracing post-induction outcomes (Shockley et al., 2013; Buchanan et al., 2013; Desimone et al., 2014). In addition, there is almost no empirical research evaluating the relative financial costs of (alternative) induction models (Ingersoll & Strong, 2012).

2.2 **INDUCTION PROGRAMME COMPONENTS**

The following components were most frequently cited as having the potential to affect the quality and retention of beginning teachers (Figure 1).

*Figure 1. Induction components cited in research literature*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National context</th>
<th>Subject/field specific mentoring</th>
<th>Common planning times</th>
<th>Professional learning networks</th>
<th>Multi-day off-site institutes</th>
<th>Coaching mentor</th>
<th>Collegial in-school support</th>
<th>Analysis of student work</th>
<th>Support for work with diverse students</th>
<th>Full release or external mentors</th>
<th>School leader involvement &amp; development</th>
<th>Communication with parents</th>
<th>Focused observation</th>
<th>Workload reduction for NTs</th>
<th>Practitioner research &amp; enquiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achinstein, &amp; Davis (2014)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algozzine et al., (2007)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bastian &amp; Marks (2017)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blömeke et al. (2015)</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desimone et al. (2014)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher &amp; Barrett (2004)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher and Strong (2009)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flores (2017)</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gehrze &amp; McCoy (2012)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glassford &amp; Salinitri (2007)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon &amp; Lowrey (2017)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grudnoff (2012)</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammerness, &amp; Matsko (2013)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harford &amp; O'Doherty (2016)</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helms-Lorenz, &amp; Maulana (2016)</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National context</td>
<td>Subject/field specific mentoring</td>
<td>Common planning times</td>
<td>Professional learning networks</td>
<td>Multi-day off-site institutes</td>
<td>Coaching mentor</td>
<td>Collegial in-school support</td>
<td>Analysis of student work</td>
<td>Support for work with diverse students</td>
<td>Full release or external mentors</td>
<td>School leader involvement &amp; development</td>
<td>Communication with parents</td>
<td>Focused observation</td>
<td>Workload reduction for NTs</td>
<td>Practitioner research &amp; enquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helms-Lorenz et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helms-Lorenz et al. (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobson et al. (2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt (2014)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingersoll &amp; Strong (2012)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kang &amp; Berliner (2012)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearney (2014)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearney (2015)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearney (2017)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutsyuruba &amp; Tregunna (2014)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langdon (2011)</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolan (2017)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saileh &amp; Tan (2013)</td>
<td>Shanghai, China</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith &amp; Ingersoll (2004)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spooner-Lane (2017)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood &amp; Nevins Stanulis (2009)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 CONDITIONS FOR EFFECTIVE INDUCTION

The following key messages were identified in the review of research:

Mentorship

- Strong educative induction is needed rather than simply access to formal induction. It is not simply a question of access to support, but the type and number of supports that matter i.e. the quality & intensity of support available to new teachers.
- Having a mentor is not enough; it is the mentor’s capacity to support new teachers that matters (Ingersoll & Strong, 2012). The development of mentorship skills is positively associated with new teacher retention (Callahan, 2016; Kidd et al., 2015).
- All mentors need support to move beyond conveying craft knowledge of what works. Effective mentoring is not transmission-orientated (hierarchical/didactic) but constructivist-orientated i.e. collegial and exploratory (O'Brien & Christie, 2005; Richter, et al., 2013; Simmie et al., 2017; Spooner-Lane, 2017).
- Access to external mentors (outside the employing school) can provide a ‘safe’ and ‘motivating’ space for new teachers. Traditional hierarchies are flattened allowing a strong focus on professional learning with a reduced fear of judgement (McIntyre and Hobson, 2013). The development needs of external mentors - as ‘boundary crossers’ - should not be overlooked (Daly and Milton, 2017).
- For optimal impact, mentees benefit from field/subject matter matched mentors (Achinstein & Davis, 2014; Hunt, 2014; Algozzine et al., 2007; Desimone et al., 2013)
- In effective partnerships a strong coaching mentor is assigned who can grow professionally as much as those they mentor (Bland, Church, & Luo, 2014).
- Benefits are optimised if induction moves beyond social and emotional support to ‘serious induction’ focused on pedagogical skills and teaching quality (Grudnoff, 2012).

School culture

- Teachers who report a school climate of trust reveal higher Content Knowledge, Pedagogical Content Knowledge, and General Pedagogical Knowledge, as well as more dynamic and constructivist beliefs (Blömeke et al., 2015).
- Induction is enhanced through the engagement of a supportive head teacher and senior staff in beginning teachers’ work (West & Hudson, 2010; Langdon et al., 2019; Kutsyuruba & Tregunna, 2014). Principal/headteacher induction should include new teacher support (Flores, 2017). School leaders may need support to interpret and understand competency profiles/teacher standards (Gerrevall, 2018).
- New teacher mentoring should be regarded as a ‘community effort’ that establishes collegial norms (Bradley-Levine et al., 2016; Squires, 2017).
- In addition to formal mentors, informal mentors play an important complementary and sometimes compensatory role, offering mentoring assistance beyond formal assessment and evaluation (Desimone et al., 2014).
- New teachers’ ‘staying power’ and ‘impact power’ are influenced by their persistence, work ethic, desire to work in ‘high needs’ schools, and by their ability to form support networks and build working relationships with families (Tricarico et al., 2015).

• Context matters. It is unsurprising that teacher attrition is associated with teacher working conditions (Geiger & Pivovarova, 2018). In some contexts, early career teachers have higher recorded rates of burnout (mental and physical exhaustion) and turnover (Kim et al., 2017). Early career teacher attrition may be reduced by placing greater focus upon professional wellbeing for job satisfaction (Kelly et al., 2018)

2.4 **POTENTIAL BENEFITS**

The review of literature identified the following potential benefits of induction programs to the new teacher and their students, the mentor and employing schools.

**Benefits for new teachers**

- Formal induction has a positive impact on three primary outcomes: “teacher commitment and retention, teacher classroom instructional practices, and student achievement” (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011, p.201).
- New teachers with some induction have higher job satisfaction, commitment and retention (Ingersoll & Strong, 2012; Ronfeldt & McQueen, 2017).
- The quality of collegial support new teachers receive makes a substantial difference to their ability to manage their teaching (Buchanan at al., 2013).
- New teachers participating in formal induction record increases in self-efficacy in the classroom at the end of the school year and a reduction in stress responses (Helms-Lorenz at al., 2013, 2016)

**Benefits for students of new teachers**

- Induction programs have a positive impact on student achievement in large, urban, low-income schools (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011)
- The impact of formal induction varies between low-poverty and high-poverty schools, with lower induction effects in high-poverty schools (Ingersoll & Strong, 2012).

**Benefits for mentors**

- Mentoring benefits not only new teachers, but also their mentors’ professional learning (Hobson et al, 2009).
- Mentoring builds teacher leadership skills for experienced teachers (Davies et al., 2015).
- Mentoring enhances communication skills, develops leadership roles (problem-solving and building capacity) and advances pedagogical knowledge (Hudson, 2015).

**Benefits for employing schools**

- Schools that exhibit a strong career culture that supports career progression are more likely to retain beginning teachers (Coldwell, 2016).
- Induction is associated with improved teacher retention in low-performing schools (Bastian & Marks, 2017).
- Teachers prepared for particular contexts have higher retention rates (Hammerness & Matsko, 2013). The complexity of teaching in an urban environment may be reduced by offering adequate early career support (Gaikhorst et al., 2014)
- After controlling for teacher and school characteristics, three induction activities are positively correlated with deciding not to move or leave the profession: seminars, common
planning time and extra classroom assistance such as teaching assistants (Kang & Berliner, 2012).

- Induction associated with reduction in school switching. Less effective teachers are more likely to leave the profession (Helms-Lorenz & Maulana, 2016).
- Creating quality induction programs that are equally available to all beginning teachers would be more effective and cost efficient than replacing teachers leaving the profession (Kidd et al., 2015).
3 FOCUS GROUPS

Summary

- The effectiveness of the Professional Learning Days was positively endorsed across all 13 focus groups. NQTs spoke highly of the benefits of networking, the opportunity to meet NQTs from other schools and curriculum areas, and to observe live practice.
- Locating Professional Learning Days in a local hub school removed new teachers from the immediate demands and work culture of their own school, while retaining an explicit focus on practice enhancement.
- Skilled facilitators made effective use of reported and observed experience to make explicit connections to the Standards and/or curriculum change.
- Access to professional learning at Pioneer Schools gave new teachers confidence and a sense of professional agency as potential change leaders, particularly in regard to curriculum change.
- Directed tasks at Professional Learning Days encouraged a cycle of planning, action and reflection.
- The e-portfolio is not highly regarded as a tool to support professional growth. The Passport was often regarded as serving an accountability function rather than a developmental function. There were reported examples of accomplished teachers’ use of the e-portfolio as a valued tool for career-long professional learning.
- According to NQTs the key qualities of an effective mentor are empathy, trust, a commitment to professional learning, accomplishment as a practitioner, strong communication skills, awareness of the needs of adult learners, and the capacity to offer constructive feedback and exemplification.
- NQTs valued a good fit between mentee and mentor, especially in regard to availability and curriculum areas/AoLE. A significant minority of NQTs in primary schools expressed concern about accessing mentor support. This was not a criticism of mentor capability, but of the capacity of mentors - especially senior staff - to fulfil the important role of induction mentor alongside the many other pressing demands on their time.
- A minority of NQTs reported judgemental rather than developmental mentoring.
- Induction support appears strongest where there are larger numbers of NQTs in school and the development of an informal mentoring culture.
- Other sources of support for professional learning included social media such as closed Facebook groups, Twitter, YouTube and teacher blogs. Some NQTs were active users of communications technology to extend opportunities for support.
- Some NQTs benefited from maintaining strong links with peers graduating from their ITE programmes and continuing contact with school-based and university-based teacher educators. Secondary teachers were able to draw on the resources of their national subject associations.
- Three general challenges not related to specific components of the induction programme were reported: (1) many NQTs believed they were treated as experienced teachers when they joined schools; (2) some believed they were assigned more challenging classes; and, (3) a small minority of secondary NQTs reported teaching outside the areas they were qualified to teach.
- NQTs who started induction later in the academic year had a less positive experience of the transition from ITE. NQTs employed on temporary contracts experienced most difficulty in accessing and understanding the model of support. Several NQTs without permanent posts reported feeling isolated outside Professional Learning Days and questioned whether they were receiving an equitable induction experience.
• Attitudes towards masters-level learning and research engagement at an early career stage were mixed. While demonstrating an enquiry disposition, many NQTs struggled to envisage a time when they would have the time and skills to engage in systematic pedagogic and curriculum enquiry. There was little evidence in the accounts offered by NQTs that most of the schools in which they worked were currently rich-rich environments.

• NQTs raised concerns about workload pressures and particularly the amount of time spent on marking and planning. NQTs in primary schools most frequently referred to handling the volume of marking as a major difficulty. NQTs appreciated practical strategies such as sampling, peer assessment and self-marking. In strong professional learning communities, new teachers developed their practice through collaborative planning.

3.1 INTRODUCTION

To address the evaluation objectives, the evaluation team engaged in non-participant observation and convened focus groups with NQTs attending Professional Learning Days scheduled in spring 2019 at a sample of Professional Learning Schools chosen in consultation with the EAS. The sample includes schools across sectors – primary, secondary and special education - and across the five local authorities of the EAS region - Blaenau Gwent, Caerphilly, Monmouthshire, Newport and Torfaen. It was appropriate to commence data gathering at this stage in the academic year as NQTs had negotiated the early ‘survival’ phase of their first year and were entering the ‘reflection’ and ‘anticipation’ stages (Moir, 1999). Every NQT attending PL days at each selected PL School was invited to take part in a focus group discussion. In advance, potential participants received an information sheet (Appendix 4) detailing the purposes of the evaluation and what was required, and a consent form (Appendix 5); none declined participation. In obtaining informed consent, the evaluation team took care to explain that participation was not linked to assessment of NQT progress during induction.

In total, 13 focus groups with between 6-9 NQTs were convened between March and May 2019 in three primary schools, two high schools and one special school. A member of the evaluation team with professional experience in primary, secondary and special education, respectively, facilitated group discussions. The moderator guides can be found in Appendix 6 and 7. The focus groups included NQTs from a range of year groups (Primary) and subject areas (Secondary). Each group contained NQTs who were supported by a number of different Internal Mentors (IMs) and External Verifiers (EVs). Group discussions were audio recorded with the permission of participants. The team attended PL day 3 (Advancing Learning) at six schools, and PL day 4 (Leadership) at five schools. One school commenced the PL days in March 2019 and in this case PL days 1, 2, and 3 were observed (see Table 1). Focus group discussions were timetabled at a convenient point in the day agreed with the facilitator(s) and were of no more than 45 minutes duration. Forty-six NQTs took part in at least one of the thirteen focus groups – 22 newly qualified primary school teachers, 17 secondary school NQTs and 7 NQTs employed at special schools.

Verbatim transcripts were prepared using professional audio transcription services. Transcripts were analysed using NVivo 11 software for qualitative data analysis. All personal identifiers were removed and replaced with a code that denotes the focus group attended. The quotations selected for inclusion in this report are those that best represent the strength of response in relation to specific themes.

---

This section of the report presents the main findings generated from analysis of focus group discussions. The findings are arranged in nine themes. The first three themes relate directly to the core components of the EAS model of induction support: (1) Professional Learning Days, (2) the Professional Learning Passport, and (3) induction mentoring. Common challenges reported by NQTs are then outlined (4), particularly challenges facing those completing induction outside full time permanent employment (5). The next three themes address issues of professional growth through the transition from initial teacher education (6), through to masters study (7) and research engagement (8). Finally, a summary is offered of NQT perspectives on workload and teacher wellbeing (9).

### 3.2 PROFESSIONAL LEARNING DAYS

There was unanimous support across all 13 focus groups for the effectiveness of the Professional Learning Days in supporting new teacher development. NQTs spoke highly of the benefits of networking, the opportunity to meet NQTs from other schools and curriculum areas, and to observe live practice. The professional Learning days were described as ‘well organised and well led’ (FG #213). Attendees reported leaving feeling ‘motivated’, ‘inspired’ (FG#214) and ‘refreshed’ (FG#113).

*From the beginning, it was very clear what was expected. I felt much more clarity than in the PGCE. This year has been easier to understand what you need to do and how you need to do it. (Secondary NQT, FG#223)*

*These days are really useful in pinpointing ways we can further develop to meet the Standards and what we can put in Pebble Pad. It’s been really useful to talk to other NQTs about our experiences. Seeing live practice is really beneficial. And to be able to see a different school and how they work. (Secondary FG, FG#114)*

*I feel like the most beneficial part of our experience so far has been the Professional Learning Days. I think that coming here and having that day out from our usual setting, and having time to focus and think about our professional development and see good practice across the school, and to get advice has been really helpful. (Secondary NQT, FG#213)*
NQTs valued the opportunity to take time out from the many demands of their day-to-day role to reflect on progress, take stock and assess development priorities. Locating professional learning days in a local hub school removed new teachers from the immediate demands and work culture of their own school, while retaining an explicit focus on practice enhancement.

*It gives you the time to reflect. That’s what most people lack because you’re so obsessed with the here and now and what I’ve got to do today and tomorrow. You don’t actually have time to just stop. It’s a buffer, to get out of school and hole up here. You’ve just got that breathing space.* (Primary NQT, FG#123)

*These days have been a real refresher where we’ve been able to take a step out of the classroom. Coming here and being able to think and talk about different ideas and see live practice. It’s allowed me to be quite reflective. I’ve made quite a few changes from these days. We have directed tasks where we take something from here, and then bring it back to see whether it works.* (Primary NQT, FG#113)

Professional Learning Days provided an important safe space where novice teachers felt able to talk openly about areas of their work where they struggled. The relatively small number of core attendees, and the positive rapport developed with the facilitators, encouraged disclosure and collegial responses. Where some NQTs had expressed a degree of reticence about raising issues in their own school, the Professional Learning Day offered an opportunity to share freely without fear of judgement or high stakes accountability.

*We’ve shared lots of good practice. There have been times when some of us have had quite bad experiences and nobody has judged anybody and we’ve been given ways to improve. That has been good.* (Primary NQT, #113)

*Our External Verifier did say from day one treat Professional Learning Days as an opportunity for you to say whatever you need to say to somebody who’s not going to judge you and who’s not going to put that on your development record. It’s an outlet - a place to share all the good and all the bad and get advice from someone who isn’t necessarily employing you at your current school.* (Secondary NQT, FG#213)

NQTs clearly valued the input from the skilled facilitators and experienced educators who led the sessions. Facilitators used a high volume of questions and modelled an inquiry stance throughout the day. Attendees valued the extensive use of rich vignettes to illustrate specific dimensions of practice. The range of activities - including small group tasks, peer work, presentations, and group discussion - promoted engagement and maintained an appropriate balance between pace and depth of engagement. At its most effective, skilled facilitators toggled between reported and observed experience to make explicit connections to the Standards and/or curriculum change. A focus on impact for learners was explicit. Access to professional learning at Pioneer Schools gave new teachers confidence and a sense of professional agency as potential change leaders.

*I’ve taken things from [the facilitator] and from the lessons we’ve observed and from discussions with each other about what we’ve done in our classroom. I very often scribble down an idea, strategy, or task and turn it into something I can do in history, even though I’ve taken it from one of the science or maths guys. There’s lots that we can take away to have a go back in our own classrooms.* (Secondary NQT, FG#213)

*They have given us a lot of ideas in areas where we’ve had troubles. Quite often in the conversations we’ve had, [the facilitator] will tease out things and suggest*
solutions on the spot as we’re going through it. I know that I’ve thought, “I’ll give that a go”. So, it’s not necessarily formally delivered by PowerPoint but in the way of delivering the sessions. S/he gives us lots and lots of novel ideas to try. (Secondary NQT, FG#213)

It’s quite an exciting time with the draft curriculum coming out. It’s particularly nice for us as NQTs. We’ve got an advantage because we’re trained in the new professional standards. We’ve very aware of the changing curriculum. It’s a little bit of a power shift because you can share your experiences and being able to engage in these PL days in a Pioneer School, where they have been moulding and experimenting with the curriculum. It’s really nice to have that little bit of power and knowledge to share with your more experienced colleagues, which is a big confidence boost. (Secondary NQT, #214)

Deliberation on Professional Learning Days is followed by directed tasks that encourage attendees to trial new practices on return to school and expand their repertoire of teaching skills. NQTs offered accounts of the impact of PL days on their development through the year, especially in regard to pedagogy and assessment. In this way, Professional Learning Days encouraged a cycle of planning, action and reflection and laid a firm foundation for continuing professional growth.

In terms of reflective practice, we bring in examples of stuff we’ve done. One session we brought in and shared examples of our differentiation worksheets. I find that I always leave with something to try. One of the days was on peer assessment and using success criteria. I left thinking, “Oh, I’ll write up success criteria for what I’m doing currently with my year 8”. I tried that in the next few weeks and it was really successful. (Secondary NQT, FG#223)

I really focused on marking grids. We discussed knowing where the children are, how they are going to be learning, how to push it forward. I focused on making that a step-by-step process, keeping that up-to-date so I knew what to tackle next and how to go forward. (Primary NQT, FG#114)

Only two of the forty-six NQTs expressed any reservations about Professional Learning Days. One primary NQT questioned whether the practice observed at the Professional Learning School (PLS) was transferable their own context. Not all schools have access to the facilities of the PLS estate. In addition, a NQT employed at a PLS noted that NQTs in this position did not have the opportunity to see practice at another school and share experiences outside their own place of employment (Special School, #313). Other NQTs also requested visits to additional schools within a local cluster model.

