2013 Annual Evaluation Report for the Teach First NZ programme pilot delivered in partnership with the University of Auckland

Jenny Whatman, Marie Cameron, Liesje Stevens, and Lorraine Spiller
NZCER

2013 Annual Evaluation Report for the Teach First NZ programme pilot delivered in partnership with the University of Auckland

Jenny Whatman, Marie Cameron, Liesje Stevens,
and Lorraine Spiller

NZCER
Rangahau Mātauranga o Aotearoa

Acknowledgement

Table of Contents

Tables

Appendices

Glossary of abbreviations

CAPNA	Curriculum and Pastoral Needs Analysis
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent
GTS	Graduating Teacher Standards
HoD	Head of Department
ITE	Initial Teacher Education
LAT	Limited Authority to Teach
N4L	Network for Learning
NCEA	National Certificate of Educational Achievement
PB4L	Positive Behaviour for Learning
PLD	Professional Learning and Development
PRT	Provisionally Registered Teacher
RTC	Registered Teacher Criteria
SAF	Student Achievement Function advisers
SII	Summer Initial Intensive
SOAR	School Observation and Reflection
TFALL	Teach For All
VCS	Visiting Curriculum Specialist

1. Background

Programme purpose

The Teach First NZ programme[1] has been established as a broad initiative intended to contribute to tackling educational disparities in New Zealand. A core element of the initiative is the introduction of a new approach to the preparation of secondary teachers in New Zealand. The programme was developed by the Faculty of Education, University of Auckland (the Faculty), and Teach First NZ, operating in partnership. The Ministry is funding some aspects of the programme.

The programme is designed to respond to a longstanding need for quality teachers in schools serving low-decile communities with high Māori and Pasifika enrolments, and the pilot is focused on preparing teachers to teach hard-to-staff secondary subjects in Auckland and Northland. English, chemistry, physics, mathematics, and te reo Māori were deemed to be hard-to-staff secondary subjects.

The 4-year pilot programme now sits within a wider government Quality Teaching Agenda which was announced in the budget, May 2013. The New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) was contracted to evaluate the pilot between 2013 and 2016.

While a core part of the initiative is an alternative pathway into teaching, the aims of Teach First NZ are wider than a focus on just preparing new teachers. Teach First NZ's broader aims include building a community of programme alumni leaders who remain committed and who work to advance educational opportunities over the long term, from within schools, the wider education sector, and other sectors of influence.

The aims of the partnership (the Faculty and Teach First NZ) in developing the programme are:

- to contribute to reducing educational disparities and inequalities in New Zealand by preparing participants[2] with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to become highly effective teachers in secondary schools with high Māori and Pasifika rolls serving lower decile communities, initially in Auckland and Northland

- to make teaching in schools serving low-decile communities a first choice for graduates

- to develop the leadership capability of participants so that they have the potential to contribute to reducing educational disparities as alumni of the programme

- to contribute to supporting and improving the status of teaching as a profession in New Zealand by providing a rigorous alternative pathway into teaching that attracts high-calibre, talented individuals (particularly male, Māori, and Pasifika), including some who may not otherwise choose to become teachers in schools serving lower decile communities

- to work towards the programme's vision that all young people in New Zealand achieve their full educational potential, regadless of socioeconomic background.

---

[1] Hereafter referred to as "the programme".

[2] Throughout this report *participant* refers to the Teach First NZ beginning teacher. We do not use the term to refer more broadly to the participants in the evaluation.

There are three confirmed intakes in the pilot with each intake undertaking field-based teacher preparation for 2 years (with no new intake confirmed for year 4). Each intake is restricted to a maximum of 20 participants.

The Ministry of Education (the Ministry) has funded cohort one participants as supernumerary (above school roll entitlement) and funded mentors at 0.2 Full-time Equivalent (FTE) throughout the pilot. Cohort one participants onwards are funded by host schools, with complementary Ministry funding to support a reduced teaching timetable for participants. The Ministry's aims in providing funding to assist in the delivery of the programme are:

- to expand the pathways available for talented potential teachers to enter the teaching profession

- to actively promote and work towards achieving the Government's priority to raise achievement and support delivery of the Better Public Service target of 85 percent of 18 year olds achieving the National Certificate in Educational Achievement (NCEA) level 2 by 2017

- to increase the engagement and achievement of Māori and Pasifika learner groups in secondary schools.

Programme aspects

- Within the partnership, the Faculty has particular responsibility for teacher preparation leading to the university's Postgraduate Diploma in Teaching (Secondary Field-based) and, through the completion of this programme, to provisional registration. The Teach First NZ team supports recruitment and selection, the design and delivery of the Summer Initial Intensive programme (SII), drop-ins and clinics, and the alumni programme, and contributes to ongoing participant development and support. All aspects of the programme are planned together and its delivery is shared to enable participants to experience it as an integrated whole.

- The selection process is designed to be rigorous and multi-faceted. It includes an online application, a phone interview, a day-long assessment centre, and a SII. Those selected for the programme will have demonstrated:

  - degree-level academic success in the subjects that they aspire to teach

  - the organisational skills needed to manage teaching and challenging academic study

  - commitment to the Teach First NZ vision

  - commitment to redressing educational inequities

  - cultural competence

  - leadership capabilities (likely to benefit their schools and communities) and the interpersonal and social skills required of a leader.

Teach First NZ's ten core selection competencies are: Achievement; Leadership; Perseverance and resilience; Influencing and motivating; Humility, respect, and empathy; Organisation and planning; Problem solving; Self-reflection; Flexibility; Commitment to the Teach First NZ mission.

Participants are enrolled in the Postgraduate Diploma in Teaching (Secondary Field-based) throughout the 2 years and 2 months of the programme. Participants must meet University of Auckland standards for all initial teacher education (ITE) graduates and meet the New Zealand Teachers Council's (Teachers Council) Graduating Teacher Standards (GTS). A maximum of two participants are employed in each host secondary school with high Māori and Pasifika rolls in Auckland and Northland; schools that mainly, but not exclusively, serve decile 1 and 2 communities. The programme aims to prioritise the placement of participants in schools with a culture of inquiry and data use. Participants are asked to make a commitment to working in their host schools for 2 years and sign a commitment agreement to signal this intention.

The programme consists of five integrated university papers: EDPROF 700 (Interdisciplinary Pedagogy in New Zealand), EDCURSE 709 (Summer Intensive), EDCURSEC 719 (Learning Area Inquiry), EDPRAC 751 (Teaching 2013), EDPRAC 753 (Teaching 2014). Assessments include:

- during SII: a teacher learning log, a seminar, a case study, a reflection portfolio, and planning and assessment tasks

- during the year: a portfolio of practice (critical reflection on self and critical analysis of the progress of a small group of learners and three formal assessments of teaching practice).

- collection of evidence that the participant has met the GTS.

After the initial 8-week residential programme (SII) in November/December/January, participants are employed in their host schools with Limited Authority to Teach (LAT) status. Class contact time for participants is limited to 0.6 FTE.

Nominated teachers in each host school are offered specialised mentor training by the Faculty prior to and during the programme, and each school selects a mentor who is intended to be well matched with each participant. Each host school has a designated member of staff who co-ordinates the mentor and participant to maximise the contribution of the participant at the host school. There is ongoing support available from the Faculty for mentors. Participants are visited and observed (to receive formative feedback and evaluation) by Visiting Curriculum Specialists (VCSs) on up to 15 occasions in year 1 and up to 10 occasions in year 2. Pastoral support is provided through the Partnership Team of Teach First NZ, which works with participants from the SII and collaborates with VCSs.