I would like to go to another pioneer school because although it’s very good, it’s very individual. Maybe they could organise it as a carousel within a cluster – ‘We’ll take your NQTs for this session. You have ours’ - so we can see a different setting. (Primary NQT, FG#123)

There is no way that we can replicate what’s going on here in my school because it’s a really old school. We’ve got tiny classrooms, no external doors. There are no break out rooms. You’ve got one class in one room with one teacher, no teaching assistants. We haven’t got technologies, so we can’t do ICT. So you see all that’s happening here and you think, ‘oh I’ve got to take this back to school’, but there’s no way we can implement it in a lot of the older schools. (Primary NQT, FG#123)
In summary, without exception NQTs reported favourably on the success of the Professional Learning Days in terms of the high quality of the professional learning opportunities and the skill of the facilitators. The accounts offered by focus group participants gave strong support for the effectiveness of the PL Days in supporting professional learning aligned with the Standards and curriculum requirements, and the impact of the Days on current and future action. Suggestions for improvement focused on increasing opportunities to observe good practice in additional schools, the inclusion of different types of school setting, and/or consideration of the transferability good practice examples to contrasting settings.

### 3.3 Professional Learning Passport

Responses from focus group participants signalled a need for stronger support to help NQTs to value the process of building the Professional Learning Passport. The e-portfolio is not highly regarded as a tool to support professional growth. Focus group comments suggest a need for further practical support in how to use the online platform effectively (for NQTs and their mentors), and clear guidance on expectations (especially how to use evidence to demonstrate engagement with different Standards). The responses suggest that there is scope to improve the functionality of the Passport and to explore how it might be further adapted to fit the specific purposes of NQT induction in Wales. For many NQTs the technical requirements and uncertainty over expectations led to a commodification of ‘experiences’ for the purposes of summative evaluation (product-oriented) and did not encourage deep and critical reflection for practice improvement (process-oriented). Some participants did value the additional that an online portfolio afforded, the ease of linking assets and the benefit of having a secure digital space to share artefacts. There was some evidence to suggest that the immediacy of the app was adding flexibility to the collection of artefacts as prompts for later reflection.

> I often use the app for adding evidence, that’s really useful. If I’m writing an experience it’s really easy for me to just grab my phone and take a picture of a workbook or a display in my classroom or my resources. The online proforma gives you more structure to help you identify your next steps. (Primary NQT, FG#114)

A minority of NQTs recognised that while ITE appeared primarily concerned with demonstrating achievement of the Standards, the induction profile was also concerned with demonstrating impact. Only a minority of focus group participants saw the profile as representing progression rather than repetition of activity undertaken during ITE, which gave rise to considerable frustration among a time poor population. It was noted that experienced teachers appeared to have little awareness or enthusiasm for the e-portfolio, which they felt was restricted to novice teachers. This perception of low value and relevance among experienced colleagues did not encourage new teachers to engage with the process. It also meant there were no examples of accomplished teachers’ use of the e-portfolio as a valued tool for career-long professional learning.

NQTs reported considerable delays of up to eight weeks between uploading experiences and mentors gaining access to view the Passport. Many NQTs did not regard the Passport to be user friendly. Issues were raised in terms of the navigability of the platform, frequent losses of material due to no automatic save facility; and changes in how to access materials between log-ins. NQTs questioned whether time invested in navigating the system was time well spent. The relationship between practice enhancement and the Induction Profile was not always evident to participants.

> The Pebble Pad website isn’t user-friendly. By the time I find what I need to do on there, it’s already into my limited time. Trying to manage that alongside moderation
and everything else that is expected of teachers, especially newly qualified teachers, is difficult. We are just beginning to learn our craft. Something like planning might take us longer than someone who’s been in the job five or six years. And obviously marking takes a good deal of time. So you are then having to find time to go back through Pebble Pad when that doesn’t have such an effect on your teaching. (Primary NQT, FG#114)

The Passport was often regarded as serving an accountability function rather than a developmental function. While intended as an aid to critical reflection and support for development, the process of collating materials and mapping against Standards was seen as laborious and time consuming. For many the process was seen as a retrospective process of providing an audit trail of ex post facto evidence, rather than driving professional learning forward in collaboration with more experienced mentors. Negative responses were expressed in the focus groups by NQTs employed across primary and secondary schools.

I do feel that at times it’s being done for the sake of it. I don’t think you can survive your NQT year without reflecting on your practice (Secondary NQT, FG#213)

It’s not something that’s helping me progress as a teacher. I feel that it is a way of keeping a paper trail on Newly Qualified Teachers. (Primary NQT, FG#114)

I think it’s just a tick box activity to show that you’re all still meeting Standards that we’ve already met. (Primary NQT, FG#114)

It helps with reflection, but it does feel like a tick box exercise at times where you just have to write the Experiences for certain things. (Secondary NQT, FG#223)

I honestly think that it’s something that we do because we have to. I don’t think I will ever rely on it to improve my practice. It will always be for me something that I do to evidence my professional development and it will never be something I ever rely on to develop professionally. (Secondary NQT, FG#223)

It’s another thing to do. It’s just something else that you have to do on top of everything else. Why would you add more paperwork to a profession where people are difficult to retain? Why would you put more strain on people in what is essentially a pass or fail system? (Secondary NQT, FG#223)

It does feel like a test. Once you’ve passed your learning profile at the end of the year, you can achieve NQT. It doesn’t seem like we’re doing it to help us through our NQT but something we need to do to complete our NQT (Secondary NQT, FG#223)

There was widespread uncertainty across the focus groups held at the both the mid-point and end of the induction year concerning evidence requirements. This uncertainty generated anxiety and strategic behaviour/superficial learning or ‘gaming’ among NQTs. The goal was to produce the good enough profile for the purposes of end-point assessment. NQTs struggled to locate the feedback offered by EVs, which they argued was difficult to locate using Pebble Pad. In some cases, feedback was uploaded but had not been accessed or used by the NQT.

It was confusing. I was asking other NQTs about how much evidence you need to meet the Standard. Some people are saying two, some people are saying three. I just did two and risked it, really. But if you had to do three for each Standard there was a
lot to do and that would take a lot more than twelve experiences, which was what I was told I needed to pass it. (Secondary NQT, FG#214)

There’s a lot of uncertainty about what’s actually required on there. How many should we do? How long should it be? How many standards should we hit? I don’t think there’s been clear guidance. I’ve been working on the two per half-term principle with evidence. We don’t do feedback. I don’t know what that is. (Secondary NQT, FG#214)

In summary, while the e-portfolio is an established tool for teacher development, care needs to be taken to ensure that it does not just become a repository but also serves its intended developmental function. Effective collaboration and training (including gaining familiarity and confidence in using the Pebble Pad platform) is needed to ensure that portfolio building is a mentored experience.

### 3.4 Induction Mentoring

The quality of mentor support is integral to effective teacher induction. This section of the report presents: (1) NQT perspectives on the qualities of effective mentors; (2) NQT experiences of accessing support from their assigned mentors, and, (3) other sources of formal and informal professional learning that NQTs have accessed within and beyond their own schools during the induction period.

#### 3.4.1 Qualities of an effective mentor

In each focus group, attendees were asked to articulate the qualities of an effective mentor of new teachers. NQTs identified important attributes including empathy, trust, a commitment to professional learning, accomplishment as a practitioner, strong communication skills, awareness of the needs of adult learners, and the capacity to offer constructive feedback and exemplification with an explicit emphasis on NQT learning goals. NQTs pointed to the value of post-observation feedback in helping them to identify targets and teaching strategies to trial.

*Someone who is willing to share their experience, good or bad. Obviously to be able to reflect on their experiences and to compare them with mine – to see if there are any similarities or differences. Someone who would be honest and open with me. When I’m being observed, I don’t want to be just criticised.*

*Somebody who can ground their feedback. Not just say you can do better in this area but couldn’t actually point me to a teacher who has excelled in that area or give me a real experience. A mentor who can say, “You can improve by... and perhaps you can see Mrs X who is really good in this area.”*

*I found the feedback from my lessons really helpful. They’re interactive and constructive. It made me go away and really think about a couple of things, like the pacing of my lessons. An experienced teacher who knew my subject really, really well and has great results herself in my subject area made the observations. I took a lot of her advice on board. I’ve changed a few aspects of my lessons and I think that’s helped me progress as a teacher. (Secondary NQT, FG#224)*

The pastoral dimensions of the mentor role were also evident in NQT accounts. During induction, NQTs continued to value emotional support from more experienced peers, and appreciated the time
taken by busy mentors to listen and offer advice to new entrants to the profession. Mentees valued mentors who showed an interest in their personal and professional development and wellbeing.

She will make time for me even if it is a struggle to do so. She has been very supportive, very interested in my personal development as well. Speaking to me at length about where I want to go and what I want to do. A lot of the feedback has been very supportive. (Secondary NQT, FG#223)

In contrast, a minority of NQTs reported judgemental rather than developmental mentoring. Poor mentoring relationships inhibit learning. Loss of trust when mentoring relationships break down can leave NQTs feeling vulnerable and isolated. As the junior colleagues in school it is not easy for NQTs to raise issues of concern. External Verifiers and facilitators at Professional Learning Days have a role to play in moderating variability in induction experiences and helping to broker local solutions.

She’s negative and doesn’t know how to praise. I’ve gone to other members of staff and said that I’m really upset. I thought about leaving but my family said, “No, get your NQT done and you can go after that.” I stuck with it. She’s upset one of the other members of staff quite badly and other teachers were involved and since then it’s been a bit better, but I wouldn’t say I’ve been supported, which is quite scary because [the EV] is coming in a week and I know they’re going to ask questions and it’s like, do I tell the truth? (Primary NQT, FG#123)

3.4.2 Accessibility

Many NQTs reported that they were satisfied with the frequency and quality of mentor support. Typical examples included a regular schedule of meetings every two weeks at a set time to discuss progress, and then every half term to focus together on the completion of an Experience for the Professional Learning Passport (Secondary NQT, FG#213). However, a significant minority of NQTs in primary schools expressed concern about accessing mentor support. This was not a criticism of mentor capability, but of the capacity of mentors - especially senior staff - to fulfil the important role of induction mentor alongside the many other pressing demands on their time. The following comments were offered by different NQTs at the mid- to end-point of the academic year.

I find it difficult because we’re a very small school. The deputy is out to cover absences, plus the head teacher is away so she’s had the headteacher role. She wants to support me, but hasn’t been there because she’s pulled in these different directions. We haven’t actually touched based all that much apart from quick five-minute chats here and there. (Primary NQT, FG#131)

My school is quite a large school. My internal mentor is constantly busy. She’s had different meetings and we’ve really struggled to get together. (Primary NQT, FG#131)

She’s on the other side of the school and it’s such a massive school. They’ve got nineteen classes and it’s two schools connected. She’s far, far away. We have different lunches, different breaks. (Primary NQT, FG#123)

Having someone that I can just touch base with if something is not going well. Somebody I just can quickly run a simple question by rather than having to track
down the head. My mentor is in and out of school a lot so I lose that lifeline. (Primary NQT, FG#131)

There’s just been so much pressure with staff illness and with my mentor being the Deputy Head that - I’m not a low priority but there’s just so many other priorities that I’m left by the wayside. It’s not her fault but obviously that doesn’t help my situation. There’s just simply not enough time. (Primary NQT, FG#131)

Our head is the Executive Head of our school and others. My mentor is the Associate Head so she’s the headteacher for three days and then a class teacher for two days. Because we’re with another school, she’s sometimes over there, so trying to find time to have a conversation is really hard. It’s pure luck that we were both in the staff room at the same time and I happened to ask a question and she said “oh, I’ve looked at this and what you’ve done is fine.” (Primary NQT, FG#132)

NQTs valued a good fit between mentee and mentor, especially in regard to availability and curriculum areas/AoLE. NQTs were not aware of the criteria used in allocating mentors and EVs. Across the focus group discussions, and through sharing at PL Days, NQTs identified a degree of inconsistency and variability in IM and EV practice. Several NQTs raised issues in regard to changes in their assigned EV leading to periods without any contact, uncertainty and delays in completing required processes. One NQT highlighted a need for, ‘consistency of advice because sometimes things get missed or relayed differently by different people’ (Primary NQT, FG#131).

3.4.3 Other sources of support for professional learning

Some NQTs were able to draw support from multiple sources. In addition to formal twilight CPD sessions in school, support was available from subject teachers, Heads of Department (secondary) and in teachers of the same year group (primary). Support appears strongest where there are larger numbers of NQTs in school and the development of an informal mentoring culture.

The Reception teacher has worked closely with me. She taught a lesson for me and also managed to book a place for me on Read Write training. So although I don’t have my formal mentor, one or two teachers are willing to step in to make sure that I’m on the same page and to help me develop as a teacher. (Primary NQT, FG#131)

Some NQTs offered accounts of their participation in strong learning communities that offered planned opportunities for collaboration and curriculum innovation.

We’re working on the twelve pedagogical principles through a series of twilights and INSETs. We’re being given time out of our timetable to go and witness other lessons as they are happening. We’re able to collaborate with our other departments whether that’s within our own area of experience or in a different area entirely. I’m collaborating with the Head of English. I’ve a colleague who is collaborating with an RE teacher. We’ve got mathematicians working on different ways to bring numeracy into authentic contexts through journaling; that’s a process started by our Assistant Head and my IM. She’s able to guide us as NQTs in the right way, so we’re not just collaborating to tick a box. We’re actually doing it purposefully. (Secondary NQT, FG#223)

In my previous experience staff spent more time doodling than actually engaging in conversation. In my current school, staff meetings focus on professional
development. It’s all focused on staff wellbeing. I’m lucky I can go to any member of staff and ask for advice and support and they are all willing to offer it, but then there are five other NQTs across our school. (Primary NQT, FG#131)

NQTs valued the opportunity to participate in professional learning designed for the particular needs of early career teachers. Opportunities to network and collaborate with peers was highly regarded by NQTs working in both primary and secondary schools. NQTs employed in special education settings reported access to specialist courses in autism, adverse childhood experiences (ACE), and speech and language that supported their current role and were also applicable to mainstream settings. Non-verbal communication was a specific area for additional support identified by one NQT employed in a special school.

I’ve been on some courses with EAS, specifically for NQTs and I found them really useful. Because sometimes when you get on the courses for everybody - because they are more experienced, it might not necessarily be pitched right for you because you’re NQTs and need more time to collaborate and talk about things (Primary NQT, FG#113)

I’m part of a history leaders’ group with the EAS and that is so helpful. That collaborative idea would be good at all levels. From an NQT perspective, I reckon everyone would find that very useful. (Secondary NQT, FG#224)

Other sources of support for professional learning included social media such as closed Facebook groups, Twitter, YouTube and teacher blogs. Some NQTs were active users of communications technology to extend opportunities for support. NQTs and experienced teachers should now benefit from professional guidance on the use of social media, and academic guidance in how to evaluate the evidence-base of teaching strategies promoted online. While embracing the potential of digital technologies, NQTs need to be equipped to be discerning consumers of information.

I use Twitter quite a lot. I just follow teachers. I trained as an MFL teacher and it helps. I follow some history teachers as well. It helps looking at the different activities they have posted and then I try them too. (Secondary NQT, FG#213)

I’ve got quite a few teacher support groups on Facebook. It helps you because you’ve got teachers from all over the country asking questions. You can go back and look at all the advice and help that’s been given. You can save things. It’s all sharing ideas, no one’s got any perfect solutions but they are there to support you. That kind of thing. So there’s a lot on regular social media that is bigger than your little circle in school. (Primary NQT, FG#131)

Some NQTs benefited from maintaining strong links with peers graduating from their ITE programmes and continuing contact with school-based and university-based teacher educators. Secondary teachers were able to draw on the resources of their national subject associations, and special education teachers on the National Association of Special Educational Needs (NASEN). In making connections with the wider education community, some NQTs were supported by their subject mentors from initial training.

I speak to members of my PGCE group who have different experiences. So for example if I’m struggling with a class and they’ve got different resources that I can adapt, they are really helpful in supporting me. You can rely on people from your
PGCE because they are in a similar situation. It helps to still have that support network. (Secondary NQT, FG#213)

The National Association of Teachers of RE do a lot of Teach Meets. One of my mentors last year was part of the lead group. He lets me know when there are teachers’ events and conferences, which I often go to because I get a reduced rate because I’m NQT. (Secondary NQT, FG#213)

Looking ahead, NQTs reported that they would value input on career development pathways. Several were aspiring to take on more roles and responsibilities in school including, for example, subject coordinator roles. One secondary teacher had taken the role of subject leader during the NQT year, although reported that this due to being ‘the last man standing’. Another primary teacher expressed concern in moving to a one-form entry school in September and having to take responsibility for planning and resources for the year without the support of stage partners. While none of the NQTs participating in the focus groups would like to see the induction period extended, many anticipated development needs in the early career phase. These included developing knowledge of SEN, enhanced assessment practice, working with teaching assistants, using data, and opportunities to network and deepen subject pedagogy.

3.5 CHALLENGES

Three general challenges that were not related to specific components of the induction programme were reported in the focus groups: (1) many NQTs believed they were treated as experienced teachers when they joined schools; (2) some believed they were assigned more challenging classes; and, (3) a small minority of secondary NQTs reported teaching outside the areas they were qualified to teach.

3.5.1 Seen as an experienced teacher

Several NQTs, particularly those employed in secondary schools, felt that colleagues did not acknowledge their status as qualified teachers who were still novice teachers. Some schools did not appear to differentiate between the needs of new and recently qualified teachers and experienced teachers joining the workforce. In their first posts, NQTs were spending considerable amounts of time in preparation due to their lack of familiarity with the curriculum. For some, the increase in class contact hours from ITE was particularly challenging. A combination of increased responsibilities and unfamiliar curriculum content meant that some NQTs reported surviving on a week-by-week basis.

In my school I was treated as an experienced teacher and only expected to reach out if I had difficulties (Secondary NQT, FG#213)

I’m not really seen as an NQT so there’s an expectation to just get straight stuck into work. You’re teaching this. You just need to pick it up and go, which I find challenging at times. (Secondary NQT, FG#223)

For me the most difficult thing is that your timetable has increased so much from your PGCE. You’re looking at a lot of material for the first time, which means come the end of the day or within a week you might not know the material you’ll need. We’re learning stuff as we’re going along. NQTs spend a huge amount of our evenings going over content to make sure we’re teaching the right things. (Secondary NQT, FG#223)
A key concern of NQTs was the length of time that new teachers needed to produce high quality learning resources in comparison to their more experienced peers. From these accounts, many NQTs were producing a high volume of their own original materials to support learning in their lessons. Accounts of collaborative planning and peer support were least likely in focus groups convened in secondary schools.

As an experienced teacher, you’ve got a bank of resources on every topic you’ve ever taught. A new teacher is teaching a topic for the first time. You’re not only having to learn it, you’re having to create your own resources from scratch. That takes so much time. (Secondary NQT, FG#223)

The hardest thing this year has been creating resources. That just takes hours and hours and hours. That is my biggest problem this year. (Secondary NQT, FG#223)

In one case, an early career teacher felt aggrieved at not being recognised in school as an NQT (and hence not entitled to NQT time) because their route into a teaching post in a maintained school in Wales had been via a first post in the independent sector.

3.5.2 Given challenging classes

There is a perception among NQTs who participated in the focus groups that new and recently qualified teachers are assigned the more challenging classes in school. NQTs reported experiencing difficulty in managing behaviour, which they attributed to the ‘problem’ classes they were assigned. These accounts did not often reflect a sense of collegiality but a perception among NQTs of being left to sink or swim ‘at the deep end’ with little support. NQT accounts conveyed a sense of resignation rather than professional agency.

I have a sense that because my contract is maternity cover I’ve been left with the classes that other teachers didn’t want to teach. I don’t teach any top sets. I teach bottom sets for Year 8 and 9 maths and science. It’s difficult in terms of behaviour and engagement with those classes. These are classes that are causing issues across the school. I feel I’ve been chucked in at the deep end with very little support in terms of the SLT backup (Secondary NQT, FG#223)

Year 8 is a problem year group in my school and I was given all those sets in Year 8, which I found really difficult to begin with and there was little support for that. I felt like I was given difficult, challenging classes which is difficult for an NQT. (Secondary NQT, FG#223)

There was a lot of cover teachers in Welsh because the member of staff was ill for a very long time. So the classes that I took over were all hers. A lot of them were quite rowdy and didn’t have much consistency, one in particular was really bad. (Secondary NQT, FG#213)

3.5.3 Teaching out of field

The majority NQTs who participated in the focus groups were only teaching within the areas they felt qualified to teach. A small minority of NQTs (only 3 of the 46 focus group participants) reported that
they were working out of field at some point in the school year. These NQTs were deployed flexibly to meet emergent school needs.

*I came as a science teacher specifically to teach chemistry, but my job has predominantly been to teach maths. I did teach some key science but now I just teach maths so I have needed a huge input from the mathematics department to support me in that role because I wasn’t even a qualified maths teacher. I was less prepared for that. (Secondary NQT, FG#223)*

*I don’t teach my subject specialism, history, very often. I predominantly teach maths, English, some BTech qualifications, but very rarely do I teach any history. (Secondary NQT, FG#223)*

*I do predominantly teach history; however, I now have two RE classes to teach and a Welsh-bac class to teach. I’ve recently gone from three days a week to five days a week because I’m covering someone’s maternity and that was where the Welsh-bac came in. The expectation there was really just get on with it and teach it and I honestly had no idea what I needed to be looking for within Welsh-bac. (Secondary NQT, FG#223)*

Some NQTs were employed in special school settings with little SEN experience or training. These NQTs had a steep learning curve. Two members of the focus group convened at a special school had only recent mainstream education experience through secondary PGCE programmes in drama and music.

3.6 Completing Induction Outside Full Time Permanent Posts

Fragmented employment experiences generate particular challenges in maintaining professional growth through the induction period. The EAS programme of induction support is intended for all NQT’s irrespective of tenure. The programme is intended to be flexible enough to give access to all NQTs, from those employed on full-time contracts to those employed on a short-term supply (STS) basis.

Those NQTs who started induction later in the academic year, e.g. due to completing ITE later, had a less positive experience of the transition from ITE to induction. NQTs commencing induction after the start of the academic year may have missed the first scheduled Professional Learning days and took longer to understand the support available through induction. NQTs employed on temporary contracts experienced most difficulty in accessing and understanding the model of support. Several NQTs without permanent posts reported feeling isolated outside PL days and questioned whether they were receiving an equitable induction experience. Those on temporary assignments experience more turbulent beginnings than those with tenure, especially new teachers on day-to-day supply.

*I just felt a little bit lost right at the beginning in transitioning from training. I wasn’t picked up and I missed the first two sessions. (Primary NQT, FG#113)*

*I didn’t have an External Verifier until Christmas. I started as a supply from March last year and I worked until the end of September. It was quite a long time before speaking to anybody and clarifying what I needed to do. (Primary NQT, FG#113)*

*I’m an SEN teacher. I’m on a temporary contract. I started in January and it was a struggle coming in towards the end of the year. A lot of the training days were*
already concluded and because I’m SEN, the school’s normal internal mentor was unsure whether she could mentor me. I had to ask the other SEN teacher. I’m glad I have another SEN teacher as my mentor but she hasn’t had any training so she can’t explain the induction process to me, so that’s been quite challenging really. (Primary NQT, FG#132)

It needs to be completely re-thought for day-to-day supply. You’ve nothing to show for half your sessions. You don’t get a mentor just because you’re going to different schools. They haven’t sorted out an External Verifier. We all have the same problem. When you’re in a school long-term they give you support, but you get nothing for day-to-day supply (Primary NQT, FG#114)

It’s very hard to do this on day-to-day supply. You can’t collect evidence doing one day in this school, one day in that school. (Special FG# 313)

The development needs of new teachers engaged on temporary contracts can be overlooked in school. NQTs occupy a marginal position in school communities and may feel estranged from support available to peers on permanent contracts. Teachers on part-time contracts can miss development opportunities scheduled for days when they are not in school, and are sometimes expected to engage voluntarily in training that falls outside their contracted hours. Teachers on temporary contracts reported concerns about their professional development during induction. Supply teachers furthest from initial qualification were most concerned about the interruption to their development resulting from extended periods of intermittent employment.

This is my second year of being on supply. When I get a full-time job, I’ll be expected to know the drills and how to do long-term year planning. In reality, I would be going back to square one almost as a teacher in a full-time role. (Primary NQT, FG#132)

I feel I’ve taken a step back in terms of my progression as a teacher now that I’m a long-term supply. I’m in year two. Schools are so busy you’re just left to your own devices. I’m just getting through the day trying to get to grips with everything. I don’t think about what I need to do to improve my teaching. I know it’s bad to say that but I’m honestly just trying to making sure everything is ticked off, everything is done. I’ve only had one observation which was for talking and writing. (Primary NQT, FG#132)

Although in my degree I spent 18 weeks over the year in school, I was only teaching 50 percent of those weeks. Going into supply I am getting confident teaching a class but I’m not getting any confidence as far as planning lessons or long-term plans or even short-term plans. I wasn’t lucky, I didn’t get a job but I’m learning on supply. I feel I’m a better teacher confidence wise, but as far as the paperwork and the background work, I feel like I have no idea whatsoever. University definitely didn’t prepare me for that. (Primary NQT, FG#132)

Coming from a short-term supply - that’s been the case for the past almost two years now. I’m also working a lot of my time as a TA and those sessions don’t count. So it’s trying to find the balance between getting work but also completing induction (Primary NQT, FG#133)

They’re not providing me with any training because I’m on a one year contract. If I was to fill out an application form now I’m no further along than when I applied for
my NQT position. They’re giving me my NQT time by shoving me into an office where I can do my typing, but it’s not actually helping me progress which is what I need as an NQT. (Secondary NQT, FG#214)

NQTs noted that as new teachers, and sometimes temporary members of the school community, it was not always easy to raise concerns with senior colleagues about support for professional learning. NQTs can feel vulnerable and find it difficult to find a way of expressing concerns. Focus group participants expressed some anxiety about expressing concerns in school because they felt this might damage their future prospects for employment. Some frustration was expressed concerning the level of spend on supply agencies, and the assumed failure of workforce planning to match new teachers with available posts.

I actually want a job next year. I’m only on a temporary contract. I’m not going to kick up a fuss. I’d rather just keep my head down, but schools should be accountable. There should be a way of flagging up problems without having to go through people. (Primary NQT, FG#123)

Schools are spending an inordinate amount of money on supply teachers. Why can’t schools be incentivised to employ NQTs instead of supply teachers from supply agencies? That will then make people doing qualifications feel valued, give them an “in” in terms of a first job, and save everyone money. (Secondary NQT, FG #224)

Not all teachers felt they received their entitlement to NQT time. This was often related to the teacher’s position in school. For example, in some schools, NQTs employed as full-time permanent teachers could be taken off replacement teaching ‘cover’ in recognition of their status as early career professionals. Other teachers appeared less fortunate due to the temporary nature of their employment. In some cases, there was confusion about how NQT time was managed and used flexibly at school level.

I’m basically cover, which means sometimes I am taken away to do cover and I don’t get that back, so it’s a bit tricky. (Secondary NQT, FG#213)

I’m the awkward one in the group of NQTs in my school. I got QTS in 2016, went straight into the independent sector. I wasn’t given my induction there. So I came in as a third year recently qualified teacher and the expectation has been from day one that I am an MPS-3 teacher, not an NQT. That does make it difficult for me in terms of fitting in the extra paperwork. Everyone else who is an NQT within my department has that extra 10% on top. (Secondary NQT, FG#213)

All schools need to be given what an NQT’s entitlement is because some schools you’ll go into and they are like “you don’t get NQT time” or you’re given it and then all of a sudden it’s taken away from you with no explanation. (Primary NQT, FG#131)

3.7 Transition from Initial Teacher Education

NQTs in their first years of teaching offered insights into the relevance and value of their initial preparation. Some NQTs reported that certain areas were offered as electives during within their ITE programmes, which they subsequently felt were important for all beginning teachers e.g. PGCE courses with three-day electives in special educational needs (SEN) or English as an Additional Language (EAL) or digital technology. Other areas of professional practice where NQTs felt under-
prepared were working with parents and teaching assistants, and handling the administrative demands of teachers’ work.

I don’t feel I was at all well prepared. We had no training whatsoever on how to separate a fight or if you had to physically touch a child. Autism and autistic behaviour was only brushed over. Since then I’ve been lucky enough to attend training through a supply agency. I have now covered some of those areas but I don’t think my initial teacher training prepared me well. (Primary NQT, FG#131)

All the SEN things were just covered in one session. It was one session in a PowerPoint and that was it. SEN needs can be so different. There were no classroom experience videos. There was no discussion. No time to ask questions. It was all thrown at you at once. When you’re back in a classroom you think, I actually don’t know that much. That’s when you research it and relate it to the child in your class. I wish there’d been more coverage. (Primary NQT, FG#131)

Primary and secondary NQTs commented that ITE addressed pedagogy above other important areas of teachers’ work. Learning to become a teacher also encompasses significant wider responsibilities including working with pupil performance data, target setting, navigating school administration software, risk assessment and safeguarding procedures, and home-school liaison. The transition from ITE to first post brought to the fore aspects of teachers’ work beyond class teaching.

I feel that we were not really prepared in terms of the admin. side of what we were supposed to do. So things like data, tracking and recording students - I feel that we weren’t given enough opportunity to learn about how we do these things in our initial teacher training year. It felt like a big shock going into the NQT year and being asked to log data for 100 plus pupils sometimes in one go without having any guidance previously on how to do that. (Secondary NQT, FG#213)

There’s just a lot of admin. that I didn’t realise was so much part of the career. Having to work to this deadline for this particular thing that I didn’t even realise was a thing. Like writing forms for trips and at the same time speaking to a parent about this child. You don’t ever focus on these things in your teacher training. I was a little surprised at first. I realised, “Oh my goodness, I have to be a lot more organised” (Primary NQT, FG#131)

NQTs acknowledged that there are elements of the role that cannot be fully experienced during initial training. Some dimensions had to be ‘learned on the job’ or experienced in practice. Nevertheless NQTs noted that initial experience was sometimes limited to ‘lower stakes’ classes outside key assessment points, and engagement with the wider community appeared limited. ITE providers and partner schools that are over cautious in their concern to support beginning teachers and protect learner progress, need to consider how well school experience ‘placements’ prepare new entrants to the profession.

During the PGCE, even towards the end when you were doing all the teaching, there were certain elements where the teacher wouldn’t relinquish control. That was my experience, so for example, any parent interaction, if I got to do any of that, it was strictly supervised and very contrived. (Primary NQT, FG#131)

Primary NQTs felt under-prepared to handle Individual Development Plans (IDPs). Moderation was also identified as a major area for development during the induction period. NQTs valued participation
in cluster moderation activities. While they found this challenging, they reported successful participation in moderation as a major achievement, and had grown in confidence and capability as a result. NQTs working in special schools signalled a need for more preparation for working with teaching assistants.

I find it really tricky doing IDPs because I never learned how to do them. (Primary NQT, FG#113)

I would have loved to have been shown an IDP on my PGCE. I got put into the learning resource base because the teacher had gone off on long term leave and all of a sudden it was our IDPs need to be done. I’d never seen an IDP, I’d never written one. And then actually being told you need to get them done and it needs to be done by such and such date, the amount of pressure on me after being in that class for four weeks was immense. (Primary NQT, FG#113)

NQTs who had previous experience of working with children and young people in education settings felt better prepared for work in schools in terms of relationship building. Several primary NQTs had considerable previous experience as teaching assistants or parent volunteers.

NQTs who completed their initial teacher education at universities in England contended with the additional challenge of moving into a school system with different a curriculum design, regulatory bodies and processes. These NQTs felt their initial training did not include acknowledgement of the different education systems within the UK where new teachers may take their first posts. This was reported by NQTs who trained at universities in border regions where the flow of teachers between systems is not uncommon. New teachers moving between national systems experienced additional challenges in navigating registration systems and developing curriculum knowledge. Support for new teachers crossing systems should consider (increasing) differences in curriculum and assessment arrangements.

My university was very good at telling us what they expected in England but we weren’t told the expectation was different in Wales. I was only told by a friend of mine that I needed to register with the UWC. I was lost coming into the Welsh system (Primary NQT, FG#132)

I trained in England and I found settling into the Welsh system - the changes and differences in curriculum - were challenging at the start, especially with teaching maths having the extra new material to prepare for and get to grips with was very challenging. I did find settling in more difficult than expected. (Secondary NQT, #214)

3.8 PROGRESSION TO MASTERS

Attitudes towards pursuing masters level study were mixed. Key factors influencing opinion were timing, funding and the relevance to practice of the masters offer. NQTs who were interested in pursuing a masters degree found the funding arrangements difficult to navigate. Some NQTs who were self-funding masters degrees with the universities where they completed ITE were frustrated that induction-related funding appeared limited to USW modules.

I was really interested in it. I approached my internal mentor who asked the head and the finance manager and was told that there is no room in the budget for that to be pursued. I went back to the University and asked whether it would be possible to
do it without the school and he said it’s a reduced fee if the institution pays for you. The NQT can ask the school if they can still put their name forward and then the NQT pays back the school, kind of like a loan at the reduced fee. I’ve asked about that but haven’t had a response. (Secondary NQT, FG#213)

I found the finance really quite obscure. At the beginning it was very much the school will pay for you to do this. When I spoke to them, it was on me to find the funding from the school. The money is not available in school. We work at a massive deficit. It’s quite frustrating as I was really interested in it. The initial promise that your school will pay for this masters module was actually a false promise. (Secondary NQT, FG#213)

The development sessions at the University felt for some like a ‘pitch for the modules’. Content was reported as rather ‘wishy washy’, ‘not focused’, repeating material from ITE or lacking relevance to classroom practice and the specific needs of NQTs completing their PLP (#231). Participants had hoped for advice and exemplification on the use of evidence to meet Standards. NQTs working in the secondary sector reported the majority of attendees were from primary schools and consequently they felt their participation in activities had been marginal.

Some NQTs were deterred by the prospect of the additional workload of advanced level study in Education at this early and demanding stage of their career. Others baulked at raising the course fees while at a lower level on the teachers’ pay scale. Some NQTs already held higher degrees in their subjects. Several participants felt that further study would be more manageable in two or three years following initial qualification as a teacher. One participant felt that funded, formal courses in Education should be ‘less about assignments and more about teaching’ (Special school NQT, FG #313)

I’ve got a masters in my subject. Maybe one day I will want to do a masters in Education however I feel the demands on my time are far too great for me to even consider thinking about a masters now. The reason so many people are leaving teaching is because of the working conditions. It’s not because of the money. We need investment in teaching so that more teachers have the time to do these things. (Secondary NQT, FG#213)

I’d consider it if there was funding there. I’ve got a young family and a single income but if there was funding there I would take up the offer. (Secondary NQT, FG#224)

3.9 RESEARCH ENGAGEMENT

The new curriculum in Wales is intended to be ‘evidence-based: drawing on the best of existing practice within Wales and from elsewhere, and on sound research’ (Donaldson, 2015 p.14).7 The four purposes of the curriculum require that all children and young people will ‘undertake research and evaluate critically what they find’ (ibid, p.29). To realise the ambitious goals of the new curriculum, schools in Wales are developing as learning organisations (SLO) (OECD, 2019).8 Schools that are learning organisations create and support continuous learning opportunities for all staff. Regional consortia are supporting schools to promote a learning culture through school-based curriculum

---


development. High quality induction and mentoring, and a culture of enquiry, innovation and exploration are key features of teacher professionalism in a self-improving education system.

In the NQT focus group discussions feedback was sought on how well new teachers were supported to engage with pedagogical research and to engage in their own professional enquiry. In common with attitudes towards masters-level learning, opinions were mixed. One primary NQT referred to his use of the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) Teaching and Learning Toolkit to help inform decisions about effective teaching practices (#131). Another referred to accessing support for professional enquiry through learning resource base network meetings (#131). Three NQTs commented on their engagement in practitioner enquiry in their school settings. None made reference to the EBSCO resources available to them, i.e. an online portal to over 4,500 academic journals and e-books.

I did action research and it’s part of my performance management this year. We have two targets from the school development plan and one of them is an action research project in an area we identify. Then we go off and implement it and feedback at the end of the school year. (Primary NQT, FG#113)

I’ve been doing more authentic learning so I was reading up on authentic learning then I did an authentic learning project in the Spring term. So I read the research, implemented it in my own classroom and now I’m writing up my own research. (Primary NQT, FG#124)

I’ve been looking at autonomy in my classroom and how learners become autonomous. I’m currently progressing through that at the moment and developing strategies in the classroom to try and develop those children as autonomous learners. Teaching and education can be very behaviourist, where you do this and get that. (Primary NQT, FG#124)

Some NQTs offered accounts that demonstrated an enquiry disposition when approaching issues in their professional practice. The following is a positive example of collaborative enquiry between a mentor and NQT to address an aspect of practice that the NQT had identified as challenging.

I know I can go to my mentor in school. The class I have this year is very different to the class I had last year. Some children present very challenging behaviour. My mentor said, ‘Well, we’ll have a look together, do some research’. I’ve seen a massive improvement in the behaviour of children in class by trialling new approaches, talking to other members of staff, and talking to their parents about things they found worked with them. I’ve done a lot of research on finding ways to engage them. It’s been a massive learning curve for me. (Special Education, FG#314)

Other NQTs struggled to see how systematic enquiry might be integral to their professional learning as a new teacher, or to envisage a time when they would have the time and skills to design and conduct their own enquiry. For NQTs struggling to manage their workload, wider reading and research engagement appeared desirable but unattainable. One NQT reflected that much of her earlier academic experience in Education had been writing for grades, rather than developing skills in professional enquiry.