Participants are also engaged in a leadership development strand, which is closely integrated with the ITE elements of the programme. Alumni will be supported to engage with an alumni programme after the two years. During the year participants attend four day-long clinics (March, June, August, November) and a 3-day mid-year intensive (residential) in July. They are also required to spend the equivalent of three weeks in contexts other than their host school as an "away" practicum in local schools or in the home school community.

2.   Key findings

This evaluation's main purpose is to understand how well the programme has been implemented and to what extent it has achieved its objectives. The key evaluation questions are:

1. How well (effectively and efficiently) has the programme been implemented?

2. To what extent has the programme achieved its overall outcomes and objectives?

To answer the evaluation questions the evaluators developed a set of evaluation criteria in consultation with the Ministry and the Teach First NZ partnership. Our key findings are provided for each of the evaluation questions in relation to these criteria.

The evaluation data for the first year of the Teach First NZ pilot programme were collected through document analysis, an online survey (*Me and My Class*) administered to students, interviews, and site visits to the nine schools hosting the 16 participants that make up the 2013 cohort. The interviews were with key personnel in schools (including participants, mentors, co-ordinators, Heads of Department/Heads of Faculty/Heads of Learning Area (HoDs), principals, and other teachers in the school including New Zealand Post Primary Teachers Association (PPTA) office holders) and with the Teach First NZ partnership and Faculty employees (including VCSs, and staff who teach on the university's established Graduate Diploma in Teaching (Secondary)). Two members of the evaluation team also spent a day observing an Assessment Centre (selection day) which involved interviews, a group exercise, a sample teaching lesson, and self-evaluation.

How well (effectively and efficiently) has the programme been implemented?

The programme was, in general, successfully implemented, with the Teach First NZ partnership being seen to provide timely and responsive support to participants and schools. The rigorous selection process and the high calibre of the 2013 cohort were seen by the evaluation team (based on the views of the different groups of people we talked to) to be major strengths of the programme. School principals and co-ordinators spoke highly of the participants and the Teach First NZ partnership staff.

Where there were any issues, reported by a minority of schools during the year, these appeared to relate, for the most part, to in-school issues (including inadequate communication between some personnel). To a large extent, variations in implementation depended on the clarity of internal school communications about the Teach First NZ programme, the suitability of organisational arrangements (including timetabling), and the placement of the participant (for example, whether located in the same department as their mentor), the learning culture within their department, and the quality of the mentor.

Who the programme attracted

The quality of the programme was judged by the extent that it attracted high-quality applicants, some of whom may not otherwise have undertaken teaching at this time (particularly in schools serving lower decile communities).

The programme was successful in attracting high-quality applicants. Sixteen participants (6 percent of those who applied) were selected for the 2013 cohort from a pool of 261 who completed the online application, although the pilot allowed for 20. The programme aimed to attract high-calibre participants and targeted males, Māori, and Pasifika graduates. The participants were perceived by the evaluation team (based on the views of the different groups of people we talked to) to be high calibre and a quarter ($n = 4$) are Māori or Pasifika and a quarter ($n = 4$) are male. Nine were English majors, three te reo Māori, three mathematics, and one chemistry and science. Over half the participants had worked and/or travelled since leaving university, some of them in teaching or tutoring roles. Ten participants had already decided to become teachers (either now or at some point in the future), and half of this group had already been accepted for a traditional ITE programme. Two thirds chose the Teach First NZ programme in preference to 1-year graduate diplomas because this programme was presented as high challenge and because of its mission to help redress inequality by deliberately working in schools that serve low-decile communities with high populations of Māori and Pasifika students. The Teach First NZ recruitment and selection team has made adjustments for 2014 to target and recruit higher numbers of males, Māori and Pasifika participants, and more science majors.

The selection process

The selection process for the 2013 cohort was thorough and exacting. All those who had been involved in selection saw it as a key strength of the programme. Participants reported that they had found the selection process "thorough", "rigorous", and "intense", and were impressed with the professionalism of staff and the effort to seek out capable candidates with the best potential. Selectors' judgements appeared to be considered and sound. While the selection process was highly regarded, two people suggested improvements to the process, particularly for Māori and Pasifika candidates, and to assess cultural competence.

Summer Initial Intensive

We collected data to evaluate: how well the School Observation and Reflection (SOAR) tool prepared participants for their SII; to what extent the SII strengthened participants' motivation to teach in low-decile schools and strengthened their understandings of the cultures of their students and how to incorporate this understanding into their teaching; how well prepared participants felt to begin teaching; and to what degree the SII built a sense of connectedness within the cohort.

Participants reported that the SII had helped them to develop the mind-set they needed to teach in schools that serve low-decile communities. An emphasis at the SII was on developing cultural competence, and the te reo Māori VCS took a lead role in managing this aspect of the programme and the participants' involvement in it. The SII was seen to be intellectually stimulating by almost all participants and to have contributed to building strong relationships within the cohort and with the Teach First NZ partnership. Improvements participants suggested were more practical and pedagogical input regarding teaching their subject, more time in their host school before starting teaching, and more time practising teaching.

Retention rates

A successful retention rate for each 2-year cohort was set at 90 percent.

All of the 2013 cohort were still in the programme in November 2013, and all expected to complete their 2 years with a limited authority to teach (LAT). At this stage the majority of participants expect to stay in teaching beyond their 2-year placement, as they work towards full teacher registration. Three participants gave indications that they may not stay in teaching beyond the 2 years.

Programme factors

For the programme to be successful, it needs to: have a common clear vision of effective teaching which permeates course work and practice in schools; have a strong core curriculum; apply case methods and teacher research; allow participants to confront and rethink assumptions about learners; be judged by the participants as intellectually challenging and practically relevant.

The programme was seen by participants and the Teach First NZ partnership to be very responsive to participant needs. The clinics and intensives during the year, along with subject meetings, provided stimulus and input that reportedly revitalised participants. The SII established the parameters for a strong core curriculum and focused on challenging assumptions about learners. The university assignments were integrated into the school-based teaching components and applied case methods and teacher research. These approaches were maintained throughout the year with ongoing course work and assignments. A small number of participants commented on a lack of clarity in some assignments and course booklets. A requirement of the programme is for all participants to build a portfolio of evidence against the GTS and Registered Teacher Criteria (RTC). A central e-portfolio system had been established by the university in July; however, most participants chose to use established systems in schools (which vary widely) for evidence collection. School teaching staff would have liked more advance information about the year's programme schedule/timelines so they could support participants with what those teachers regarded as a heavy workload.

Support to participants from the Teach First NZ partnership

We evaluated the extent to which participants felt that their wellbeing has been important to Teach First NZ and that they are part of the Teach First NZ community. Overall, participants reported they felt very well supported by the Teach First NZ partnership team and by VCSs. The kaihapai (pastoral care) role was appreciated by participants. Opportunities for ongoing communication within the cohort were well established and well utilised by almost all participants. Participants in Northland felt very well supported by Teach First NZ, with liaison visits to Northland viewed as useful and timely. The Northland participants often had to travel long distances to take part in workshops and meetings, although Teach First NZ compensated for the financial cost and sometimes arranged meetings in North Auckland so that participants could more easily take part.

Support to participants from host schools

We assessed to what degree the quality of mentoring and school support enabled participants to be successful beginning teachers.