---

9 [https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/teaching-learning-toolkit/](https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/teaching-learning-toolkit/)
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There’s no time to think. I’d love to carry out some independent research but you’re treading water most of the time in terms of marking and planning. (Secondary NQT, FG224)

During the week I work twelve-hour days. I’m in school for eight. I come home, I mark and plan till eight to twelve at night, and then I plan on the weekend. So when am I going to have time to do something extra like research? It’s just another thing on top of everything else. (Secondary NQT, FG#123)

I wish I had more time for reading outside of what was expected for assignments on my PGCE. Things like reading about SEN, because a lot of the books I read and the research I did read, were just for assignments but weren’t really for the purpose of when I become a teacher. Now I really don’t have the time to sit down and read a book. I have to allocate time to other priorities like a deadline in school (Primary NQT, FG#132)

There was little evidence in the accounts offered by NQTs attending focus groups that most of the schools in which they worked were rich-rich environments. Relevant research was signposted in the core content of the Professional Learning Days but this was lightly addressed, if at all, by facilitators who are accomplished practitioners and may not be practitioner researchers. Most NQTs attending focus groups reported limited opportunities to engage purposefully with pedagogic research and to develop their research literacy. If replicated across the workforce, this would have implications for the reform agenda in Wales outlined above.

I don’t feel we’ve been supported or guided in any way to engage with research. I feel like I’m in a worse situation this year in terms of research. Once again, it’s time. It’s really difficult. It’s something extra we could do but when you’ve got so much planning and marking and just getting settled and knowing what you’re doing - it’s so vital this year - If I were to have the support and guidance to do it, then maybe I would be more inclined to make time to do it but I wouldn’t know where to start to gain that. (Secondary NQT, FG#214)

### 3.10 Workload & Wellbeing

When asked about teacher wellbeing, NQTs raised concerns about workload pressures and particularly the amount of time spent on marking and planning. NQTs in primary schools most frequently referred to handling the volume of marking as a major difficulty. One NQT described the ‘stress at the beginning of the year where you’re not quite sure how to cope with that big tidal wave that’s coming towards you’ (Primary NQT, FG#124). As the year progressed, NQTs became more skilled in making judgements about the purpose, value and frequency of different assessment activities. While some professional learning was informal or ad hoc, several NQTs offered accounts of interventions by more experienced colleagues to reduce workload while maintaining standards. NQTs valued guidance from senior colleagues, especially reassurance that longer marking does not mean better teaching. NQTs appreciated practical strategies such as sampling, peer assessment and self-marking. In strong professional learning communities, new teachers developed their practice through collaborative planning.

*Our deputy head went through all the teachers’ planning and marking and we were told where we were doing too much and how to save time for yourself. He told me I*
was marking too much. My planning was too detailed. He said there’s no need for it and he showed me how to save time while still keeping standards really high. (Primary NQT, FG#132)

We have child-shared planning. So we do our planning for the term with the children. It’s done in lessons, so during our planning time we’re just adding details to it. (Primary NQT, FG#132)

In the beginning I was spending a lot of time marking and now I’ve realised that the box is really full and overflowing, and there’s no need to do so much work in books. I’m spending less time marking and more time checking understanding. We’re doing whiteboard work, we’re having more discussions and the children like it better. I’m not going home and spending hours marking and it seems to be that they are getting a better outcome at the end of it. (Primary NQT, FG#124)

I’m usually marking God knows how long with all these closing the gap comments. When she was leaving I asked, “How are you already done?” and she says “I just pick one group per week to feedback with closing the gap”. The next week she’ll choose a different group for close the gap marking. Tips like that would save me hours. (Primary NQT, FG#124)

Discussion of teacher wellbeing has featured more prominently in recent national debates on education. There is some evidence in the NQT accounts of consideration of teacher wellbeing at primary school level.

There’s a big onus on wellbeing. The new Head is very keen to reward unsung heroes. We get little boosts and little shout-outs. If you’re in a school where you feel valued and where you’re listened to, immediately your wellbeing is better. I think that’s a really good start.

The Head is having a system that we don’t stay past 5:15pm and we don’t arrive before 8:10am. We take guitar lessons together so we can show the children that we can learn ourselves. She’s quite big on wellbeing.

While all NQTs reported working long hours including some vacation periods, NQTs on supply contracts noted that they received no payment outside term-time.

I’m still struggling to get the work-life balance right because I am working every weekend and there just aren’t enough hours in the day. I am getting more efficient with planning and marking. I stay late trying to get the marking done for that day, even later after staff meetings. I’m struggling with the work during the holidays. At the moment it’s assessment for records of achievement. Because I’m paid through a supply agency, I don’t get paid for half terms and summer holidays. I’m still expected to do that work, but I’m not being paid for it. (Primary NQT, FG#114)

NQTs employed on a part time basis also reported having to work beyond contracted hours in order to complete the roles required of them.

Even though I’m part time, I’m expected to plan for the full week because the other person isn’t a teacher, she’s a HLTA who comes in the other two days. It takes me longer to plan anyway because I don’t have that experience. It’s a one form entry so I
don’t have anyone I could check with. I plan for five days when I’m only in for three. So I find that most days I will do work at home or stay until late. (Primary NQT, FG#132)

Other NQTs noted that the timetable of the school day and the layout of the school site restricted opportunities for meeting with other staff and sharing experiences. In some schools, the school estate presented physical barriers to collaboration. While professional dialogue and collaboration was valued, the space to support such activity was limited. In these settings, it was not difficult for new teachers to withdraw into their own classrooms and consequently have reduced opportunities for peer support.

Our school is very large. The staff room is in the top part of the school and our block is in the middle. Our block doesn’t actually have a toilet. It doesn’t have a staff room or anywhere the staff can use a kettle, or heat up meals. There’s no place for staff to interact at lunch. We end up spending quite a lot of time in our rooms during lunchtime, which in turn means we end up working a lot of our lunchtimes. (Secondary NQT, FG#214)
Summary

- The top three development areas identified by NQTs and their mentors on taking up a first post are working with parents, completing Individual Education Plans, and working in culturally diverse settings. Fifty-five per cent of NQTs felt that their top three development needs had been fully met during their induction period and 40% reported that their development needs had been partially met.

- At least 50% of mentors reported that they provided a great deal of feedback to NQTs in relation to classroom management, teaching strategies and assessment practices.

- Over 50% of NQTs reported that mentors provided a great deal of feedback on classroom management, inclusive pedagogy and teaching strategies.

- Over 85% of NQTs receive day-to-day support from their induction mentor. Sixty-five per cent of NQTs reported spending less than four hours a month with their assigned mentors. The majority of Mentor respondents spent less than four hours a month with their mentee (75%, 45).

- Mentors reported that seven NQTs do not receive protected NQT time, whereas 16 of the 42 NQTs who responded to the survey report they do not receive protected time.

- Over 40% NQT survey respondents reported that the Professional Learning Days had a large impact on their development as a teacher, especially in relation to the opportunity to work with peers from other settings (68%), time away from school/co-workers for reflection (48%) and focused profession reflection for practice development (43%).

- Only 30% of mentors were positive about the use of the Career Entry Profile to set NQT development priorities. A significant proportion of NQTs who responded to the survey indicated that are unlikely to continue to use their Professional Learning Passport (19, 45%).

- Mentors consistently reported that NQTs had a higher level of development need across all areas of development areas compared with NQTs’ own assessment of their high-level development needs.

- In terms of job satisfaction, NQTs are least satisfied with their salary (24%) and their work-life balance (19%).

- The majority of NQTs would highly recommend teaching as a career to others (27, 67%); Seven (17%) NQTs would not recommend teaching, and seven (17%) do not know if they would recommend teaching.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In addition to focus groups, two online surveys were designed for completion by 105 NQTs mentors and 257 NQTs. The survey questions, with frequency counts for each question, can be found in Appendix 2 and 3. The surveys were administered from May 2019 through to September 2019.

4.1.1 Mentor characteristics

The NQT mentor survey received 60 responses, a response rate of 57%. The survey was open to 105 mentors who were identified and invited to complete the survey by the EAS. Forty-four (44) mentors working in primary schools responded to the survey. The majority of mentors in primary schools
worked in maintained schools (33). In addition, responses were received from primary school-based mentors working in Welsh-medium maintained community primary schools (6), Bilingual, dual medium primary schools (2) and maintained voluntary aided primary schools (3). Thirteen (13) mentors working in secondary schools responded to the survey. Eleven (11) of the secondary school respondents work in maintained schools, and two (2) work in Maintained voluntary aided secondary (faith schools). Nine (9) NQT mentors work in Curriculum Pioneer Schools, thirteen (13) in Pioneer Professional Learning schools and thirty-seven (37) work in schools not in the pioneer school network. Responses were received from mentors in all 5 local authorities, including: twenty-one (21) from Newport, sixteen (16) Caerphilly, ten (10) from Torfaen, eight (8) from Monmouthshire and five (5) from Blaenau Gwent. Thirty-one (31) mentors were based in urban or semi/urban schools and twenty-nine (29) mentors were based in rural or semi-rural schools. As detailed in Figure 3 the majority of mentors worked in schools with less than 300 students (26 mentors) or 300-599 (15 mentors).

Figure 2 Number of mentors in each school size (n=60)

Twenty-two (22) mentors work in schools with only one NQT, twenty-eight (28) mentors work in schools with 2-3 NQTs, eight (8) work in schools with more than 4 NQTs and 2 mentors were unsure of how many NQTs were working in their school. The majority of mentors have been teachers for over 10 years (49, 82%), seven mentors (7, 12%) have been teachers for 7-9 years and the remaining four mentors have been teachers between 4-6 years. Thirty-two (32) mentors highest level of formal education was a Bachelor degree and the most common qualification was second-class honours upper division. A Masters degree was the highest level of formal education achieved by seventeen (17) mentors.

Thirty-three (33) mentors had been a mentor for new teachers for less than two years, with twenty-two (22) of these mentors being a first time mentor. Twenty-seven (27) of the mentors had been a mentor for new teachers for over three years, 21 of these have more than five years of mentor experience. The majority of mentors (92%, 55) support NQTs in the school where they work, twelve (12) mentors support NQTs across a number of local schools and three (3) mentors work with supply teachers.
The majority of mentors are either Deputy Headteachers (23) or upper pay range class teachers (21). Mentors that responded to the survey taught across all year groups in primary and secondary schools. Mentors from secondary schools taught across the following subjects: English (5), Mathematics (3), History (4), Special Education (2), Physical Education (2), Welsh Language (1), MFL (1), Design and Technology (1), Information Technology (1) and Music (1). In total, 46 NQT mentees were supported by mentors outside of the mentors’ age range/specialist subject area and 63 NQT mentees had mentors from the same age range/specialist subject specialization.

4.1.2 NQT characteristics

The NQT survey received 42 responses, a response rate of 16%. The survey was open to 257 mentors who were identified and invited to complete the survey by EAS. Twenty-two (22) NQTs working in primary schools responded to the survey. The majority of NQTs in primary schools worked in English-medium maintained schools (17). In addition, responses were received from primary school-based NQTs working in Welsh-medium maintained community primary schools (4) and Bilingual, dual medium primary schools (1). Sixteen (16) NQTs working in secondary schools responded to the survey. Fourteen (14) of the secondary school respondents work in English-medium maintained community schools and two (2) work in Maintained voluntary aided secondary (faith schools). Four (4) NQTs work in special schools. Nine (9) NQTs work in Curriculum Pioneer Schools, four (4) in Pioneer Professional Learning schools, two (2) work in Digital Pioneer Schools and twenty-three (23) work in schools not in the pioneer school network. Survey responses were received from NQTs in all five local authorities, including: fifteen (15) from Newport, ten (10) Caerphilly, eight (8) from Torfaen, eight (8) from Monmouthshire and one (1) from Blaenau Gwent. Twenty-one (21) NQTs were based in urban or semi/urban schools, and twenty-one (21) were based in rural or semi-rural schools.

As detailed in figure 4 below the most common school size NQTs worked in was less than 300 students (15 NQTs). Twelve (12) NQTs work in schools with only one NQT, twenty (20) NQTs work in schools with 2-3 NQTs, ten (10) work in schools with more than 4 NQTs.

Figure 3 Number of NQTs in each school size as reported by NQTs (n=42)
Twenty-four NQTs work in schools with a good Estyn rating, five in schools with an excellent rating, nine in schools classed as adequate and needs improvement. Four NQTs did not know the Estyn rating for their school. Nineteen (19, 45%) NQTS worked in a school with more than 20% of pupils known to be eligible for Free School Meals.

NQTs who responded to the survey were employed across all of the primary and secondary year groups. NQTs teaching in secondary schools responded from each of the subject areas except for Sociology. Thirty-seven (37) NQTs were employed full time as teachers in their school, two (2) were employed part time and three (3) were employed on long-term supply.

Thirty-four (34) NQTs trained to teach via a full time university-led PGCE, five (5) NQTs trained via a full time university-led undergraduate course with QTS, and three (3) NQTs completed the Welsh Graduate Teacher Programme. Two (2) NQTs report that have completed a qualification beyond Bachelor degree level and most commonly achieved degree classification by NQTs was second-class honours upper division (26, 62%). Prior to training to teach, eleven NQTs (11, 26%) had either no or very little experience of working with children, fifteen (15, 36%) had a great deal of experience, and sixteen (16, 38%) had some experience. NQTs had a range of different experience of working with children and young people, these included:

- Voluntary work in schools
- Working as a TA
- Sports coaching
- Teaching English Overseas
- Running clubs for disabled children
- Running music clubs in primary school

During their ITE the majority of NQTs (31) were on a single placement model, six (6) were on a multiple placement model and five (5) were on a paired placement model. Seventy percent of NQTs (29, 70%) completed their initial teacher training in 2018, a further six (6) completed their training in 2017 and the remaining seven (7) completed their training prior to 2017. Seventeen (17) NQTs received a financial incentive to train to teach and twenty-five (25) did not receive this incentive to train.

Common areas of development identified in NQTs career entry profiles include:

- Behaviour Management
- Welsh
- Assessment strategies
- Differentiation
- Subject knowledge
- Working with parents
- Developing use of data
- Developing use of IT
- Improving student attainment
- Time management
- Specific learning needs /SEN
- Develop leadership skills

4.2 PREPAREDNESS AFTER INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION

4.2.1 Mentor perspectives

Table 3, details mentors views on how well prepared their NQTs were after their initial teacher training. The most positive responses (over 80% of mentors judged their mentee to be very well or adequately prepared) were:
• Meeting the needs of diverse learners
• Planning individual Lessons
• Selecting the most appropriate teaching strategy
• Taking responsibility for a class as the only teacher in the room
• Using digital technology to support learning
• Safeguarding children and young people

More than a third of mentors reported that their mentees were *un*prepared for:

• Working with parents
• Completing individual Education Plans
• Working in culturally diverse settings
• Using data to support pupil progress (assessment data, student data, evaluation data)
• Supporting students with specific additional learning needs
• Working with others in the classroom (Teaching Assistants)

Table 3 Mentor perspectives on NQT initial teacher education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very well or adequately prepared</th>
<th>Relatively or very unprepared</th>
<th>Don’t Know/ no response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting the needs of diverse learners</td>
<td>55 (92%)</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing challenging classroom behaviour</td>
<td>42 (70%)</td>
<td>17 (28%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting students with specific learning needs</td>
<td>38 (63%)</td>
<td>21 (35%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with others in the classroom (Teaching Assistants)</td>
<td>38 (63%)</td>
<td>21 (35%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing curriculum plans (medium term)</td>
<td>41 (68%)</td>
<td>18 (30%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning individual Lessons</td>
<td>55 (92%)</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting child-led experiences</td>
<td>45 (75%)</td>
<td>13 (22%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a variety of assessment strategies</td>
<td>47 (78%)</td>
<td>12 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting the most appropriate teaching strategy</td>
<td>52 (87%)</td>
<td>10 (12%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with parents</td>
<td>20 (33%)</td>
<td>39 (65%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in culturally diverse settings</td>
<td>22 (37%)</td>
<td>27 (45%)</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding children and young people</td>
<td>49 (82%)</td>
<td>10 (17%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedding health and wellbeing in the curriculum</td>
<td>38 (63%)</td>
<td>19 (32%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using digital technology to support learning</td>
<td>51 (85%)</td>
<td>8 (13%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting social and emotional health in children and adolescents</td>
<td>39 (65%)</td>
<td>15 (25%)</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using data to support pupil progress (assessment data, student data, evaluation data)</td>
<td>33 (55%)</td>
<td>25 (42%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 NQT perspectives

Table 5 details NQTs view on how well prepared they were after their initial teacher training. The most positive responses (over 80% of NQTs thought they were very well or adequately prepared) were:

- Planning individual Lessons
- Safeguarding children and young people
- Meeting the needs of diverse learners
- Using a variety of assessment strategies
- Selecting the most appropriate teaching strategy
- Time management

More than a third of NQTs reported that they were unprepared for:

- Completing individual Education Plans
- Working in culturally diverse settings
- Supporting students with specific additional learning needs
- Promoting social and emotional health in children and adolescents
- Working with others in the classroom (Teaching Assistants)
- Working with parents
- Embedding health and wellbeing in the curriculum
- Designing curriculum plans (medium term)
- Using digital technology to support learning
- Using data to support pupil progress (assessment data, student data, evaluation data)

Table 4 NQT perspectives on initial teacher education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very well or adequately prepared</th>
<th>Relatively or very unprepared</th>
<th>Don’t Know/ no response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting the needs of diverse learners</td>
<td>36 (86%)</td>
<td>6 (14%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing challenging classroom behaviour</td>
<td>32 (76%)</td>
<td>10 (24%)</td>
<td>0 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting students with specific additional learning needs</td>
<td>23 (55%)</td>
<td>19 (45%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with others in the classroom (Teaching Assistants)</td>
<td>25 (60%)</td>
<td>17 (40%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing curriculum plans (medium term)</td>
<td>24 (57%)</td>
<td>16 (38%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning individual Lessons</td>
<td>41 (98%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting child-led experiences</td>
<td>30 (71%)</td>
<td>12 (29%)</td>
<td>0 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>NQT (%)</td>
<td>Mentor (%)</td>
<td>Other (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a variety of assessment strategies</td>
<td>36 (%)</td>
<td>6 (%)</td>
<td>0 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting the most appropriate teaching strategy</td>
<td>36 (86%)</td>
<td>5 (14%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with parents</td>
<td>26 (49%)</td>
<td>16 (49%)</td>
<td>0 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in culturally diverse settings</td>
<td>21 (50%)</td>
<td>20 (48%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding children and young people</td>
<td>37 (%)</td>
<td>5 (%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedding health and wellbeing in the curriculum</td>
<td>26 (88%)</td>
<td>16 (12%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using digital technology to support learning</td>
<td>30 (65%)</td>
<td>16 (35%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting social and emotional health in children and adolescents</td>
<td>24 (57%)</td>
<td>18 (43%)</td>
<td>0 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using data to support pupil progress (assessment data, student data, evaluation data)</td>
<td>27 (64%)</td>
<td>13 (31%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>36 (86%)</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing individual Education Plans</td>
<td>16 (38%)</td>
<td>23 (55%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking responsibility for a class as the only teacher in the room</td>
<td>30 (71%)</td>
<td>12 (29%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.3 Comparison of Mentor and NQT responses

When comparing NQT and Mentor responses regarding how prepared NQTs were after their initial teacher training, **NQT were more positive** about their level of preparation compared to mentors assessment in the following areas:

1. Completing individual Education Plans
   - 98% of NQTs reports that they were well prepared compared with 92% of mentors
2. Promoting social and emotional health in children and adolescents
   - 88% of NQTs reports that they were well prepared compared with 77% of mentors
3. Working with parents
   - 86% of NQTs reports that they were well prepared compared with 92% of mentors
4. Working in culturally diverse settings
   - 86% of NQTs reports that they were well prepared compared with 78% of mentors
5. Using digital technology to support learning
   - 76% of NQTs reports that they were well prepared compared with 70% of mentors
6. Meeting the needs of diverse learners
   - 64% of NQTs reports that they were well prepared compared with 55% of mentors
7. Using a variety of assessment strategies
   - 62% of NQTs reports that they were well prepared compared with 33% of mentors
8. Time management
   - 50% of NQTs reports that they were well prepared compared with 37% of mentors
9. Planning individual Lessons
   - 38% of NQTs reports that they were well prepared compared with 28% of mentors
NQT mentors were more positive about the level of preparation of the NQTs in the following areas:

1. Supporting students with specific additional learning needs
   92% of NQT mentors reports that NQTs were well prepared compared to 86% of the NQTs
2. Embedding health and wellbeing in the curriculum
   87% of NQT mentors reports that NQTs were well prepared compared to 71% of the NQTs
3. Using data to support pupil progress (assessment data, student data, evaluation data)
   85% of NQT mentors reports that NQTs were well prepared compared to 65% of the NQTs
4. Designing curriculum plans (medium term)
   75% of NQT mentors reports that NQTs were well prepared compared to 71% of the NQTs
5. Safeguarding children and young people
   68% of NQT mentors reports that NQTs were well prepared compared to 57% of the NQTs
6. Taking responsibility for a class as the only teacher in the room
   65% of NQT mentors reports that NQTs were well prepared compared to 57% of the NQTs
7. Supporting child-led experiences
   63% of NQT mentors reports that NQTs were well prepared compared to 60% of the NQTs
8. Managing challenging classroom behaviour
   3% of NQT mentors reports that NQTs were well prepared compared to 55% of the NQTs

At least 55% of NQTs felt that their top 3 development needs had been fully met during their induction period. Apart from 2 NQTs (5%) all other NQTs (40%) reported that their development needs had been partially met.

4.3 Mentor Support for NQTs

4.3.1 Mentor responses
Mentors were asked how much support they received for their mentor role from their External Verifier and from their headteacher. Twenty-six (26) mentors received a little or no support from their External Verifiers and twenty-four (24) mentors reported receiving a little or no support from their headteachers. Mentors reported that their main development needs as a mentor were:

- Opportunity to take part in professional learning days
- More time to network and learn from other mentors and EVs
- Training on the use of pebble
- Training to become an EV
- Time management creating time to support mentors
- More formal training
- Mid-year refresher/moderation sessions to ensure standards for all NQTs are consistent.

As detailed in Figure 5 overleaf the majority of mentors (75%, 45) spend less than 4 hours with their mentees each month.
Mentors most commonly reported providing a great deal of feedback to their mentees regarding:

- Classroom management (53%, 32)
- Teaching Strategies (52%, 31)
- Assessment practices (50%, 30)
- School policies & procedures (42%, 25)
- Lesson planning (42%, 25)

Mentors reported using a range of strategies to support their NQT mentees (see Figure 6). The most common NQT support strategies always utilised by NQT mentors were lesson observations, (used by 34 mentors, 57%) helping NQTS to meet other professionals in schools (used by 20 mentors, 33%) and learning walks (used by 19 mentors, 32%).

Figure 5 Percentage of Mentors that always support NQTs using the following strategies (n=60)

- Helping NQTS engage with research & professional...
- Helping NQTS meet other professionals in school
- Guiding practitioner enquiry
- Modelling enquiry-oriented teaching
- Facilitating collaborative planning
- Pupil Voice
- Learning walks
- Work Scrutiny
- Lesson observations
4.3.2 NQT responses

Thirty-seven (37, 88%) of NQTs reported that they receive day-to-day support from a qualified and experienced induction mentor, five (5, 12%) reported they did not receive this support. As detailed in Figure 7 below the majority (29, 65%) of mentors spend less than 4 hours with their mentees each month.

*Figure 6 Time NQT spend with mentors (n=42)*

NQTs most commonly reported their mentors providing a great deal of feedback to their mentees regarding:

- Classroom management (57%, 24)
- Inclusive pedagogy (55%, 23)
- Teaching Strategies (55%, 23)
- School policies & procedures (52%, 22)
- Assessment practices (50%, 21)

More than a third of NQTs reported that their mentors had large impact on enhancing the NQTs practice in relation to:

- Supported identification of professional development goals (20, 48%)
- Improved skills in addressing pupil needs (19, 45%)
- Increased ability to use data effectively to support student groups (17, 41%)
- Deepened subject knowledge (13, 31%)
- Equipped NQT to conduct practitioner enquiry (13, 31%)

NQTs reported that a range of mentor qualities were very important in qualities to support new teachers (Figure 8). Over 80% of NQTs felt the following qualities were very important in NQTs mentors: confidentiality and trust, willingness to share skills and knowledge, positive attitude, caring personal relationship and ability to offer focused constructive. NQTs reported that the least important quality in a NQT mentor was day-to-day availability.
4.3.3 Comparison of Mentor and NQT responses

NQTs and NQTs mentors where both asked how many hour they spend with each other a month. The most common response either NQTs or their mentors were that they spent less than 4 hours with each other each month.

Figure 9 overleaf compares the difference between NQTs and NQTs mentors response in terms of the areas that mentors most commonly provide a great deal of feedback to their NQTs. In almost all areas, NQTs rate that they are provided a great deal of feedback from their mentors higher than the mentors rate the feedback they give to the NQTs.
4.4 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

4.4.1 Mentor responses

The 60 mentors reported that 101 of the NQT mentees they support do receive time protected each week (i.e. 10% timetable reduction) and that 7 NQT mentees do not receive protected time each week.

Twenty-eight (28, 47%) of mentors found the Induction Profile (professional Learning Passport) useful or extremely useful in supporting their NQT mentors to monitor their progress and identify their development needs. Mentors most commonly identified the main pressure points for NQTs as the first half term (47 mentors) and the final half term (26 mentors). As detailed in Figure 10 over 40% mentors reported that their NQTs had a high level of development need in the following areas:

- Managing challenging classroom behaviour (55%)
- Using data to support pupil progress (54%)
- Supporting students with specific additional learning needs (50%)
- Time management (48%)
- Completing Individual Education Plans (47%)
- Using a variety of assessment strategies (42%)
Mentors provided the following feedback on changes they would like to see for newly qualified teachers:

- Ensure NQT protected time is provided / increase the amount of protected time
- Reduce paperwork and other administrative tasks
- Move to more emphasis on observation and feedback rather than logging experience on Pebble Pad
- Create more opportunities for NQT, Mentor and EV to meet together

Mentors also provided the following feedback on changes they would like to see for NQT mentors:

- Provide compulsory training for all mentors
- More time for mentors to support their NQTs
- Enable mentors to be part of external mentor selection for NQTs
- More external support and resources
- More opportunities to work collaboratively with other mentors.
4.4.2 NQT responses

Twenty-six (26, 62%) NQTs reported that they do receive time protected each week (i.e. 10% timetable reduction) and sixteen (16, 38%) reported that they do not receive protected time each week. Those NQTs that reported receiving protected time each week used this time for:

- Planning
- Marking
- NQT passport
- Undertaking observations of other teachers
- Completing PLP
- Developing strategies to meet own targets
- Helping student (revision sessions)
- Research
- Recording experience on pebble pad
- Meeting mentors
- Administrative work (printing resources)

NQTs most commonly identified the main pressure points during their induction periods as the first half term (24 NQTs), the second half term (15 NQTs) and the final half term (15 NQTs).

Twenty-six (26, 62%) NQTs received support from their head teacher and twenty-four (26, 62%) received support from more experienced teachers. NQTs in primary schools most commonly report having informal support from other teachers in their year group/key stage (23 NQTs, 55%) and NQTs working in secondary schools most commonly report seeking additional informal support from Heads of Departments (18 NQTs, 43%). Most commonly NQTs meet their external verifier either for a meeting at the NQTs school or for the external verifier to observe the NQTs teaching. NQTs provided the following further comments regarding the role of their EV:

- “My assigned EV came to complete meetings and observations alongside my HOD and IM. At PL Days, I worked alongside two other EVs who had no links to my own.”
- “He has been very supportive and feedback is focused on helping me improve my teaching”
- “Offers advice for me relating to their school setting and gives ideas for my own teaching practice.”
- “I did not see the purpose of an EV”
- “My external verifier has been incredibly supportive during my induction year. I have received support and advice whenever necessary.”
- “I began my induction year on supply so my EV also served as my IM. She was available via email and I visited her school before the PL days began to discuss the use of the Pebblepad system.”

Over 40% of NQTs reported that the Professional Learning Days for NQTs had a large impact on their development as a teacher in relation to the opportunity to work with peers from other settings (68%), time away from school/colleagues for reflection (48%) and focussed profession dissection for practice development (43%). Professional Learning Days had small or no impact on NQTs development of research literacy (52%), completing the induction profile (33%) and listening to learners/work scrutiny (33%). For further analysis of the impact of Professional Learning Day please refer to Table 6.
Table 5 Impact of Professional Learning Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of Professional Learning Days</th>
<th>Large Impact</th>
<th>Mod Impact</th>
<th>Small or No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation of live practice</td>
<td>17 (40%)</td>
<td>17 (40%)</td>
<td>8 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused professional discussions for practice development</td>
<td>18 (43%)</td>
<td>19 (45%)</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to learners – work scrutiny</td>
<td>13 (31%)</td>
<td>15 (36%)</td>
<td>14 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to network with peers from other settings</td>
<td>28 (68%)</td>
<td>8 (20%)</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to learn about close-to practice educational research</td>
<td>14 (33%)</td>
<td>21 (50%)</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing the Induction Profile</td>
<td>9 (21%)</td>
<td>19 (45%)</td>
<td>14 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time away from own school/co-workers for reflection</td>
<td>20 (48%)</td>
<td>16 (38%)</td>
<td>6 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of research literacy</td>
<td>9 (21%)</td>
<td>11 (26%)</td>
<td>22 (52%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most commonly used sources by NQTs in their induction period to support professional learning were peer observation (78%), contact with colleagues from initial teacher training (76%), reading professional literature (63%). For all responses regarding NQTs choices of learning resources please see figure 11.

Figure 10 The percentage of NQTs that report the following sources had a large or moderate impact on their development as a teacher. (n=42)
Nineteen (19, 45%) of NQT do not plan to or are unlikely to continue to use their Professional Learning Passport, fourteen (14, 33%) NQTS will probably continue to use this resource and five (5, 12%) will definitely continue to use their Learning Passport.

Sixty-seven percent (67%) of NQTs attend the session provided by the University of South Wales. Of those that attended the university training session, four (4) found the session very or extremely useful, ten (10) found the session somewhat useful, eight (8) found the session minimally useful and six (6) found the session not useful. Fifteen NQTs (15, 36%) would enrol for a Masters study in education, of these thirteen (13) would enrol at the University of South Wales. Seventy-five percent (75%) of NQTs interested in enrolling for Masters study would prefer a blended delivery style of teaching. The most common reasons for not planning to enrol to study a masters in Education were either that further study would be too demanding at this stage in my career (17 NQTs) or that the NQT has limited access to funding (12 NQTs).

As detailed in Figure 12 over 40% NQTs reported that they had a high or moderate level of development need in the following areas:

- Managing challenging classroom behaviour (55%)
- Supporting students with specific additional learning needs (55%)
- Meeting the needs of diverse learners (50%)
- Designing curriculum plans (50%)
- Using data to support pupil progress (50%)
- Using digital technology to support learning (48%)
- Time management (48%)
- Promoting social and emotional health in children and adolescents (45%)
4.4.3 Comparison of Mentor and NQT responses

As detailed in Fig 13, mentors consistently reported that NQTs had a higher level of development need across all areas of development areas compared to NQTs assessment of their own high level development needs. Time management, managing challenging behaviour and using data to support pupil progress where included in the top five areas of development for NQTs by both mentors and NQTs.

Top five areas of high development as reported by NQTs:

- Designing curriculum plans (17%)
- Working in culturally diverse settings (14%)
- Using data to support pupil progress (14%)
- Time management (14%)
- Managing challenging classroom behaviour (12%)
Top five areas of high development as reported by NQT mentors:

- Managing challenging classroom behaviour (55%)
- Using data to support pupil progress (54%)
- Supporting students with specific additional learning needs (50%)
- Time management (48%)
- Completing Individual Education Plans (47%)

*Figure 12 Comparing Mentor and NQT views regarding NQTs high development needs*
4.5 WORKING AS AN NQT, JOB SATISFACTION AND CAREER PLANS

As detailed in Figure 14 the activities that NQTs report spending most of their work week time on are timetabled teaching (average 19hrs, max 30 hrs), planning preparation for classes (average 6hrs, max 12.5 hrs) and assessing students’ work outside of lessons (average 4 hrs, max 20 hrs). On average, NQTs spend 4 hours per week travelling to and from school. The maximum reported weekly commute was 10.5 hours.

Figure 13 Reported NQT activity per week

NQTs in their first year took on additional responsibilities including extracurricular activities (33 NQTs), coordination of specific projects (18 NQTs) and additional administrative duties (7 NQTs). Additional administration duties that NQTs have taken on during their first year including acting head of subject, key stage moderation and school athletic clubs. Additional specific projects/areas work undertaken by NQTs in their first year include:

- Reviewing new teaching units
- Teaching resource creation
- Supporting pupil voice
- Coordinating expressive art
- Developing revision guides
- Planning transition days and school trips

Additional extra-curricular activities undertaken by NQTs in their first year include:

- Running or contributing to after school clubs (Cheerleading, Gym, Dance, Language, Cookery, Choir, Coding, Sport, Craft, Phonics, Art, Books)
- Running revision sessions
- Helping to put on school productions
Five NQTs (5, 12%) were sometimes (2) or rarely (3) required to teach outside the age range they were employed to teach. Thirty-five (35) NQTs were never required to teach outside the age range they were employed to teach. Seven NQTs (7, 17%) were sometimes (5) or rarely (2) required to teach outside the subject they were employed to teach at KS3, K4 or Advanced Level. Thirty-one (31) NQTs were never required to teach a subject outside the subject they were employed to teach.

Over 50% of NQT report that they were very satisfied with the following aspects of their job:

- Level of collegiality among staff (62%)
- Opportunity to build positive relationships with children/young people (74%)
- Opportunities for collaborative professional learning (55%)
- Level of personal/professional challenge (55%)

The aspects of the NQTs job that they were least likely to report that they were very satisfied with were their salary (24%) and their work-life balance (19%). For further analysis regarding NQTs job satisfaction, see figure 15 below.

*Figure 14 Percentage of NQTs that were very satisfied with various aspects of their job (n=60)*
Thirty-three (33, 79%) of NQTs reported that teaching was their first career choice, the remaining nine (9, 21%) have made a career change to come into teaching. NQTs provided the following further details regarding why they decided to become a teacher:

- Passion for the subject
- A challenging career with good prospects
- Always been my dream job – I want to inspire and help young people
- For a more fulfilling job
- Career progression from TA

Twenty-eight (28, 67%) of NQTs would highly recommend teaching as a career to others, seven (7) NQTs would not recommend teaching and seven (7) do not know if they would recommend teaching. The majority of NQTs (32, 76%) expect to stay in teaching for over 10 years, a further eight (19%) intend to teacher for between 5-10 years, one intends to teach for 4-5 years and 1 for less than 4 years. NQTs reported that they would like to see the following changes for their role:

- Less bureaucracy and paperwork
- A salary that reflects the hours required to do the job
- More professional development opportunities
- Mentors to have more time allocated to mentoring
- Greater protection of NQT time
- More structure to the meetings with the EV
- Move to a greater focus on lesson observations rather than requiring NQTs to reflect and record their experiences
- Less focus on the implantation of Welsh language
- Create a professional development plan with your school
- PebblePad to become clearer
Sixteen (16, 38%) NQTs considered leaving during their Induction year. The most common reasons given for considering leaving teaching during the induction period were:

- Unmanageable workload, long hours (10)
- Time spend on tasks with limited impact on pupil learning (6)
- The accountability system in education (5)
- Lack of support from senior staff (5)

Half of all NQTs (21) plan to stay working in their current school for the foreseeable future, four (4) NQTs plan to stay in their current school for 1-3 years and six (6) intend to leave their current school at the end of their induction year. Eleven (11, 26%) of NQTs are currently in temporary teaching posts. The most common reasons cited by NQT regarding why they would want to move from their current school are career advancement (25), proximity to home/reducing commute (20), quality of school leadership (15) and more manageable workload (14).
5 Conclusion & Recommendations

The purpose of statutory induction for newly qualified teachers in Wales is to:

- contribute to building an excellent teaching workforce for the benefit of all learners;
- support NQTs to have the best start to their teaching career;
- provide all NQTs with the opportunity to develop their practice by focusing on the requirements set out in the professional standards;
- prepare all NQTs for their career as a teacher by establishing the skills and behaviours that they need to build on throughout their career;
- ensure that all NQTs focus on national priorities;
- ensure that NQTs are equipped to meet the challenges of the education reform agenda;
- ensure that NQTs focus their professional learning on the most effective methods and approaches, including reflective practice, effective collaboration, coaching and mentoring, and effective use of data and research evidence;
- build on the experiences gained in initial teacher education (ITE) to support career-long professional growth (Welsh Government, 2017 pp.2-3).

The findings of the evaluation provide strong evidence that the EAS model of support provides explicit opportunities for NQTs to develop their practice in accordance with the Professional Standards. All NQTs valued the Professional Learning Days, and appreciated how skilled facilitators and experienced educators created a safe space for professional dialogue. Collaboration, innovation and exploration is encouraged in PLD activities that reflect the concerns of new teachers and connect directly with classroom practice. Mentorship is vital to new teacher learning and there is some evidence of variability in mentor support, especially in terms of accessibility. A key concern is the reported disparity in induction experience according to tenure. All NQTs should have a comparable induction experience irrespective of their employment status. While premised on the promotion of personalised and reflective models of learning, there are some challenges in the use of digital portfolios as a record of, and tool to support, the professional growth of new teachers. NQTs use of data and research evidence was also less evident in this strand of the evaluation, although many participants demonstrated an inquiry stance. More can be done to equip new teachers, and their mentors, to engage with and be discerning consumers of practice-focused research. It is too early to assess the longer-term impact of investment in induction on teacher development, mobility and learner outcomes. This should be a research priority for the EAS as the model of support matures.