Overall, mentoring and school support was enabling participants to become successful beginning teachers. Schools, for the most part, welcomed and supported the participants as new members of staff. For the very few exceptions, participants had found ways to overcome any initial problems by the time we visited and were well integrated into the school and accepted and appreciated by staff.

The quality of the subject department in which the participant was placed was critical, both to the wellbeing of the participant and to the support they received in learning to teach. Host schools provided support to participants in different ways. Where a participant was in a strong department, as they were in the majority of cases, that department provided "wrap-around" support alongside the mentor. Co-ordinators in some schools provided pastoral care or subject-specific information to strengthen the mentoring that participants required. Participants in very small or less organised departments had less support in learning to teach, even with a good mentor, than participants placed in larger or well-organised departments.

Host schools' preparation for, and support in, their roles

We looked at the extent to which host schools thought the preparation and support for their roles by the partnership was high quality and how well supported they felt.

Principals reported that the Teach First NZ partnership had prepared them well for their roles in the programme. Within a small number of schools inadequate communication meant that a minority of departments were not well prepared for having a new staff member. Most co-ordinators felt well prepared, although in some schools the co-ordinator role was not established until after the participants had begun in the schools. Once-a-term co-ordinator meetings were appreciated, although difficult for Northland co-ordinators to attend. The majority of HoDs who were not also mentors felt well informed and were happy with the level of information and communication with the Teach First NZ partnership.

Mentor teachers

We reviewed to what degree mentor teachers were: well supported by the partnership; provided regular high-quality observation, mentoring and feedback to participants; and helped participants to become part of the wider school community.

Levels of mentor satisfaction with their support from the Teach First NZ partnership were mixed: half were very satisfied and the other half, while also generally satisfied, said they would have liked more direction about observations and expectations for participants. The mentor meetings twice a term provided valuable opportunities to learn what others were doing and to learn more about mentoring. A few mentors considered that mentor training should take more account of their previous experiences as mentors, and of other approaches to mentoring already operating in schools. This was particularly the case for some mentors who had pivotal roles in their school's Te Kotahitanga programme.

The quality of mentoring and the relationships between participant and mentor was variable. All mentors conducted observations of participants and provided feedback to them. Most mentors provided weekly observations, although in a very few cases observations were irregular or the feedback did not meet participants' needs. Sometimes this was a consequence of timetabling that we were told made it difficult for the mentor to meet with the participant or to conduct observations, or because the mentor was not in the same subject area as the participant. Where mentors were not in the same subject area, participants required subject-area support from additional sources. As this programme is reliant on school personnel to support participants to learn to teach the New Zealand curriculum, participants require strong mentoring in their subject area.

The mentor was pivotal in helping the participant become part of the wider school community. In a very few instances participants relied on the co-ordinator or another staff member to help with this integration into the school.

Visiting Curriculum Specialists

For the programme to work well, VCSs need to provide regular high-quality observation, mentoring, and feedback to participants. There should also be explicit links between the curriculum papers in the qualification and the feedback provided by the specialists in schools.

In some instances, the VCS feedback clearly showed the links to curriculum papers; in others, attention to immediate classroom practice was foregrounded, especially earlier in the year. Participants appreciated ongoing relationships with VCSs, as did most mentors. VCSs were seen to be very responsive to participants' needs. Co-ordinators appreciated receiving the summary statements from VCSs after observations. A small number of HoDs who were not mentors wanted more involvement with the VCS. A small number of participants found that VCSs provided different, and sometimes conflicting, advice to that provided by mentors, which left them unsure about whose advice to follow. A few participants said the VCS visits did not allow sufficient time for discussion. All VCSs really enjoyed their roles and thought the amount of time allocated to visiting was adequate. A number of participants commented positively on the learning for them during the formal observations conducted by the mentor and the VCS together.

Programme responsiveness

We looked for evidence that the programme was responsive to feedback from participants and participating schools.

Overall, the small size of the cohort and the considerable investment of staffing in the programme has made it possible for the programme to be very responsive to participant and school needs. Evaluations conducted regularly by the partnership and made available to the researchers provided ample opportunity for participants to have input into the programme and for programme staff to respond to these suggestions. Teach First NZ has been able to quickly accommodate requests for information and to arrange resources and information to suit individuals and groups. Participants reported that they had been very well supported by the Teach First NZ partnership when difficulties arose.

To what extent has the programme achieved its overall outcomes and objectives?

The second evaluation question looks at how well and to what extent the programme achieved its overall outcomes and objectives. To answer this question, the evaluation focused on: the effectiveness of participants' teaching, their level of support for the pastoral life of the school, the leadership development strand of the programme, the ongoing involvement and/or retention of participants, programme impact on quality of teaching and learning in participating schools, status of teaching, enablers and barriers to success, and alumni engagement. On the basis of the data we have collected so far, we can make some preliminary judgements about the 2013 cohort's teaching, engagement in the pastoral life of the schools, and leadership development.

Effectiveness of participants' teaching

To gauge the effectiveness of participants' teaching we evaluated the extent to which participants' students (particularly their Māori and Pasifika students) are engaged in learning, how well participants' teaching aligns with the Teach First NZ model, and student achievement.

Most of the cohort were perceived to be teaching as well or better than a 'typical' first-year provisionally registered teacher (PRT). In September, two of the 16 participants were reported by VCSs and school mentors to be finding the transition into teaching more difficult than the other participants. Extra support was being provided to them by the partnership and by their schools. All participants were enjoying positive relationships with some or all of their classes.

Participants were reported to be extremely hard working and resilient and in most cases to have 'won over' difficult classes. The NZCER survey *Me and My Class* was used to provide an indication of the extent to which students in participants' and similar classes experienced teaching strategies and reported their engagement. There was no statistically significant difference between participant and comparison classes at Year 9 or 10. Although we would caution against placing too much emphasis on the *Me and My School* survey results, there were indications that participants' Year 9 students may have been more engaged than students in comparison classes and more engaged than participants' Year 10 classes. Students in Year 10 comparison classes indicated greater engagement than students in participants' Year 10 classes. Students in participants' classes responded more positively to some items about teaching strategies. These tentative findings suggest that students report their engagement in participants' classes as similar to student engagement in classes taught by more experienced colleagues. There was evidence shown to us by some participants that NCEA or standardised (for example, e-asTTle) assessment results for participants' classes compared favourably with other classes, and this was endorsed by other staff members.

Support by participants for pastoral life of school

This evaluative criterion relates to the expectation that participants will contribute positively to wider school activities.

In their first year, participants have been cautious about becoming involved in too many activities outside of teaching. At the same time, they are seen by school staff to be very well integrated into the schools and to be supporting sports and cultural events and activities, staff professional learning and development (PLD), and homework and NCEA revision centres.

Leadership development strand

The leadership development strand is a key element of the programme. The aim is to produce teachers who will, in the long term, provide "a network of leaders in education and across all fields, who are committed to addressing educational inequality". In the first year participants are expected to demonstrate effective leadership of students. We assessed the extent to which participants were demonstrating this leadership.

Almost all participants were showing leadership in the classroom, with some also taking strong leadership roles within their department. Participants in two schools were expected to take responsibility for a tutor/form class, while others shared the responsibility. For the most part, participants reported enjoying this role, although a few reported they were left to cope on their own, without additional support and guidance. Principals and co-ordinators reported that all participants were having a positive impact on the school, particularly in their departments. Participants' content knowledge, the resources they developed and shared, their facility with technology, and their attitude towards wanting to do the best for all students were all seen to make a valued contribution to the school.

3.   Methodology

Purpose and scope of the evaluation

This evaluation's main purpose is to understand how well the programme has been implemented and to what extent it has achieved its objectives.

 This evaluation is designed to provide timely and relevant information to:

- support decision making about ongoing implementation of the programme

- develop a deeper understanding of alternative pathways into the teaching profession, particularly pathways for talented potential teachers entering the teaching profession

- generate learning about effective approaches to aspects of ITE

- understand the effectiveness of the programme in terms of its stated immediate, medium-, and long-term aims.

More broadly the evaluation will contribute to national and international understandings of ways to prepare knowledgeable and effective teachers who are able to have positive effects on students' motivation and engagement, and ultimately on outcomes, consequences, and results.

The purpose of the evaluation is not to compare the quality or effectiveness (impact on student learning outcomes) of the graduates of the pilot programme with other "alternative" or "traditional" ITE programmes in New Zealand. It also does not cover comparisons with the recently announced Exemplary Models of Postgraduate ITE programmes. Further, value for money is not within scope for this programme evaluation.

Key evaluation questions

The key evaluation questions are:

1. How well (effectively and efficiently) has the programme been implemented?

2. To what extent has the programme achieved its overall outcomes and objectives?

The Ministry developed a list of indicative subquestions for both of these questions, which we used as a starting point to confirm the evaluation scope, focus, and design. These are shown in Appendix 1. Note that these subquestions were not transferred verbatim into the evaluation plan but were significant in guiding the approach agreed between NZCER and the Ministry.

Evaluation approach

Between April and June 2013 the evaluation team developed an evaluation plan, based on our reading of the international literature on similar Teach First sister programmes (which are independent programmes but part of the global Teach For All network), interviews with key stakeholders (the Ministry, Teachers Council, PPTA, Teach First NZ partnership), and review of the available material on Teach First NZ.

We developed evaluation criteria and possible data sources to address each of the key evaluation questions. This approach was endorsed by the partnership. The first evaluation question addresses how well the programme has been implemented from the perspectives of Teach First NZ participants, host school teachers, and Faculty staff and is the focus of this report. The second evaluation question concerns impact and will be addressed more fully in subsequent reports. Table 1 sets out the evaluation criteria for evaluation question one.

Table 1 **Evaluation question one, evaluation criteria, and data sources for 2013**

Key evaluation question	Specific areas for investigation	Evaluation criteria	Data sources
How well (effectively and efficiently) has the programme been implemented?	Who the programme attracts	Programme attracts high-calibre participants, some of whom may not otherwise have undertaken teaching (particularly in schools serving lower decile communities) at this time.	Document analysis (i.e., candidate applications (with permission); candidate academic records; interviews
	Retention rates	Retention rate for the 2 years is 90 percent.	Programme records
	SII	SOAR prepared participants well for their SII. SII strengthened participants' motivation to teach in low-decile schools. SII strengthened participants' understandings of the cultures of their students and how to incorporate this understanding into their teaching. Participants felt well prepared to begin teaching. SII built a sense of "connectedness" within the cohort.	Data collected by Teach First NZ staff during and after the SII Participant interviews Programme personnel interviews
	Programme factors	There is a common clear vision of effective teaching. The vision permeates course work and practice in schools. There is a strong core curriculum. The programme uses case methods and teacher research. Participants confront and rethink assumptions about learners. Participants judge the course work to be intellectually challenging and practically relevant.	Document analysis (for example, programme resources and documents) Interviews with participants, programme and school personnel (mentors, co-ordinators, principals, HoDs, PPTA representatives, and other staff members in participants' departments)

Key evaluation question	Specific areas for investigation	Evaluation criteria	Data sources
	Support to participants from Teach First NZ programme	Participants feel that their wellbeing has been important to Teach First NZ. Participants feel that they are part of the Teach First NZ community.	Interviews with participants Surveys of participants' Year 9 or 10 class and comparison class Surveys of all interviewees as follow-up at end of 2 years
	Support to participant from host school Host schools are well prepared for, and supported in, their roles	The quality of mentoring and school support has enabled participants to be successful beginning teachers. Host schools rate their preparation and support for their roles as high quality. Host schools feel well supported by the partnership.	Document analysis (participant, school staff records, minutes of mentoring meetings, resources, etc.) Interviews with school personnel (mentors, co-ordinators, principals, HoDs, PPTA representatives, and other staff members in participants' departments) Participant interviews
	Mentor teachers	Mentor teachers provide regular high-quality observation, mentoring, and feedback to participants. Mentor teachers are well supported by the partnership. Mentors help participants to become part of the wider school community.	Document analysis Interviews with mentors Interviews with participants
	VCSs	VCSs provide regular high-quality observation, mentoring, and feedback to participants. There are explicit links between the curriculum papers in the qualification and the feedback provided by the specialists in schools.	Document analysis (for example, programme resources and documents; participant records) Interviews with VCSs Interviews with participants Interviews with school personnel (mentors, co-ordinators, principals, HoDs, PPTA representatives, and other staff members in participants' departments)
	Programme responsiveness	The programme has evidence of its responsiveness to feedback from participants and participating schools.	Document analysis Interviews with participants, school personnel, (mentors, co-ordinators, principals, HoDs, PPTA representatives, and other staff members in participants' departments), programme personnel Surveys of all interviewees as follow-up at end of 2 years

The second key (higher order) evaluation question focuses on the impact of the programme. It calls for a summative focus and an impact or outcomes evaluation. The programme, however, has not been established long enough at this stage for impact to be estimated. Table 2 identifies the evaluation criteria and data sources that will be addressed in this report. It does not cover all of the criteria related to this question.

Table 2 **Evaluation question two and intended data sources**

Key evaluation question	Specific areas for investigation	Evaluation criteria	Data sources
To what extent has the Teach First NZ programme achieved its overall outcomes and objectives?	Effectiveness of participants' teaching	There is high engagement of students, especially Māori and Pasifika. Teaching aligns with Teach First NZ model.	*Me and My Class* survey administered to participants' Year 9 or 10 class and comparison class Document analysis from mentor feedback to participants (from, for example, mentor teachers, VCSs) Interviews with mentors, VCSs, other teachers in same department as the participant, and school principals
	Support by participants for pastoral life of school	Participants contribute positively to wider school activities.	Interviews with school personnel Interviews with participants
	Leadership development strand	Participants demonstrate effective leadership of students in the first year.	Document analysis (feedback from lesson observations) Examination of the participants' projects Interviews with Teach First NZ and school personnel.

The key aim of the evaluation in 2013 has been to ascertain how well the Teach First NZ programme has been implemented. We chose a mixed-methods design, collecting both quantitative and qualitative data.

We employed three main sources of data collection: document analysis, interviews with key personnel in schools (including participants, mentors, co-ordinators, HoDs, principals and other teachers in the school including PPTA representatives) and with the Teach First NZ partnership and the Faculty (including VCSs and academic staff), and an NZCER online survey (*Me and My Class*) administered to students. Qualitative data from site visits and interviews were used to develop deeper understanding of processes, including the factors that enhanced or hindered the effectiveness of programme implementation. Interview questions were based on the evaluation criteria. Quantitative data from surveys were used to measure student engagement and student perceptions of participants' pedagogical approaches compared with comparison Year 9 or 10 classes. We also spent a day observing an Assessment Centre (selection day).