In summary, the evaluation suggests the following four key areas for development:

- **Building capacity in high quality mentoring** – to ensure that all mentors have the time required to complete the role well, and support for mentor professional learning (recruitment, selection and evaluation).
- **Reviewing support for new teachers employed on part-time and supply contracts** – to ensure equity of experience for all NQTs irrespective of tenure.
- **Reviewing the functionality and fitness of the e-portfolio** - to promote authentic learning rather than contrived or strategic performances for summative evaluation.
- **Strengthen research-practice linkage** – to build research literacy among NQTs and their supporters so that they can make effective use of research evidence for practice enhancement.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for NQTs

1. Access and understand the statutory arrangements for induction in Wales, the Professional Standards, and the role of the Professional Learning Passport as a development tool.
2. Maintain connections with initial teacher education provider (ITE) through alumni networks.
3. Explore specialist and subject associations for high quality resources and networking opportunities.
4. Access e-resources for professional learning and develop research literacy to be a discerning consumer of pedagogical research.
5. Ensure that NQT time is used constructively to reflect on progress and review learning. Be proactive in identifying possible learning opportunities.
6. Commit to a mentoring relationship that is not just a ‘check in’ conversation. Ask for feedback on a regular basis and set smart development goals. Establish respectful mutual accountability at an early stage in the mentoring relationship: discuss ground rules, confidentiality safeguards, and set boundaries.
7. Seek support in identifying impactful PLEs that demonstrate progress and achievement.
8. Use Professional Learning Days and the External Verifier to communicate individual needs, issues of concern and to broker additional support, where necessary.
9. Work with your formal and informal mentors to set learning goals that extend professional growth beyond the induction period and into the early career stage. Consider how you will record and share your learning with others.

Recommendations for schools

10. Ensure every NQT has access to a mentor who is suitably skilled and experienced to support the NQT and has the time and commitment to provide appropriate day-to-day support. Safeguard time for mentor meetings and interactions between mentor(s) and new teachers.
11. Ensure that all mentors are familiar with the EAS induction programme and the requirements of their role, including mutual accountability.
12. Review the process (and create protocols) for matching mentors and mentees to ensure strong support for professional learning.
13. Consider the training and development needs of mentors, and allocate sufficient resources/support, to build capacity in peer mentoring so that every school has a strong mentoring culture. Create and maintain a mentor pool.
14. Value, recognise and reward mentoring as a professional skill and educational priority. Ensure visible support for new teacher development from senior leaders.
15. Make all staff aware of the needs of NQTs as early career stage teachers and develop strategies for supporting those needs, including demonstration of effective teaching practice, common preparation times, and strategies for reducing unnecessary workload.
16. Consider how the school as a learning organisation can support the development of NQTs research literacy through small-scale and collaborative practitioner research and reading.
17. Articulate and share the school policy on financial support for professional development for NQTs via masters-level learning.

Recommendations for the EAS

18. Review the operation of the model to ensure that all NQTs have equitable access to high quality induction that addresses their professional learning needs. This may require development of bespoke strands within the induction program to address the specific needs of different groups of teachers, or specific teaching areas/context. Target funding to programme components that need development.
19. Clearly articulate rigorous criteria for mentor selection and evaluation. Support professional learning communities of mentors, and additional professional learning opportunities that exceed compliance with statutory requirements.

20. Improve communication to ensure all NQTs understand the developmental purpose of the PLP and intervene to reduce strategic behaviour and superficial engagement. Review support systems to ensure that portfolio building is a mentored experience that is used as a basis for ongoing professional conversations, rather than as a summative evaluation tool.

21. Introduce the e-portfolio platform at an earlier stage and provide sufficient support for NQTs to learn how to become confident users of the system.

22. Provide explicit guidance and exemplification to help NQTs understand how they can share professional learning experiences aligned with the Standards.

23. Promote the further development of NQT networks (digital and face-to-face) aligned with school cluster and curriculum networks.

24. Enhance the level of research literacy among lead practitioners facilitating Professional Learning Days, and draw on the expertise of University faculty within collaborative planning and delivery (to strengthen the transition from ITE to first post).

25. Continue to celebrate the achievements of NQTs and their mentors in high profile dissemination events and via digital media, including a possible NQT e-journal.

26. Consider how m-level learning can be more closely aligned with the needs of early career teachers so that it is both academically challenging and professionally relevant.

27. Review employment data to identify which schools have a consistently positive record of retaining NQTs within the profession, and conversely where retention rates are low.
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APPENDIX 1 EAS INDUCTION PROGRAMME

The 2018/19 Programme outline:

Host Professional Learning Schools will run one twilight, followed by four full programme days which focus on the Pedagogy strand of the new Professional Standards as the basis for the content of their programmes and a final half day Impact and reflection session in the Summer term.

Twilight – for NQT’s and Induction Mentors to visit the Host Professional Learning Schools and meet key programme staff including their External Verifiers, take a tour of the school and start to focus on aspects of collaborative professional development. This may involve an aspect of exploring the Induction Profile.

Day 1 – Influencing Learning: The host schools will concentrate on aspects of practice which cover the elements of challenge and expectations, listening to learners, learners leading learning, sustained effort and resilience in learners, reflection on learning, learning outcomes and well-being.

Day 2 - Refining Teaching; The host schools will concentrate on aspects of practice which cover the elements of Managing the learning environment, Assessment, Differentiation, Recording and reporting, Involving partners in learning.

Day 3 – Advancing Learning; The host schools will concentrate on aspects of practice which cover the elements of The four purposes for learners, Subjects in areas of learning, blended learning experiences, real life contexts, progression in learning, cross-curricular themes.

Day 4 – Leadership; The host schools will concentrate on aspects of practice which cover the elements of what is leadership and a bespoke session based on the needs of the group.

Impact celebration day – The host school will provide their NQT’s with a half-day session in the summer term to reflect and celebrate their Induction year. This usually involves a short presentation by all the NQT’s celebrating their developments and focusing upon their next developmental steps a teaching professional.

The programme uses the Professional Standards for Teachers and Leaders as the context for Professional Learning and development (overleaf).
The five professional standards for teaching and leadership

Working as one...
to secure effective pedagogy
with overarching values and
dispositions

What do the 5 professional standards say?

The standard for effective Pedagogy... teaching and learning is paramount
The teacher consistently secures the best outcomes for learners through progressively refining teaching, influencing learners and advancing learning.
The teacher in a formal leadership role exercises accountability for the pedagogy of others by creating and sustaining the conditions to realise the four purposes for learners and achieve the best for them in terms of standards, well-being and progress.

The standard for Collaboration... enabling effective pedagogy to spread
The teacher takes opportunities to work productively with all partners in learning in order to extend professional effectiveness.
The teacher in a formal leadership role builds a climate of mutual support in which effective collaboration flourishes within and beyond the school to spread effective pedagogy.

The standard for Leadership... helping effective pedagogy to grow
The teacher exercises leadership through all aspects of professional practice to support the efforts of others across the school and beyond to fulfil the educational ambitions for Wales.
The teacher in a formal leadership role works intelligently to bring coherence, clarity and a shared commitment to realising the vision for pedagogy, learners, colleagues and the wider community.

The standard for Innovation... moving pedagogy forward
The teacher employs an innovative outlook which is exemplified through the controlled and measured development of techniques and approaches to improve pedagogic outcomes.
The teacher in a formal leadership role ensures a positive climate for innovation that is coherent and manageable and outcomes are evaluated, disseminated and applied.

The standard for Professional Learning... taking effective pedagogy deeper
The teacher consistently extends knowledge, skills and understanding and can show how reflection and openness to challenge and support informs professional learning to progressively develop pedagogy.
The teacher in a formal leadership role stimulates an appetite for professional learning that is valued, has impact upon pedagogy and supports professional growth across a learning community within and beyond the school.
APPENDIX 2 MENTOR SURVEY

1. What type of school setting are you working in?

- Welsh-medium maintained community primary: 6 (10%)
- Welsh-medium maintained community secondary: 0
- Bilingual dual medium primary: 2 (3.3%)
- Bilingual dual medium secondary: 0
- English-medium maintained community primary: 33 (55%)
- English-medium maintained community secondary: 11 (18.3%)
- Maintained voluntary aided primary (faith schools): 3 (5%)
- Maintained voluntary aided secondary (faith schools): 2 (3.3%)
- Special school: 3 (5%)
- Independent primary: 0
- Independent secondary: 0
- Other: 0

2. Is the school where you work a Pioneer School?

- Curriculum Pioneer: 9 (15%)
- Pioneer Professional Learning School: 13 (21.7%)
- Digital Pioneer School: 0
- Not in the Pioneer School Network: 37 (61.7%)
- Don't know: 1 (1.7%)

3. In which local authority do you work?

- Blaenau Gwent: 5 (8.3%)
- Caerphilly: 10 (20.7%)
- Newport: 21 (35%)
- Monmouthshire: 9 (15.7%)
- Torfaen: 10 (15.7%)
4. What type of locality is your school?

- Urban: 19 (31.7%)
- Suburban: 12 (20%)
- Semi-rural (small town): 24 (40%)
- Rural: 5 (8.3%)

5. How many students are enrolled at your school?

- Less than 300 students: 26 (41.3%)
- 300-500: 16 (25.7%)
- 500-900: 6 (10%)
- 900-1,200: 5 (8.2%)
- Over 1,200: 7 (11.7%)

6. How many teachers in their first or second year of teaching work in your school?

- Only one NQT in my school: 22 (36.7%)
- 2-3 NQTs: 23 (46.7%)
- 4-5 NQTs: 7 (11.7%)
- More than 5 NQTs: 1 (1.7%)
- Don't know: 2 (3.3%)

7. How long have you been a mentor for new teachers?

- I am a first time mentor: 22 (36.7%)
- 1-2 years: 11 (18.3%)
- 3-4 years: 6 (10%)
- Over 5 years: 21 (35%)
8 How do you currently support NQTs? (please select all that apply)

- I support NQTs at the school where I work: 35 (91.7%)
- I support NQTs across a number of local schools: 12 (20%)
- I work with a group of supply teachers: 3 (7%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

9 What is your position in the school?

- Executive Headteacher: 0
- Headteacher: 0
- Deputy Headteacher: 23 (38.3%)
- Assistant Headteacher: 5 (8.3%)
- Senior Leadership Team: 8 (13.3%)
- Head of Year: 1 (1.7%)
- Head of Department: 2 (3.3%)
- Class teacher upper pay range: 21 (35%)
- Class teacher main pay range: 4 (6.7%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

10 Which year groups and subject areas do you teach at this school? Select all that apply.

- Primary: Reception: 10 (16.7%)
- Primary Year 1: 8 (13.3%)
- Primary Year 2: 11 (18.3%)
- Primary Year 3: 14 (23.3%)
- Primary Year 4: 10 (16.7%)
- Primary Year 5: 10 (16.7%)
- Primary Year 6: 12 (20%)
- Secondary: Year 7: 8 (13.3%)
- Secondary Year 8: 9 (15%)
- Secondary Year 9: 9 (15%)
- Secondary Year 10: 11 (18.3%)
- Secondary Year 11: 11 (18.3%)
- Secondary Year 12: 5 (8.3%)
- Secondary Year 13: 5 (8.3%)
- I don’t regularly teach: 8 (13.3%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)
11. If you are a secondary teacher, which subject areas do you teach? (Please tick more than one box if you teach multiple subjects)

- Welsh: 5 (33.3%)
- English: 3 (20%)
- Mathematics: 2 (13.3%)
- Physics: 0
- Chemistry: 0
- Biology: 0
- Welsh second language: 1 (6.7%)
- Modern Foreign Languages: 1 (6.7%)
- Design and technology: 1 (6.7%)
- Information technology: 1 (6.7%)
- History: 4 (26.7%)
- Geography: 0
- Sociology: 0
- Psychology: 0
- Art: 0
- Music: 1 (6.7%)
- Physical education: 2 (13.3%)
- Religious education: 0
- Special education: 2 (13.3%)
- I don't regularly teach: 3 (20%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question's respondents chose that option)

12. Does your mentee teach the same age range/specialist subject area as yourself?

12.1 Yes

- Mentee 1: 38 (100%)
- Mentee 2: 12 (31.6%)
- Mentee 3: 7 (18.4%)
- Mentee 4: 4 (10.5%)
- Mentee 5: 2 (5.2%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

12.2 No

- Mentee 1: 22 (75.9%)
- Mentee 2: 16 (55.2%)
- Mentee 3: 4 (13.8%)
- Mentee 4: 2 (6.9%)
- Mentee 5: 2 (6.9%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)
13. How useful was the Career Entry Profile in helping you set initial development priorities with your NQT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not useful</th>
<th>Minimally useful</th>
<th>Somewhat useful</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
<th>Extremely useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
<td>11 (18.3%)</td>
<td>25 (41.7%)</td>
<td>17 (28.3%)</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. In your experience, how well did initial teacher education prepare your NQT(s) for:

14.1 Meeting the needs of diverse learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very well prepared</th>
<th>Adequately prepared</th>
<th>Relatively unprepared</th>
<th>Very unprepared</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9 (15%)</td>
<td>46 (76.7%)</td>
<td>4 (6.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all respondents chose that option)

14.2 Managing challenging classroom behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very well prepared</th>
<th>Adequately prepared</th>
<th>Relatively unprepared</th>
<th>Very unprepared</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
<td>33 (55%)</td>
<td>10 (20.7%)</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all respondents chose that option)
In your experience, how well did Initial Teacher Education prepare your NQT(s) for:

### 14.1 Meeting the needs of diverse learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>9 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>45 (75.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>4 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question’s respondents chose that option)

### 14.2 Managing challenging classroom behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>9 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>33 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>16 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question’s respondents chose that option)

### 14.3 Supporting students with specific additional learning needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>7 (11.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>31 (51.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>10 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question’s respondents chose that option)

### 14.4 Designing curriculum plans (medium term)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>35 (58.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>14 (23.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>4 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question’s respondents chose that option)

### 14.5 Planning individual lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>28 (46.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>27 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question’s respondents chose that option)
### 14.7 Supporting child-led experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>12 (20.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>25 (44.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>19 (32.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question’s respondents chose that option)*

### 14.8 Using a variety of assessment strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>10 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>25 (58.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>12 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question’s respondents chose that option)*

### 14.9 Selecting the most appropriate teaching strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>9 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>43 (71.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>7 (11.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>0 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question’s respondents chose that option)*

### 14.10 Working with parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>4 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>16 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>35 (58.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>4 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question’s respondents chose that option)*
14.11 Working in culturally diverse settings

- Very well prepared: 1 (1.7%)
- Adequately prepared: 21 (35%)
- Relatively unprepared: 24 (40%)
- Very unprepared: 3 (5%)
- Don't know: 11 (18.3%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

14.12 Safeguarding children and young people

- Very well prepared: 16 (26.7%)
- Adequately prepared: 33 (55%)
- Relatively unprepared: 7 (11.7%)
- Very unprepared: 3 (5%)
- Don't know: 1 (1.7%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

14.13 Embedding health and wellbeing in the curriculum

- Very well prepared: 2 (5%)
- Adequately prepared: 35 (56.3%)
- Relatively unprepared: 16 (26.7%)
- Very unprepared: 3 (5%)
- Don't know: 3 (5%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

14.14 Using digital technology to support learning

- Very well prepared: 12 (20%)
- Adequately prepared: 39 (65%)
- Relatively unprepared: 8 (13.3%)
- Very unprepared: 0
- Don't know: 1 (1.7%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)
### Have you completed induction training with the EAS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>53 (88.3%)</th>
<th>7 (11.7%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Yet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How much focused development time do you spend with your NQT(s) each month?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Span</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than two hours</td>
<td>13 (21.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 hours</td>
<td>32 (53.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 hours</td>
<td>9 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10 hours</td>
<td>4 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 hours</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only at termly formal assessment meetings</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How much feedback have you offered to your NQTs in the following areas?

#### 17.1 School policies & procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Level</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>25 (41.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>35 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)*

#### 17.2 Classroom management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Level</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>32 (53.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>26 (43.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)*

#### 17.3 Lesson planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Level</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>25 (41.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>31 (51.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>4 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)*
17.4 Teaching strategies

- A great deal: 31 (51.7%)
- Some: 28 (46.7%)
- A little: 1 (1.7%)
- None: 0
- Don't Know: 0

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the questions respondents chose that option)

17.5 Assessment practices

- A great deal: 30 (50%)
- Some: 24 (40%)
- A little: 6 (10%)
- None: 0
- Don't Know: 0

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the questions respondents chose that option)

17.6 Inclusive pedagogy

- A great deal: 23 (38.3%)
- Some: 30 (50%)
- A little: 7 (11.7%)
- None: 0
- Don't Know: 0

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the questions respondents chose that option)

17.7 Impact evaluation

- A great deal: 18 (30%)
- Some: 30 (50%)
- A little: 11 (18.3%)
- None: 1 (1.7%)
- Don't Know: 0

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the questions respondents chose that option)
Which strategies do you use in your NQT support role?

18.1 Lesson observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option).

18.2 Work scrutiny

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option).

18.3 Learning walks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option).

18.4 Pupil voice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option).
18.5 Facilitating collaborative planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

18.6 Modelling enquiry-oriented teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

18.7 Guiding practitioner enquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

18.8 Helping NQTs meet other professionals in school e.g. additional support, pastoral

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)
Helping NQTs engage with research & professional literature

**18.9**

- **Always**: 9 (15%)
- **Often**: 17 (28.3%)
- **Occasionally**: 25 (41.7%)
- **Rarely**: 8 (13.3%)
- **Never**: 1 (1.7%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

Other (please specify)

**18.10**

- **Always**: 4 (44.4%)
- **Often**: 1 (11.1%)
- **Occasionally**: 1 (11.1%)
- **Rarely**: 2 (22.2%)
- **Never**: 1 (11.1%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

Do your NQTs have time protected each week, i.e. 10% timetable reduction

**19.1** Yes

- **Mentor 1**: 57 (100%)
- **Mentor 2**: 25 (43.9%)
- **Mentor 3**: 8 (15.8%)
- **Mentor 4**: 6 (13.3%)
- **Mentor 5**: 4 (7%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

**19.2** No

- **Mentor 1**: 3 (42.0%)
- **Mentor 2**: 3 (42.0%)
- **Mentor 3**: 1 (14.3%)
- **Mentor 4**: 0
- **Mentor 5**: 0

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)
20. When are the main pressure points in the induction period for your NQTs?

- First half term: 47 (78.3%)
- Second half term: 17 (28.3%)
- Third half term: 11 (18.3%)
- Fourth half term: 8 (13.3%)
- Final half term: 26 (43.3%)
- Second year (part-time employment): 2 (3.3%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the questions respondents chose that option)

21. How useful has the Induction Profile (Professional Learning Passport) in supporting your NQT mentors to monitor their progress and identify their development targets?

- Not useful: 1 (1.7%)
- Minimally useful: 9 (15%)
- Somewhat useful: 22 (36.7%)
- Very useful: 23 (38.3%)
- Extremely useful: 3 (8.3%)

22. What support have you received for your mentor role from the External Verifier?

- A great deal: 5 (9.6%)
- Some support: 21 (40.4%)
- A little support: 14 (26.9%)
- No support: 12 (23.1%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the questions respondents chose that option)

23. What support have you received for your mentor role from your headteacher?

- A great deal: 12 (20%)
- Some support: 24 (40%)
- A little support: 15 (25%)
- No support: 9 (15%)

24. In your opinion what are the main professional development needs of NQTs at the midpoint of their induction period? Please mark one choice in each row.