Document analysis

We were provided with copies of:

- anonymised information about participants, including some of the material they provided during recruitment

- recruitment and selection material, including Assessment Centre protocols

- programme description and course outlines, including assessments

- participants' portfolio material—material towards meeting the GTS and the RTC (online and hard copy)

- anonymised participants' evaluations of aspects of the programme (for example SII)

- material provided by Teach First NZ to schools

- written observations and feedback from school-based mentors and faculty-based VCSs

- participants' folders containing lesson plans, copies of student work, assessments, and assessment results that were examined during field visits.

We had asked that participants provide us with their documentation towards meeting the GTS and RTC and towards completing their university work. What we saw was very varied in its content and volume. All participants showed us their observations and feedback. The material provided by some of the first participants we visited alerted us to other documents we should request.

Site visits

A typical finding of evaluation studies is that, as well as the overall effect of the intervention, there is variance in impact between different settings and Participants.[3]

Secondary schools are very different from each other, even when they are situated near each other and have similar student populations. Therefore, it was important to visit all sites in 2013 and to interview all participants and the people they worked closely with. We visited the nine schools between 30 August and 26 September, spending 1–2 days in each school. In most schools we were given a tour and saw the office and classroom spaces used by participants. We attended early-morning staff briefings in six schools.

Interviews with school personnel

Interviews provide teacher/leader self-reports and could potentially be a design weakness because of the potential for bias or lack of shared understanding of the purpose of interview questions. To mitigate against this, we asked interviewees the same questions so that responses from a variety of people about aspects of the programme could be triangulated to check the validity of claims from different perspectives. The questions that were common across all interviewees related to Teach First NZ goals and mission; communication between Teach First NZ and the school; the participant's placement in a department and their relationships with their mentor, other staff members, and students; and the impact that the participant was having in the classroom and in the school.

At each site we interviewed participants, mentors, co-ordinators, HoDs, principals, and other teachers in the school including PPTA officeholders. Where a staff member had more than one role, for example, HoD and mentor, we conducted one interview. The interview schedules are attached as Appendix 2. These were structured interviews and took place face-to-face and on site.[4] The interviews typically lasted 45–60 minutes (although interviews with participants often took longer). They were audio-taped and the audio tapes filed as a check for veracity. The tapes were not transcribed.

Interviews with Teach First NZ and University of Auckland personnel

In September and October we interviewed the four Teach First NZ partnership staff, four VCSs[5] (two of these are Faculty staff), and four Faculty lecturers from the Graduate Diploma of Teaching (Secondary) who teach in the subject areas that the participants are teaching (science, mathematics, and English). These lecturers were chosen because of their experience in ITE and to ascertain their

---

[3] Muijs, D., Collins, A., & Armstrong, P. (2010). *Maximum impact evaluation: The impact of Teach First teachers in schools.* Manchester: Manchester University.

[4] One participant was ill at the time of our visit to his school and so was interviewed at the home of an interviewer.

[5] There were six VCSs. One other VCS was interviewed as a partnership staff member and the sixth, who was at the time of our site visit, a mentor teacher, was interviewed using the mentor teacher interview schedule.

views on the Teach First NZ programme. The interview schedule is attached as Appendix 3. These were structured interviews and took place by phone (two) and face to face (six). Interviews were recorded but not transcribed. Interviewers took notes by hand and then transferred their notes to a Google spreadsheet.

All together we conducted 92 interviews.

Table 3 **Interviewees August–October 2013**

Interviewee	Number interviewed
Participant	16
Principal	9
Co-ordinator	8 (one co-ordinator was also the principal)
Mentor	16 (some participants had more than one mentor and one mentor was mentor to two participants; some mentors are also HoDs or co-ordinators)
HoD	10 (many HoDs were also mentors, co-ordinators, or PPTA office holders)
Other teachers in the school, including PPTA office holders	21
Teach First NZ partnership personnel	4
VCSs	4
Faculty staff not involved in the Teach First NZ programme	4
Total	92

Survey administration

The *Me and My Class* is a survey[6] designed by NZCER for Years 4 to Year 13 students. It explores students' perspectives on learning in their classroom. The *Me and My Class* survey has two sections:

- Me and My Class: The first section has 24 questions that explore students' views on the extent to which learning opportunities in their class reflect effective teaching pedagogy.

- Me in My Class: This section contains 10 questions that explore students' personal responses to learning in their class.

The survey was administered by NZCER's Products and Services Assessment Team in September, 8 months after participants began teaching. We obtained results from the *Me and My Class* survey for 13 of the 16 participants (seven out of nine schools) for a Year 9 or 10 class taught by the participant and a comparison class (a class at the same year level and, where possible, taught by another teacher in the same department). Ideally the comparison teacher would have been a PRT, however in most cases comparison teachers were fully registered teachers and had considerably more teaching experience than the participant. Evaluators administered *Me and My Class* surveys with four classes in the first school (approximately 20 students in each class: two Year 9 and two Year 10 classes) as this visit occurred before the survey was available online.

---

6   The survey is attached as Appendix 4.

Analysis of data

Documentation

The programme documentation helped us more fully understand the intentions of the pilot programme and how the different components fitted together over the initial year of its implementation.

The observation and feedback documents supplied by participants and, in some instances, by mentors or co-ordinators, were intended to provide an overall sense of the approach taken by mentors and VCSs to supporting the participant through regular and ongoing observations of the same classes. We did not analyse these documents in relation to whether or not the participant was making the desired progress, or whether each mentor and VCS was following a similar approach. Our aim was to ascertain the extent to which the frequent observations (once a week suggested for mentors and up to 15 times a year for VCSs) were providing the support the participants or their mentors told us they needed. The university set up an online portfolio for participants to track progress towards meeting the GTS and RTC in July. Some participants also shared their lesson planning, assessments and assessment results, and student work with us. Again, these documents helped us get a sense of participants' emerging understanding of teaching, but we did not evaluate the quality of their work.

Site visits

At the end of the nine site visits, the three researchers involved created a table of key findings against the evaluation criteria under the headings 'strengths', 'issues', and 'potential recommendations', based on our observations made during the visits and the interviews. This table was used to provide an informal briefing for the Ministry and to shape this annual report.

Interviews with school personnel

Interviews were recorded but not transcribed. Interview data were recorded on a Google spreadsheet according to the interview questions. The spreadsheet was converted to Excel and a statistician and the research assistant worked with two of the researchers to code the information and identify key themes by role and by school. These themes were written up as a MS Word document and the findings triangulated with the summary table. An analysis of the data by role recorded under each heading yielded the most useful information; analysis by school did not yield any additional information.

Interviews with Faculty and Teach First NZ staff

Interviews with four Teach First NZ staff and four VCSs were summarised on a Google spreadsheet. Interview data from four Faculty staff who teach in the Graduate Diploma of Teaching were recorded on a separate spreadsheet. We were able to analyse responses to the questions that were relevant for all 12 interviewees and compare these data to data derived from participants and school personnel.

4.   Evaluation question one: How well (effectively and efficiently) has the programme been implemented?

Key findings

The programme was, in general, successfully implemented, with the Teach First NZ partnership being seen to provide timely and responsive support to participants and schools. The rigorous selection process and the high calibre of the 2013 cohort were seen by the evaluation team (based on the views of the different groups of people we talked to) to be major strengths of the programme. School principals and co-ordinators spoke highly of the Teach First NZ partnership staff. Where there were any issues, reported by a minority of schools during the year, these appeared to relate, for the most part, to in-school issues (including inadequate communication between some personnel). To a large extent, variations in implementation depended on the clarity of internal school communications about the Teach First NZ programme, the suitability of organisational arrangements, including timetabling, and the placement of the participant (for example, whether located in the same department as their mentor), the learning culture within their department, and the quality of the mentor.

This chapter provides an overview of the 2013 cohort and provides evidence for the evaluation criteria for evaluation question one, following the same order as the key findings. Evaluation question two is answered in the following chapter.

The 2013 cohort

Teach First NZ reported that they accepted six percent of the people who applied for the programme. For 2013, Teach First NZ considered that 16 of the participants out of the 261 who applied were suitable to begin the programme in 2013. (One other deferred the start date for family reasons.) The participants were placed in seven deciles 1–2 and two decile 3 schools. Two schools are in Northland (Okaihau College and Tikipunga High School), one is in East Auckland (Tamaki College), and six are in South Auckland (Alfriston College, Mangere College, Papatoetoe College, Tangaroa College, Sir Edmund Hilary Collegiate School, and Southern Cross Campus). Two participants were placed in each of these schools, except for Okaihau College and Southern Cross Campus, each of which has one participant. Twelve of the participants are female, two are Māori (one male, one female), and two are Pasifika (both female). Nine participants teach English, three teach te reo Māori (one of these also has an English class), three teach mathematics, and one teaches chemistry and science.

Who the programme attracted

The quality of the programme was judged by the extent that it attracted high-quality applicants, some of whom may not otherwise have undertaken teaching at this time (particularly in schools serving lower decile communities).

Key findings. The programme was successful in attracting high-quality applicants. Sixteen participants (6 percent of those who applied) were selected for the 2013 cohort from a pool of 261 who completed the online application, although the pilot allowed for 20. The programme aimed to attract high-calibre participants and targeted males, Māori, and Pasifika graduates. The participants were perceived by the evaluation team (based on the views of the different groups of people we talked to) to be high calibre and a quarter ($n = 4$) are Māori or Pasifika and a quarter ($n = 4$) are male. Nine were English majors, three te reo Māori, three mathematics, and one chemistry and science. Over half the participants had worked and/or travelled since leaving university, some of them in teaching or tutoring roles. Ten participants had already decided to become teachers (either now or at some point in the future), and half of this group had already been accepted for a traditional ITE programme. Two thirds chose the Teach First NZ programme in preference to 1-year graduate diplomas because this programme was presented as high challenge, and because of its mission to help redress inequality by deliberately working in schools that serve low-decile communities with high populations of Māori and Pasifika students. The Teach First NZ recruitment and selection team has made adjustments for 2014 to target and recruit higher numbers of males, Māori and Pasifika participants, and more science majors.

Participants had heard about Teach First NZ through a number of avenues:

- Five heard by word of mouth from family and friends.

- Six learned about it online either while looking for jobs, courses, and scholarships or through news articles.

- One saw a noticeboard poster.

- Two received emails specifically about the programme from their university and from Teach First NZ.

- Two were on summer internships at one of Teach First NZ's partner organisations and were approached by the Teach First NZ recruitment director.

- One saw a presentation by Teach First NZ at a University Māori club.

Of the 16 participants in this cohort, 10 had already applied for, or were intending to go into, a graduate diploma programme either now or at some point in the future. However, they were attracted to the Teach First NZ option by the challenge of an intensive programme and the specific mission to address inequities in outcomes for disadvantaged students, or because it was better aligned with their personal circumstances or philosophy. Three valued the opportunity for "on the job" training, and three told us that the financial incentive of employment was an important consideration. Three specifically mentioned the leadership aspect of the programme. Four participants would have opted for further study in other fields if they had not been accepted for the programme. Two had not intended to go teaching at all until they heard about this programme.

Teach First NZ places five key expectations on participants:

1. Completion of the SII (the final stage of the selection process), including:

   - attending all compulsory SII sessions and events

   - actively contributing to their own learning, reflection, and the learning of others

   - completing all tasks, written assignments, and reflections to the required standard

   - attending and participating successfully in practicum, observations, and teaching in schools

   - demonstrating the potential to meet the GTS

   - being respectful of the SII learning process, environment, and facilities.

2. Employment in the host school. It is expected that participants remain employed full time in the same school throughout the 2 years of the programme. (While employed/paid full time they are expected to teach a 0.6 FTE timetable.)

3. Completion of the teaching qualification.

4. Completion of the Teach First NZ leadership development strand.

5. Working within Teach First NZ's core values:

   - integrity/te ngākau pono

   - respect/te whakaute

   - partnership/te mahi ngātahi

   - continuous learning/te ako mā te whakaaroaro

   - resilience/te manawanui me te ū

   - excellence/te kairangitanga

If participants are unable to fulfil one or more of these expectations, policies and procedures to support or remove them apply. Participants sign a "commitment agreement" when they are offered a place in the programme.

Most school and university-based interviewees commented favourably on the calibre of the participants. Two of the principals described the participants as "young stars" and "top grads". Another told us that "Hard working teachers are an asset in every school and they are certainly that." The high calibre of the 2013 participants appeared to be one of the key factors in the success of the programme. Participants are all perceived by Teach First NZ and school personnel to have personal qualities, such as resilience and openness to learning, to be hard working, and to have excellent subject knowledge. Participants were seen by school leadership teams to be "cherry-picked" and as bringing a high level of skill and knowledge to their preparation as teachers:

> *These teachers are quality. Quality equals commitment to work, to kids, flexibility of mind to realise when things are going wrong, to find solutions and they care.* (Teacher in the same department as the participant)

> *We [New Zealand society] have always underestimated the desire of young people to make a difference—the strength of Teach First NZ is it taps into the energy of youth.* (Teach First NZ staff member)

A majority of respondents to a question asking how the participants compared to graduate diploma student teachers described the participants they had been associated with favourably. School staff commented on their passion, their intellectual rigour, their ability to reflect, and their ability to make rapid progress as teachers. A VCS described the difference between the participants and other

student teachers as "their [participants'] ability to take feedback on board, a sense of strong urgency to want to change, to learn—this is consistently high and there's more variability in [the traditional graduate programme]".

Several people told us that the calibre of 1-year secondary graduate diploma students had been very high in recent years, and that they displayed similar attributes to the participants.

Participants were seen by some school personnel to have clear advantages over other student teachers and some PRTs in having a very clear focus on why they were teaching and their desire to reduce inequality for Māori and Pasifika students and students from schools that serve low-decile communities. Their sense of mission and their values were seen to derive from a genuine desire to understand students from culturally diverse communities and to want them to achieve. A VCS said that the participants accepted students for "who they were and aimed to improve their life choices, not to change who they were".

> *[Participants] are the biggest winners. Intensive hours of support from the VCS, the school, the intensives, very strong collegiality, a very caring unit of participants. They're learning to be adaptive experts more quickly [than other new teachers] because of the support. (VCS)*

Retention rates

A successful retention rate for the 2 years was set at 90 percent.

Key findings. All of the 2013 cohort were still in the programme in November 2013, all expected to complete their 2 years with a LAT. At this stage the majority of participants expect to stay in teaching beyond their 2-year placement, as they work towards full teacher registration. Three participants gave indications that they may not stay in teaching beyond the 2 years.

All participants expected to complete their 2 years as a teacher with a LAT. Of the three who indicated they will probably not stay in schools after the 2-year programme, two thought they might be overseas and one did not feel the length of time required to work towards full registration had been adequately explained, reporting that she was not alone in expecting that they were to have been employed as PRTs rather than as LATs and that they would have gained full registration after 2 years.