24.1. Meeting the needs of diverse learners

- No need at all: 9
- Low level of need: 10 (21.7%)
- Moderate level of need: 24 (40%)
- High level of need: 23 (28.3%)
- Don't know: 0

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the questions respondents chose that option)
### 24.0 Planning individual lessons

- No need at all: 5 (3.5%)
- Low level of need: 23 (39%)
- Moderate level of need: 10 (30.3%)
- High level of need: 13 (22%)
- Don't know: 0

*Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)*

### 24.7 Supporting child-led experiences

- No need at all: 2 (3.4%)
- Low level of need: 13 (22%)
- Moderate level of need: 23 (42.4%)
- High level of need: 19 (32.2%)
- Don't know: 0

*Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)*

### 24.8 Using a variety of assessment strategies

- No need at all: 0
- Low level of need: 11 (18.6%)
- Moderate level of need: 23 (39%)
- High level of need: 23 (42.4%)
- Don't know: 0

*Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)*

### 24.9 Selecting the most appropriate teaching strategy

- No need at all: 2 (3.4%)
- Low level of need: 16 (27.1%)
- Moderate level of need: 23 (42.4%)
- High level of need: 16 (27.1%)
- Don't know: 0

*Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)*
### 24.10 Working with parents

- **No need at all**: 2 (3.4%)
- **Low level of need**: 12 (20.3%)
- **Moderate level of need**: 24 (40.7%)
- **High level of need**: 21 (35.6%)
- **Don’t know**: 0

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this questions respondents chose that option).

### 24.11 Working in culturally diverse settings

- **No need at all**: 3 (3.2%)
- **Low level of need**: 16 (27.6%)
- **Moderate level of need**: 24 (41.4%)
- **High level of need**: 9 (15.5%)
- **Don’t know**: 6 (10.3%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this questions respondents chose that option).

### 24.12 Safeguarding children and young people

- **No need at all**: 5 (8.6%)
- **Low level of need**: 21 (36.2%)
- **Moderate level of need**: 14 (24.1%)
- **High level of need**: 17 (29.3%)
- **Don’t know**: 1 (1.7%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this questions respondents chose that option).

### 24.13 Embedding health and wellbeing in the curriculum

- **No need at all**: 1 (1.7%)
- **Low level of need**: 13 (22.4%)
- **Moderate level of need**: 30 (51.7%)
- **High level of need**: 13 (22.4%)
- **Don’t know**: 1 (1.7%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this questions respondents chose that option).
24.18 Completing Individual Education Plans

- No need at all: 1 (1.7%)
- Low level of need: 15 (25.3%)
- Moderate level of need: 15 (25.9%)
- High level of need: 27 (40.6%)
- Don’t know: 0

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option).

24.19 Taking responsibility for a class as the only teacher in the room

- No need at all: 9 (15.3%)
- Low level of need: 18 (30.3%)
- Moderate level of need: 19 (32.8%)
- High level of need: 13 (22%)
- Don’t know: 1 (1.7%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option).

24.20 Research Literacy

- No need at all: 3 (5.2%)
- Low level of need: 18 (31%)
- Moderate level of need: 20 (35.7%)
- High level of need: 13 (22.4%)
- Don’t know: 1 (1.7%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option).

24.21 Other (please specify)

- No need at all: 1 (100%)
- Low level of need: 0
- Moderate level of need: 0
- High level of need: 0
- Don’t know: 0

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option).
What is your age?

- Aged under 25: 0
- 25 to 34: 16 (26.7%)
- 35 to 44: 21 (35%)
- 45 to 54: 15 (26.7%)
- 55 and over: 7 (11.7%)

How long have you been a teacher?

- 1-3 years: 0
- 4-6 years: 4 (6.7%)
- 7-9 years: 7 (11.7%)
- Over 10 years: 49 (81.7%)

What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?

- Doctorate: 0
- Masters degree: 17 (28.3%)
- Bachelor degree - First-class honours (1st): 2 (3.3%)
- Bachelor degree - Second-class honours, upper division (2:1): 24 (40%)
- Bachelor degree - Second-class honours, lower division (2:2): 10 (16.7%)
- Bachelor degree - Third-class honours (3rd): 0
- Ordinary degree (pass): 1 (1.7%)

What is your gender?

- Male: 10 (16.7%)
- Female: 49 (81.7%)
- Prefer to self describe: 0
- Prefer not to say: 1 (1.7%)

What is your ethnicity?

- White: 59 (100%)
- Mixed/multiple ethnic groups: 0
- Asian/Asian British: 0
- Black/African/Caribbean/Black British: 0
- Prefer not to say: 0
## APPENDIX 3 NQT SURVEY

1. What type of school setting are you working in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welsh-medium maintained community primary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh-medium maintained community secondary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual, dual medium primary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual, dual medium secondary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-medium maintained community primary</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-medium maintained community secondary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintained voluntary aided primary (faith schools)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintained voluntary aided secondary (faith schools)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent primary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent secondary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.a If you selected Other, please specify.
No responses

2. Is the school where you work a Pioneer School?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Pioneer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Professional Learning School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Pioneer School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in the Pioneer School Network</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In which local authority do you work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaenau Gwent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerphilly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouthshire</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torfaen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. What type of locality is your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-rural (small town)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How many students are enrolled at your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Count</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 300</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900-1,200</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1,200</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How many teachers in their first or second year of teaching work in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am the only NOT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 NQTs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 NQTs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 NQTs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What is your school’s most recent Estyn rating?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate and needs improvement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory and needs urgent improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Does your school have more than 20% of pupils known to be eligible for Free School Meals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. What is your employment status as a teacher at this school?

- Full time: 37 (86.1%)
- Part time: 2 (4.8%)
- Short-term supply (less than one term): 0
- Long-term supply: 3 (7.1%)

10. Which year groups and subject areas do you teach at this school? Select all that apply

- Primary: Reception: 6 (14.1%)
- Primary: Year 1: 8 (19%)
- Primary: Year 2: 3 (7.1%)
- Primary: Year 3: 8 (19%)
- Primary: Year 4: 9 (21.4%)
- Primary: Year 5: 4 (9.5%)
- Primary: Year 6: 2 (4.6%)
- Secondary: Year 7: 14 (33.3%)
- Secondary: Year 8: 14 (33.3%)
- Secondary: Year 9: 14 (33.3%)
- Secondary: Year 10: 16 (38.1%)
- Secondary: Year 11: 14 (33.3%)
- Secondary: Year 12: 7 (16.7%)
- Secondary: Year 13: 6 (14.3%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

11. If you are a secondary teacher, which subject areas do you teach? (Please tick more than one box if you teach multiple subjects)

- Welsh: 1 (6.3%)
- English: 1 (6.3%)
- Mathematics: 4 (22%)
- Physics: 2 (12.5%)
- Chemistry: 2 (12.5%)
- Biology: 2 (12.5%)
- Welsh second language: 2 (12.5%)
- Modern Foreign Languages: 5 (31.3%)
- Design and technology: 1 (6.3%)
- Information technology: 2 (12.5%)
- History: 2 (12.5%)
- Geography: 1 (6.3%)
- Sociology: 0
- Psychology: 1 (6.3%)
- Art: 2 (12.5%)
- Music: 1 (6.3%)
- Physical education: 2 (12.5%)
- Religious education: 4 (22%)
- Special education: 1 (6.3%)
- Other: 3 (18.6%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)
### 12.2.1 Fully met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development area priority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 (78.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25 (75.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23 (90.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

### 12.2.2 Partially met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development area priority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18 (72%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

### 12.2.3 Not met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development area priority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

### 13 How well did your initial teacher education prepare you for:

#### 13.1 Meeting the needs of diverse learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparedness Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>5 (11.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>31 (73.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>6 (14.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

#### 13.2 Managing challenging classroom behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparedness Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>20 (54.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>23 (54.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>8 (19%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>2 (4.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

#### 13.3 Supporting students with specific additional learning needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparedness Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>17 (50.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>19 (52.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)
### Working with others in the classroom (Teaching Assistants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparedness</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>8 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>17 (40.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>14 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>3 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)*

### Designing curriculum plans (medium term)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparedness</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>7 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>17 (40.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>10 (23.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>6 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)*

### Planning individual lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparedness</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>27 (64.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>14 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>1 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)*

### Supporting child-led experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparedness</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>7 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>23 (54.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>10 (23.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>2 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)*

### Using a variety of assessment strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparedness</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>12 (26.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>24 (57.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>8 (18.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>1 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)*

### Selecting the most appropriate teaching strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparedness</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>8 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately prepared</td>
<td>28 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively unprepared</td>
<td>5 (11.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unprepared</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)*
13.15 Promoting social and emotional health in children and adolescents

Very well prepared: 5 (11.0%)
Adequately prepared: 19 (45.2%)
Relatively unprepared: 15 (35.7%)
Very unprepared: 3 (7.1%)
Don't know: 0

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

12.16 Using data to support pupil progress (assessment data, student data, evaluation data)

Very well prepared: 3 (7.1%)
Adequately prepared: 24 (57.1%)
Relatively unprepared: 9 (21.4%)
Very unprepared: 4 (9.3%)
Don't know: 2 (4.8%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

13.17 Time management

Very well prepared: 16 (38.1%)
Adequately prepared: 20 (47.6%)
Relatively unprepared: 4 (9.5%)
Very unprepared: 1 (2.4%)
Don't know: 1 (2.4%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

13.18 Completing individual Education Plans

Very well prepared: 6 (14.3%)
Adequately prepared: 10 (23.8%)
Relatively unprepared: 13 (31%)
Very unprepared: 10 (23.8%)
Don't know: 3 (7.1%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

12.19 Taking responsibility for a class as the only teacher in the room

Very well prepared: 16 (38.1%)
Adequately prepared: 14 (33.3%)
Relatively unprepared: 7 (15.7%)
Very unprepared: 5 (11.9%)
Don't know: 0

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)
14. Do you have day-to-day support from a qualified and experienced induction mentor in your school?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(88.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(11.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. How much time do you spend with your designated Induction Mentor in your school each month?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than two hours</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 hours</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(35.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 hours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10 hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 hours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only at termly formal assessment meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(11.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How much feedback have you received on the following areas of practice from your mentor?

16.1 School policies & procedures

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(52.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(11.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

16.2 Classroom management

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(37.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

16.3 Lesson planning

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(47.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)
### How has mentor feedback contributed to practice enhancement?

#### 17.1 Deepened my subject knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>9 (21.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small impact</td>
<td>10 (28.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>10 (28.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A large impact</td>
<td>13 (31%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 17.2 Improved my skills in addressing pupil needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>3 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small impact</td>
<td>2 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>18 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A large impact</td>
<td>19 (45.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 17.3 Increased my ability to use data effectively to support pupil progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>4 (9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small impact</td>
<td>5 (11.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>16 (38.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A large impact</td>
<td>17 (40.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 17.4 Supported identification of professional development goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>3 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small impact</td>
<td>3 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>16 (38.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A large impact</td>
<td>20 (47.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 17.6 Supported the development of my research literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>9 (21.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small impact</td>
<td>6 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>15 (35.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A large impact</td>
<td>12 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 17.7 Other (please specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small impact</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A large impact</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.1 A positive attitude, enthusiasm

Very important: 37 (88.1%)
Moderately important: 4 (9.5%)
Slightly important: 0
Not at all important: 1 (2.4%)
Don’t know: 0

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option).

10.2 Confidentiality, trust

Very important: 39 (92.9%)
Moderately important: 3 (7.1%)
Slightly important: 0
Not at all important: 0
Don’t know: 0

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option).

10.3 Caring personal relationship, empathy

Very important: 37 (88.1%)
Moderately important: 4 (9.5%)
Slightly important: 1 (2.4%)
Not at all important: 0
Don’t know: 0

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option).

10.4 Day-to-day availability

Very important: 22 (52.4%)
Moderately important: 16 (38.1%)
Slightly important: 2 (4.9%)
Not at all important: 2 (4.6%)
Don’t know: 0

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option).
18.3 Time to offer sustained support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately important</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

18.5 Ability to offer focused constructive feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

18.7 Willingness to share skills and knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly important</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

18.9 Matched areas of (subject) specialism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately important</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly important</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)
### Training - familiarity with Standards and curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mult answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

### Awareness of the needs of adult learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mult answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

### Ability to model enquiry-oriented teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mult answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

### Other (specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mult answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)
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10 How often have you met with your External Verifier? And for what purpose?

10.1 Once

Meeting in my school: 14 (60.9%)
Observing my teaching: 11 (47.8%)
At PL Day: 5 (21.7%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

10.2 Twice

Meeting in my school: 9 (30%)
Observing my teaching: 15 (55.6%)
At PL Day: 9 (30%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

10.3 Three times

Meeting in my school: 0 (0%)
Observing my teaching: 4 (26.7%)
At PL Day: 7 (46.7%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

10.4 More frequently

Meeting in my school: 0
Observing my teaching: 1 (7.7%)
At PL Day: 13 (100%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

10.5 Not yet met with EV

Meeting in my school: 2 (66.7%)
Observing my teaching: 0
At PL Day: 1 (33.3%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)
20. Who else has provided informal mentor support to you as a new teacher in school? (please select multiple responses if required)

- Other teachers in your Year Group/Key Stage (primary): 23 (54.8%)
- Other Year Group teachers (primary): 14 (33.3%)
- Head of Department (secondary): 18 (42.9%)
- Teachers in my subject area(s) (secondary): 13 (31%)
- Head of Year: 10 (23.8%)
- Other early career teachers in my school: 9 (21.4%)
- SENCO/ALNCO: 12 (28.6%)
- Headteacher: 18 (42.9%)
- Other: 3 (7.1%)

*Multi answer Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

21. Do you have regular and supportive communication with the headteacher?

- Yes: 26 (51.9%)
- No: 16 (33.1%)

22. Do you have regular scheduled opportunities to plan with other more experienced teachers?

- Yes: 26 (51.9%)
- No: 16 (33.1%)

23. Is your NQT time protected each week, i.e. 10% timetable reduction?

- Yes: 27 (64.3%)
- No: 15 (35.7%)
24. When you started work at your school, how did fellow staff regard you?

24.1 As a newly qualified teacher with support needs appropriate to career stage

- Yes: 24 (54.9%)
- No: 9 (24.3%)
- Don't know: 4 (10.8%)

Multi-answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option).

24.2 As a qualified teacher just like all other members of staff

- Yes: 35 (82.7%)
- No: 1 (2.6%)
- Don't know: 3 (7.7%)

Multi-answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option).

25. What impact do the Professional Learning Days for NQTs have on your development as a teacher?

25.1 Observation of live practice

- No impact: 2 (4.3%)
- A small impact: 6 (14.3%)
- Moderate impact: 17 (40.3%)
- A large impact: 17 (40.3%)

Multi-answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option).

25.2 Focused professional discussions for practice development

- No impact: 1 (2.4%)
- A small impact: 4 (9.5%)
- Moderate impact: 19 (45.2%)
- A large impact: 19 (45.2%)

Multi-answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option).

25.3 Listening to learners – work scrutiny

- No impact: 2 (4.8%)
- A small impact: 12 (28.6%)
- Moderate impact: 15 (35.7%)
- A large impact: 13 (31%)
### 25.4 Opportunity to network with peers from other settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>2 (6.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small impact</td>
<td>3 (7.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>8 (19.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A large impact</td>
<td>28 (68.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)**

### 25.5 Opportunity to learn about close-to-practice educational research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>2 (4.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small impact</td>
<td>5 (11.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>21 (50.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A large impact</td>
<td>14 (33.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)**

### 25.6 Completing the Induction Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>5 (11.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small impact</td>
<td>8 (19.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>19 (45.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A large impact</td>
<td>9 (21.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)**

### 25.7 Time away from own school/co-workers for reflection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>1 (2.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small impact</td>
<td>5 (11.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>16 (38.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A large impact</td>
<td>20 (47.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)**

### 25.8 Development of research literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>12 (28.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small impact</td>
<td>10 (23.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>11 (26.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A large impact</td>
<td>9 (21.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)**

### 25.9 Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>1 (50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small impact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>1 (50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A large impact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)**
During the induction period, did you access sources to support professional learning, and what was the impact of these on your development as a teacher?

### 26.1 Face to face informal events e.g. Teach Meets
- No Impact: 1 (2.6%)
- Small Impact: 5 (12.2%)
- Moderate Impact: 15 (35.6%)
- Large Impact: 7 (17.1%)
- Didn’t use this resource: 13 (31.7%)

Mult. answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this questions respondents chose that option)

### 26.2 Professional learning resources on Learning Wales website
- No Impact: 4 (10%)
- Small Impact: 4 (10%)
- Moderate Impact: 15 (37.5%)
- Large Impact: 8 (20%)
- Didn’t use this resource: 18 (45.5%)

Mult. answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this questions respondents chose that option)

### 26.3 Education social media – Facebook groups, Twitter
- No Impact: 3 (7.5%)
- Small Impact: 8 (20%)
- Moderate Impact: 15 (37.5%)
- Large Impact: 8 (20%)
- Didn’t use this resource: 5 (12.5%)

Mult. answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this questions respondents chose that option)

### 26.4 Professional associations e.g. Chartered College of Teachers
- No Impact: 7 (17.9%)
- Small Impact: 5 (12.8%)
- Moderate Impact: 4 (10.3%)
- Large Impact: 1 (2.6%)
- Didn’t use this resource: 22 (56.8%)

Mult. answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this questions respondents chose that option)

### 26.5 Subject associations and special interest groups
- No Impact: 4 (10%)
- Small Impact: 6 (15%)
- Moderate Impact: 8 (20%)
- Large Impact: 5 (12.5%)
- Didn’t use this resource: 17 (42.5%)

Mult. answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this questions respondents chose that option)
### 26.6 EBSCO Education Source package and eBook Education collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small impact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large impact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't use this resource</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

### 26.7 Reading professional literature e.g. journals, evidence-based papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small impact</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large impact</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't use this resource</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

### 26.8 Conferences and workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small impact</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large impact</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't use this resource</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

### 26.9 Teacher-led research, school enquiry groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small impact</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate impact</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large impact</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't use this resource</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)
26.10 Collaborative curriculum development

No impact: 3 (7.5%)
Small impact: 4 (10%)
Moderate impact: 10 (23%)
Large impact: 14 (35%)
Did not use this resource: 9 (22.5%)

Multi answer. Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question's respondents chose that option).

26.11 Peer observation, learning walks/rounds

No impact: 1 (2.4%)
Small impact: 2 (4.9%)
Moderate impact: 16 (39%)
Large impact: 16 (39%)
Did not use this resource: 6 (14.6%)

Multi answer. Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question's respondents chose that option).

26.12 Lesson Study - collaborative planning and evaluation of a series of lessons

No impact: 1 (2.5%)
Small impact: 6 (15%)
Moderate impact: 10 (25%)
Large impact: 9 (22.5%)
Did not use this resource: 14 (35%)

Multi answer. Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question's respondents chose that option).

26.13 Contact with colleagues from initial teacher training (formal and informal)

No impact: 2 (4.9%)
Small impact: 2 (4.9%)
Moderate impact: 12 (29.3%)
Large impact: 19 (40.3%)
Did not use this resource: 6 (14.6%)

Multi answer. Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question's respondents chose that option).
27. In your experience to date, when are the main pressure points in the induction period?

- First half term: 24 (57.1%)
- Second half term: 15 (35.7%)
- Third half term: 8 (19%)
- Fourth half term: 12 (28.6%)
- Final half term: 15 (35.7%)
- Second year (part-time employment): 1 (2.4%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

28. Did you attend the session provided by the University of South Wales?

- Yes: 28 (60.7%)
- No: 13 (31%)
- Don't know: 1 (2.4%)

28.a. If yes, how useful was the session in supporting your induction?

28.a.1. How useful was the session provided by the University of South Wales?