Over half of the participants saw themselves teaching in the long term; two said they would return to teaching after seeking other experiences; three had varying intentions, including a 5-year plan for teaching, teaching overseas, and uncertainty over being away from family in the long term. One had not planned to be teaching long term but was open to considering it now given how much she valued the experience.

The selection process

Key findings. The selection process for the 2013 cohort was thorough and exacting. All those who had been involved in selection saw it as a key strength of the programme. Participants reported that they had found the selection process "thorough", "rigorous", and "intense", and were impressed with the professionalism of staff and the effort to seek out capable candidates with the best potential. Selectors' judgements appeared to be considered and sound. While the selection process was highly regarded, two people suggested improvements to the process, particularly for Māori and Pasifika candidates, and to assess cultural competence.

The selection process was seen by all parties to be one of the major strengths of the programme. The process consists of an online application, a phone interview for those candidates who met the selection criteria, an Assessment Centre, and the SII. The Assessment Centre involves candidates in group activities, two interviews, a short teaching demonstration, and a self-reflection exercise. The Centre borrows some elements from the Teach First (UK) selection process but is adapted for the New Zealand context.

The participants reported that they had found the selection process "thorough", "rigorous", and "intense", and were impressed with the professionalism of staff and the effort to seek out capable candidates with the best potential. Two participants who were recruited from another city were impressed that Teach First NZ was prepared to pay for their airfares and accommodation so that they could attend the Assessment Centre. They saw this as reflecting Teach First NZ's commitment to selecting "the right people" for the programme.

The two NZCER observers were also impressed with the design of the selection activities and with the smooth organisation of the day. We also saw scope for development of the selection process, including the involvement of initial teacher educators who currently teach on secondary teacher education programmes[7] and for further developing the assessment rubrics.

Two interviewees made suggestions for improving selection, especially in relation to recruiting Māori and Pasifika and assessing applicants' cultural competence. One of these reported that selection for 2014 had been adapted from the 2013 process to better recruit Māori and Pasifika.

Mentors, HoDs, and other staff also noted the rigorous selection process, the opportunity to place quality teachers in schools that serve low-decile communities, and the quality of the participants. In the very few cases where there was concern about a participant, it was often the match between the participant and the department rather than the selection of the participant that influenced teachers' views of them.

Summer Initial Intensive

We collected data to use to evaluate: how well the SOAR tool prepared participants for their SII; to what degree the SII strengthened participants' motivation to teach in low-decile schools and strengthened their understandings of the cultures of their students and how to incorporate this understanding into their teaching; how well prepared participants felt to begin teaching; and to what degree the SII built a sense of connectedness within the cohort.

Key findings. Participants reported that the SII had helped them to develop the mind-set they needed to teach in schools that serve low-decile communities. An emphasis at the SII was on developing cultural competence, and the te reo Māori VCS took a lead role in managing this aspect of the programme and the participants' involvement in it. The SII was seen to be intellectually stimulating by almost all participants and to have contributed to building strong relationships within the cohort and with the Teach First NZ partnership. Improvements participants suggested were: more practical and pedagogical input regarding teaching their subject, more time in their host school before starting, and more time practising teaching.

---

[7] Though there were none involved on the day we attended, the Teach First NZ partnership reports that Teach First NZ and the Faculty always have an equal number of representative staff on selection panels. The university representatives are drawn from the group of people who interview for the Graduate Diploma in Teaching (Secondary), along with the Director of Secondary Teacher Education.

Intellectual challenge

We asked the participants a number of questions about the SII. We wanted to know the extent to which the SII had been intellectually challenging, because challenge was one of the things that attracted participants to the programme. While many participants described the summer programme as "challenging" and even "exhausting", this was often associated with the intensity of the programme, and the "live-in" delivery. Participants described a sense of intellectual stimulation and encouragement, with many ideas being presented at once and needing to be applied to practical situations. The live-in format, while seemingly increasing the intensity, also offered collegial support, with four participants referring to the importance of the positive group dynamics.

Understanding cultures

Teach First NZ staff, the SII timetable, and participant responses indicated that cultural competence was a clear focus of the SII, although we are not clear at this stage how much the SII contributed to participants' cultural competence as we observed it, and how much could be attributed to other aspects of the programme and to the participants themselves. The te reo Māori VCS and the three participants who teach te reo Māori appear to have played an important leadership role for other participants.

Preparation for teaching

The SII was seen by mentors to have contributed to developing the mind-set required to begin teaching in schools that serve low-decile communities. A third of the school co-ordinators and mentors commented that compared with someone who had been on practicum in a range of schools and brought a range of classroom experiences to their teaching position, participants had little prior experience to draw on to begin teaching. These mentors and co-ordinators said that participants needed more practical classroom experience and knowledge about planning and "pitching a lesson" before they began teaching. The inability to "pitch" lessons was seen to be the main cause of classroom management issues.

The quality of the SII lecturers and an understanding that they would "not be alone" and would have the support of mentors, other staff, and their own cohort, contributed to building participants' self-confidence. A few participants commented that the intensity of the live-in part of the course was itself good preparation for the intensity of teaching. Practical sessions, and especially the 'summer school' week[8] spent teaching students, were viewed as particularly helpful, although less so for those who taught a subject for which they had no post-school study, and which they would not be teaching once in a school.

Almost half the participants reported that they would have liked more subject-specific preparation before they began teaching, and a quarter identified the need for more preparation for classroom management and practical components, as well as expected administrative tasks. A small minority of participants commented that the SII did not take account of the prior knowledge and experience that they already had as teachers. In fact, at least four participants had had teaching experience overseas or at tertiary level.

Connectedness

A strong sense of connectedness (among participants) was reported by almost all participants, which was in part attributed to the live-in component of the programme.

---

[8] The Teach First NZ partnership co-ordinates a 1-week 'summer school' in early January, when groups of secondary-school-aged students (usually from Teach First NZ partner schools) participate in a week of structured lessons taught by Teach First NZ participants, during the SII.

Improvements

We asked participants what improvements they thought could be made to the SII. The following improvements were suggested:

- more practical guidance

- more subject-specific preparation

- more time with students and learning about classroom and behaviour management.

The programme works with schools to develop curriculum content knowledge and subject-specific pedagogy (pedagogical content knowledge), and there were indications that about a third of the departments did not appear to be doing this well. The participants also recognised that while the programme aims to cover theory and practical training and advice, not everything could be assimilated at once, and the reality of being in a classroom was expected by most to be "somewhat tough".

Programme factors

For the programme to be successful, it needs to: have a common clear vision of effective teaching which permeates course work and practice in schools; have a strong core curriculum; apply case methods and teacher research; allow participants to confront and rethink assumptions about learners; be judged by the participants as intellectually challenging and practically relevant.

Key findings. The programme was seen by participants and the Teach First NZ partnership to be very responsive to participant needs. The clinics and intensives during the year, along with subject meetings, provided stimulus and input that reportedly revitalised participants. The SII established the parameters for a strong core curriculum and focused on challenging assumptions about learners. The university assignments were integrated into the school-based teaching components and applied case methods and teacher research. These approaches were maintained throughout the year with ongoing course work and assignments. A small number of participants commented on a lack of clarity in some assignments and course booklets. A requirement of the programme is for all participants to build a portfolio of evidence against the GTS and RTC. A central e-portfolio system had been established by the university in July, however most participants chose to use established systems in schools (which vary widely) for evidence collection. School teaching staff would have liked more advance information about the year's programme schedule/timelines so they could support participants with what those teachers regarded as a heavy workload.