- Not useful: 6 (21.4%)
- Minimally useful: 8 (28.6%)
- Somewhat useful: 10 (35.7%)
- Very useful: 3 (10.7%)
- Extremely useful: 1 (3.5%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

29. Would you enrol for Masters study in Education?

- Yes, at the University of South Wales: 12 (30.8%)
- Yes, at another university provider: 3 (7.7%)
- Not at any provider: 7 (17.9%)
- Don't know: 18 (46.2%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

29.a. If you were to enrol for Masters study in Education, what would be your preferred mode of teaching delivery?

- Face to face delivery only: 4 (11.4%)
- Evening, Weekend or Summer delivery: 5 (14.3%)
- Online delivery only: 26 (74.2%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)
29.5 If you are not planning to enrol for a masters in Education, what are your reasons for not enrolling? (please select all that apply)

- I already hold a masters qualification: 1 (3.6%)
- Further study would be too demanding at this stage in my career (not yet): 17 (60.7%)
- A Masters in Education would not support my professional growth as a teacher: 1 (2.6%)
- I have limited access to funding/cost is prohibitive: 12 (40.6%)
- Lack of employer support: 4 (14.3%)
- I am interested in a Masters in my specialist subject area: 6 (21.4%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the questions respondents chose that option)

50. Do you plan to continue to use the Professional Learning Passport as a tool to reflect and improve practice?

- Definitely: 5 (11.0%)
- Probably: 14 (33.3%)
- Unlikely: 13 (31.3%)
- No: 6 (14.3%)
- Don’t know: 4 (9.5%)

51. Thinking of your own professional development needs, please indicate the extent to which you have such needs in each of the areas listed. Please mark one choice in each row.

31.1 Meeting the needs of diverse learners

- No need at all: 5 (12.2%)
- Low level of need: 14 (33.1%)
- Moderate level of need: 17 (40.1%)
- High level of need: 4 (9.8%)
- Don’t know: 1 (2.2%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the questions respondents chose that option)

31.2 Managing challenging classroom behaviour

- No need at all: 5 (12.2%)
- Low level of need: 12 (29.3%)
- Moderate level of need: 19 (43.0%)
- High level of need: 5 (12.2%)
- Don’t know: 1 (2.4%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the questions respondents chose that option)
3.3 Supporting students with specific additional learning needs

No need at all: 2 (4.9%)
Low level of need: 15 (35.6%)
Moderate level of need: 19 (46.3%)
High level of need: 4 (9.8%)
Don't know: 1 (2.4%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

3.4 Working with others in the classroom (Teaching Assistants)

No need at all: 8 (10.5%)
Low level of need: 22 (53.7%)
Moderate level of need: 9 (22%)
High level of need: 1 (2.4%)
Don't know: 1 (2.4%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

3.5 Designing curriculum plans (medium term)

No need at all: 3 (11.9%)
Low level of need: 15 (55.7%)
Moderate level of need: 14 (33.3%)
High level of need: 7 (16.7%)
Don't know: 1 (2.4%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)

3.6 Planning individual lessons

No need at all: 12 (29.3%)
Low level of need: 21 (51.2%)
Moderate level of need: 5 (12.1%)
High level of need: 2 (4.9%)
Don't know: 1 (2.4%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)
### 31.11 Working in culturally diverse settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No need at all</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level of need</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate level of need</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level of need</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question's respondents chose that option).

### 31.12 Safeguarding children and young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No need at all</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level of need</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate level of need</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level of need</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question's respondents chose that option).

### 31.13 Embedding health and wellbeing in the curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No need at all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level of need</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate level of need</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level of need</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question's respondents chose that option).

### 31.14 Using digital technology to support learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No need at all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level of need</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate level of need</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level of need</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the question's respondents chose that option).
31.15 Promoting social and emotional health in children and adolescents

- No need at all: 3 (7.3%)
- Low level of need: 18 (43.9%)
- Moderate level of need: 17 (41.3%)
- High level of need: 2 (4.9%)
- Don't know: 1 (2.4%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

31.16 Using data to support pupil progress (assessment data, student data, evaluation data)

- No need at all: 6 (14.6%)
- Low level of need: 13 (31.7%)
- Moderate level of need: 15 (35.5%)
- High level of need: 6 (14.6%)
- Don't know: 1 (2.4%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

31.17 Time management

- No need at all: 12 (29.3%)
- Low level of need: 14 (34.1%)
- Moderate level of need: 8 (15.5%)
- High level of need: 0 (14.0%)
- Don't know: 1 (2.4%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

31.18 Completing Individual Education Plans

- No need at all: 9 (14.5%)
- Low level of need: 18 (43.9%)
- Moderate level of need: 13 (31.7%)
- High level of need: 3 (7.3%)
- Don't know: 1 (2.4%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)
31.19 Taking responsibility for a class as the only teacher in the room

- No need at all: 19 (40.3%)
- Low level of need: 13 (31.7%)
- Moderate level of need: 6 (14.6%)
- High level of need: 2 (4.9%)
- Don’t know: 1 (2.4%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all respondents chose that option)

33 In your first year as a teacher, did you take on any of the following additional responsibilities?

- Additional administrative duties: 7 (17.1%)
- Extracurricular activities: 33 (80.5%)
- Coordination of specific projects/areas of work: 18 (43.9%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all respondents chose that option)

34 In the last year, were you asked to teach outside of your specialist area you are qualified to teach?

34.1 Teaching outside the age range employed to teach

- Sometimes: 2 (5%)
- Rarely: 3 (7.5%)
- Never: 35 (87.5%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all respondents chose that option)

34.2 Teaching outside the subject(s) employed to teach at KS3

- Sometimes: 5 (12.2%)
- Rarely: 2 (5.3%)
- Never: 31 (81.5%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all respondents chose that option)

34.3 Teaching outside the subject(s) employed to teach at KS4

- Sometimes: 6 (15.3%)
- Rarely: 1 (2.5%)
- Never: 31 (81.5%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g., 100% would represent that all respondents chose that option)
34.4 Teaching outside the subject(s) employed to teach at Advanced level

- Sometimes: 6 (15.8%)
- Rarely: 1 (2.6%)
- Never: 31 (81.6%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

35. How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job:

35.1 Opportunities for collaborative professional learning

- Very satisfied: 23 (54.8%)
- Somewhat satisfied: 14 (33.3%)
- Neither satisfied or dissatisfied: 4 (9.5%)
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 0
- Very dissatisfied: 1 (2.4%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

35.2 Level of personal/professional challenge

- Very satisfied: 23 (55.1%)
- Somewhat satisfied: 14 (34.1%)
- Neither satisfied or dissatisfied: 3 (7.3%)
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 0
- Very dissatisfied: 1 (2.4%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

35.3 Level of collegiality among school staff

- Very satisfied: 20 (51.9%)
- Somewhat satisfied: 11 (26.2%)
- Neither satisfied or dissatisfied: 2 (4.8%)
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 1 (2.6%)
- Very dissatisfied: 2 (4.8%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)

35.4 Recognition – acknowledgment of good work

- Very satisfied: 18 (42.9%)
- Somewhat satisfied: 16 (36.1%)
- Neither satisfied or dissatisfied: 5 (11.9%)
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 1 (2.4%)
- Very dissatisfied: 2 (4.8%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option)
35.5 Opportunity to build positive relationships with children/young people

- Very satisfied: 31 (71.8%)
- Somewhat satisfied: 10 (23.8%)
- Neither satisfied or dissatisfied: 0
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 0
- Very dissatisfied: 1 (2.4%)

Notes: Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option).

35.6 Level of autonomy over class-level decisions/scope for innovation

- Very satisfied: 21 (50%)
- Somewhat satisfied: 17 (40.5%)
- Neither satisfied or dissatisfied: 2 (4.8%)
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 1 (2.4%)
- Very dissatisfied: 1 (2.4%)

Notes: Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option).

35.7 Quality of the physical environment/school accommodation

- Very satisfied: 19 (45.2%)
- Somewhat satisfied: 17 (40.5%)
- Neither satisfied or dissatisfied: 5 (11.9%)
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 0
- Very dissatisfied: 1 (2.4%)

Notes: Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option).

35.8 Access to resources to support learning

- Very satisfied: 18 (42.9%)
- Somewhat satisfied: 14 (33.3%)
- Neither satisfied or dissatisfied: 7 (16.7%)
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 2 (4.8%)
- Very dissatisfied: 1 (2.4%)

Notes: Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question's respondents chose that option).
37 When did you decide to become a teacher?

- Teaching is my first career choice: 33 (73.6%)
- I made a career change to come into teaching: 9 (21.4%)

38 Is teaching a career that you would highly recommend to others?

- Yes: 28 (60.7%)
- No: 7 (16.7%)
- Don't know: 7 (16.7%)

39 How long do you expect to stay in teaching?

- Complete the induction period only: 0
- 1-3 years post induction: 1 (2.4%)
- 4-5 years post induction: 1 (2.4%)
- Between 5-10 years: 8 (19%)
- Over 10 years: 32 (70.2%)

40 How long do you intend to stay at your current school?

- My post is temporary: 11 (26.2%)
- I am full time but I intend to stay for this year only: 6 (14.3%)
- I plan to stay for 1-2 years post induction: 4 (9.5%)
- I plan to stay for the foreseeable future: 21 (50%)

41 During the induction period, have you considered leaving teaching?

- Yes: 16 (38.1%)
- No: 26 (61.9%)
41.a If you have considered leaving teaching during your induction period, why?

- Unmanageable workload, long hours: 10 (66.7%)
- Time spent on tasks with limited impact on pupil learning: 6 (46.2%)
- The accountability system in education: 5 (33.3%)
- Intermittent or insecure employment (supply work): 3 (20%)
- Better remuneration outside teaching (higher salary): 3 (20%)
- Lack of support from senior staff: 5 (33.3%)
- Personal circumstances: 1 (6.7%)
- Other (specify): 5 (33.3%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the questions respondents chose that option)

42 What factors would influence your decision to move schools? Check all that are relevant

- Career advancement: 25 (29.3%)
- More manageable workload: 14 (33.3%)
- Stronger professional development opportunities: 11 (20.2%)
- Less challenging context: 9 (21.4%)
- Quality of school leadership: 15 (35.7%)
- More collaborative atmosphere: 7 (16.7%)
- Housing costs: 2 (4.3%)
- Proximity to home, reduced commute: 20 (47.6%)
- School mission/vision compatible with my own: 9 (21.4%)
- Other (specify): 1 (2.4%)

Multi answer: Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all the questions respondents chose that option)
43 What qualification route did you complete to train to teach?

- Graduate Teacher Programme (Wales) 3 (7.1%)
- University-led PGCE (full time) 34 (61%)
- University-led PGCE (part time) 0
- University-led undergraduate with QTS (full time) 5 (11.9%)
- University-led undergraduate with QTS (part time) 0
- School Direct - Fee Paying (England) 0
- School Direct - Salaried (England) 0
- Teach First 0
- School Centered Initial Teacher Training 0
- Accelerated Training (QTG in two terms via SCITT or School Direct Salaried) 0
- Researchers in Schools 0

44 Which model of placement did you experience in ITE?

- Single placement model (sole trainee in specialist area) 31 (73.8%)
- Paired placement model (two trainees placed together in same specialist area at one school) 5 (11.5%)
- Multiple placement model (several trainees in specialist area at same school) 6 (14.3%)

45 When did you complete your initial teacher training?

- Prior to 2015 1 (2.4%)
- 2015 3 (7.1%)
- 2016 3 (7.1%)
- 2017 6 (14.3%)
- 2018 26 (60%)
46. Did you receive a financial incentive to train to teach e.g. bursary or scholarship?

| Yes | 17 (40.5%) |
| No  | 25 (59.5%) |

47. What school or schools have you attended for Professional Learning Days?

- Blaenau Gwent: Tredegar Secondary: 1 (2.4%)
- Blaenau Gwent: Willowtown: 1 (2.4%)
- Caerphilly: Ystrad Mynach: 1 (2.4%)
- Caerphilly: Glyn Gaer: 0
- Caerphilly: Maesteg: 0
- Caerphilly: Rhiv Syl Dyfydd: 4 (9.5%)
- Caerphilly: Risca Primary: 1 (2.4%)
- Caerphilly: St Martin’s cluster: 0
- Caerphilly: St Gwladys: 0
- Caerphilly: Trinity Fields (Special): 3 (7.1%)
- Caerphilly: White Rose: 1 (2.4%)
- Caerphilly: Cwm Rhydderch: 1 (2.4%)
- Newport: Eveswell: 0
- Newport: Blan Skir: 3 (7.1%)
- Newport: John Frost: 7 (16.7%)
- Newport: Jubilee Park: 1 (2.4%)
- Newport: Langstone: 0
- Newport: Milbrook: 1 (2.4%)
- Newport: St Joseph’s: 4 (9.5%)
- Newport: St Julian’s: 0
- Newport: Caerleon: 3 (7.1%)
- Monmouthshire: Caldicot: 2 (4.3%)
- Monmouthshire: Gwent: 0
- Monmouthshire: King Henry VIII: 3 (7.1%)
- Monmouthshire: Kymbin View Primary: 1 (2.4%)
- Monmouthshire: Shirenewton: 0
- Torfaen: Coed Eva: 0
- Torfaen: George Street: 6 (14.3%)
- Torfaen: Maendy: 0
- Torfaen: St Albans: 2 (4.3%)
- Torfaen: Blaenavon: 0

Multi answer. Percentage of respondents who selected each answer option (e.g. 100% would represent that all this question’s respondents chose that option)
**Q8.** What is the highest level of formal education that you have completed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree - First-class honours (1st)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree - Second-class honours, upper division</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree - Second-class honours, lower division</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree - Third-class honours (3rd)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary degree (pass)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q9.** Before training to teach, what experience did you have of (school) working with children and young people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little experience</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some experience</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal of experience</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q10.** What is your gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to self describe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q11.** What is your age?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### What is your ethnicity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed/multiple ethnic groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian British</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African/Caribbean/Black British</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Would you be willing to be contacted in future about your career progression?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening</strong></td>
<td>Tell us who you are, what you do and where you are working (inc. full time or short-term supply) All names will be removed from the transcript and replaced with a code.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introductory</strong></td>
<td>Write down three positive things about your experience of induction, no matter how small that positive thing is. Let’s list these on the flip chart. Where do we agree?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Transition** | How does your school support you to develop as a new teacher?  
What words would you use to describe an effective mentor?  
What do effective mentors do to support your learning? |
| **Key Questions** | You are attending a series of Professional Learning Days (Day 1, influencing learning; Day 2 Refining teaching; Day 3 Advancing learning; Day 4 Leadership).  
How effective are each of these days in terms of their focus, activities, impact on practice?  
Can you give me an example from your induction experience of:  
  - Collaborative learning through the use of peer networks  
  - Reflective practice by applying learning back in school between workshops  
  - Engaging with relevant data and evidence from research  
How effective are the systems for recording your professional growth? (Induction Profile)  
Reflecting on your induction experience to date, what has been most helpful in supporting your professional learning?  
What has been most challenging? And why?  
If you could change one thing about induction what would you change? What’s the main reason that one thing needs changing?  
Are you interested in pursuing further opportunities with the University of South Wales? (initially a half-day session and pathway to masters accreditation)  
Outside formal induction, what other professional learning opportunities are available to you?  
When you did initial teacher training how much input did you get on working with children with SEN or inclusive practice generally?  
To what extent has there been a key focus upon inclusive practice in your NQT Induction programme? |
| **Ending questions** | If you had a chance to give advice to the director of the induction programme, what advice would you give?  
Think about all we have talked about today. What do you think is the most important for the EAS to keep doing/stop doing?  
We wanted you to help us evaluate the model of induction support. We want to know how to improve the support available to you. Is there anything we have missed? Is there anything that you came wanting to say that you didn’t get the chance to say? |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Please tell us who you are, where you are working &amp; your employment status. All names will be removed from the transcript and replaced with a code.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Key Questions** | You are attending a series of Professional Learning Days (Day 1, influencing learning; Day 2 Refining teaching; Day 3 Advancing learning; Day 4 Leadership). What impact did the last PL Day (Day 3 Advancing Learning) have on your practice?  
- Can you give me an example?  
What else has changed since we last met (concerning your learning as a teacher)?  
- Breakthroughs/advances?  
- New challenges? Pressure points in induction period for NQTs  
How has your External Verifier supported you? What support did you value most?  
How is your relationship with your mentor developing?  
- When do you now approach your mentor in school? If not regularly, why not?  
- What are the main reasons for making contact?  
To what extent do mentors give you space to try out your own ideas?  
How do you use your timetable reduction?  
How are you finding the process of recording your experiences in the Induction Profile?  
What’s the last piece of research that influenced your practice or thinking?  
- How did your thinking/practice change?  
- How did you access this research?  
- What are the main barriers to research uptake?  
Have you had the opportunity to engage in practitioner research yourself?  
Have you thought any further about continuing your professional learning at m-level with the USW or another provider?  
How has the programme supported you in terms of preparing you for the emotional aspects of the job?  
Do you feel the programme has supported you in becoming more ‘resilient’/developing strategies for wellbeing/work-life balance? If so, how?  
What does/or could your school do to promote a positive work-life balance for NQTs?  
How would you describe your workload/ work-life balance at this point?  
How did your previous work experiences with children or young people help to prepare you?  
What are your professional learning needs at this stage?  
- How have your needs changed since ITE and appointment to first post?  
What policy measures could be put in place to strengthen the induction support available for teachers who are employed on part time or fixed term contracts? (if applicable)  
How could the Induction Programme leads improve the programme for future cohorts?  
- What elements of the support system might be changed?  
- Do you feel that mentoring support should continue after then end of the induction period?  
Is there anything further that you want to add? Is there anything that we have yet to address? |
APPENDIX 6  IMPROVING INDUCTION: PROMPTS FOR REFLECTION

What are the specific support needs of new teachers joining school communities for their first posts?

How do the support needs of novice and veteran teachers differ?

How might the needs of new teachers vary according to tenure and previous experience?
- full-time permanent post
- part time post
- fixed term contract
- short-term supply

What criteria are used in deciding the classes assigned to NQTs?
- Ideally/ usually

What are the qualities of an effective mentor?

What criteria are used in mentor selection?
- Evidence of accomplished teaching
- Inter-personal skills in supporting adult learners & collaborative practice
- Commitment to lifelong learning
- Professional knowledge of curriculum and Standards
- Knowledge of new teacher development

What criteria are used to assign mentors to NQTs?

How is high quality mentoring recognised and rewarded in school and the LA/region?

What are the development needs of new and experienced mentors?

How do we know that mentors are continuing to grow in their practice?

How do we know that all NQTs receive equitable induction experiences?
- From mentors
- From EVs
- From Professional Learning Days

What opportunities are there for NQTs to observe high quality teaching in school?

How does the school timetable and school layout support or hinder collaboration & opportunities for peer support?

How does the school help NQTs to make efficient use of NQT and PPA time and reduce unnecessary workload?

How is NQT and early career teacher voice represented at school, local authority and regional levels?

What is the role of the headteacher in induction practices? How do the headteacher and senior leadership team model a commitment to professional learning?

Does the school take collective responsibility for the success of new colleagues and for the learners in new colleagues’ classrooms?

How can transitions be improved e.g. moving between schools, local authorities, EVs?

How can new teachers be supported to develop skills of collaborative practitioner enquiry?