This section focuses on those programme components that the Teach First NZ partnership controls or manages (as opposed to those aspects that the school determines, such as the participant's timetable), and is focused around delivery of the Faculty courses and related university assignments. Note that the SII is also included in this suite of courses but has been addressed earlier.

There is a strong and fluid partnership between the Faculty and Teach First NZ in relation to programme implementation. Whilst the programme leader developed and administers course materials and assignments for the postgraduate diploma, the SII, the clinics, the leadership component, and ongoing communication are very much shared responsibilities. We received copies of all course booklets and assignments from the Teach First NZ partnership. Our main sources of information about the delivery of these components of the programme were participants' documentation and school personnel interviews.

This section of the report also provides views about the Teach First NZ pilot programme from Faculty staff members who currently teach in the 1-year graduate programme. One interviewee summed up what a number of interviewees involved in the programme said:

> *This is not a better programme, it's a different way of doing things. Some students [on the traditional programme] wouldn't manage the workload or aren't driven by social conscience. The aim [of Teach First NZ] is to develop teachers with a strong social and moral approach to teaching and education. Leadership is part of the social 'conscientisation'.* (VCS)

There was some sense from partnership staff we interviewed that while it had been challenging to develop and deliver the courses in the time they had, they had been "totally implemented as planned" and that "implementation had exceeded hopes". The "tough but rigorous" approval process meant that there was not as much lead-in time for programme development as the team would have liked. That the programme delivery had gone well was considered to be due to:

- all parties involved (the Ministry, the schools, the partnership, and the participants) being committed to success

- the close-knit team at the heart of the delivery

- employment of the first cohort of participants as supernumerary.

The people centrally involved in the programme reported being very pleased with the way it had unfolded. One identified that its small size meant the programme is "not fixed in concrete so there is the ability to tailor it to individual needs". Because the course components (five inter-related university courses that cover the SII and the 2-year teaching practice) are aligned and integrated the staff could be responsive, and they reported continually making adjustments to the programme. The VCSs regularly met with the programme director to discuss upcoming events, such as clinics; visiting schools; participant case management; and to moderate assignment work. VCSs acknowledged that it could be tricky to ascertain if there were problems in schools, as participants were loyal to their mentor and the school and did not always report when they lacked resources or if other difficulties arose. To overcome this, it was felt that the VCSs needed to be proactive in talking to HoDs or mentors and reminding them of the specific support participants needed. A requirement of the programme is for all participants to build a portfolio of evidence against the GTS and RTC. A central e-portfolio system had been established by the university in July, however most participants chose to use established systems in schools (which vary widely) for evidence collection.

Participants told us that the quality of the lecturers, the connectedness of the cohort, and the ongoing feedback were the strengths of the programme. Four staff in schools commented on the integration of study and practical work experience as being "like an apprenticeship". Other staff in almost all schools expressed concerns about the expectations placed on the participants, including the workload in terms of time spent on observations and meetings. The staff responses suggested that some teachers not directly involved had not been well informed about the Teach First NZ programme, which left room for some misunderstanding or negativity.

For others in less central roles, communication had been a weakness, especially in relation to the bigger picture and how the different components fitted together. They acknowledged that this was true of any new programme when starting from scratch. They would have liked programme schedules and timelines, assignments, and information that hadn't been readily available. Many of the Teach First NZ staff, the VCSs, and the school personnel identified the intensity of the programme and its demands, with one summing this up as "when you see a participant who is fantastic, it is all worth the effort".

We interviewed four Faculty staff members in English, mathematics, and science who teach on the secondary graduate programme but not on the Teach First NZ programme. It appeared that only one initial teacher educator from those (subject) departments was involved in the Teach First NZ programme, however a number of other Faculty staff contributed to the programme. These four Faculty staff had three main observations:

- They indicated they had a lack of knowledge about the programme and lack of involvement despite feeling their expertise was important in preparing participants to teach the New Zealand curriculum.

- On the basis of the limited knowledge they had about the programme, they expressed the view that participants had insufficient opportunities before they started teaching to develop necessary subject content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge, or enough opportunities during the year to increase this knowledge.

- They did not accept that there is currently a demonstrated need for the Teach First NZ programme. They reported that there is no longer any shortage of teachers and considered that schools that serve low-decile communities are not currently having difficulty attracting "good applicants". They reported that the student teachers on the 1-year graduate programme were also of very high calibre, with many of them having very good subject qualifications.

Support to participants from the Teach First NZ partnership

We assessed the extent to which participants felt that their wellbeing has been important to Teach First NZ and that they are part of the Teach First NZ community.

Key findings. Overall, participants reported they felt very well supported by the Teach First NZ partnership team and by VCSs. The kaihapai (pastoral care) role was appreciated by participants. Opportunities for ongoing communication within the cohort were well established and well utilised by most participants. Participants in Northland felt very well supported by Teach First NZ, with liaison visits to Northland viewed by participants as useful and timely. The Northland participants often had to travel long distances to take part in workshops and meetings, although Teach First NZ compensated for the financial cost and sometimes arranged meetings in North Auckland so that participants could more easily take part.

All participants from Teach First NZ reported being well supported by Teach First NZ. This extended from their very first contact through the recruitment and selection processes, leading up to and through the SII, and during the school year. Participants valued the ongoing support they received from the kaihapai (the Teach First NZ person with overall responsibility for pastoral care), the programme leader, their VCS, liaison visiting lecturers, and from each other through the networks established by Teach First NZ. This wrap-around support was particularly appreciated by the participants in Northland who benefited from timely liaison visits and financial support with travel. Support for all participants was both structured and regular and also able to be responsive and flexible. The small size of the cohort and the geographical proximity of most of the participants as well as the investment of Teach First NZ staff enabled this flexibility. Workshops and clinics during the year were welcomed by participants as opportunities to debrief, reconnect, and re-energise.

Support to participants from host schools

We assessed to what degree the quality of mentoring and school support enabled participants to be successful beginning teachers.

Key findings. Overall, mentoring and school support enabled participants to become successful beginning teachers. Schools, for the most part, welcomed and supported the participants as new members of staff. For the very few exceptions, participants had found ways to overcome any initial problems by the time we visited and were well integrated into the school and accepted and appreciated by staff. The quality of the subject department in which the participant was placed was critical, both to the wellbeing of the participant and to the support they received in learning to teach. Host schools provided support to participants in different ways. Where a participant was in a strong department, as was in the majority of cases, that department provided "wrap-around" support alongside the mentor. Co-ordinators in some schools provided pastoral care or subject-specific information to strengthen the mentoring that participants required. Participants placed in very small or less organised departments had less support in learning to teach, even with a good mentor, than participants in larger or well-organised departments.

Participants' orientation to school

The large majority of the participants (14 of 16) were positive about their orientation experience, with five having previously been to the school they were assigned to as part of their SOAR visits.[9] Others made contact themselves either by visiting or by email following initial contact by the principal. Those who joined in teacher only/orientation days for new staff were able to meet their mentors and other staff, as well as to get basic information about the school and procedures, including some guiding documentation such as the Positive Behaviour for Learning (PB4L) booklet, prospectus, charter, etc. This initial contact was reported to make beginning at the school easier for these participants, and they were mostly treated like any new staff member. Principals made a conscious effort not to introduce participants as special or different. For the vast majority of staff they were seen as another PRT. Principals' approaches to consulting with departments about the feasibility and implications of employing a participant varied—some principals solicited departmental views while others made the decision without input from their staff. Three participants reported less positive introductions to their school because of lack of communication within the school and/or staffing difficulties.

Quality of school support for participant

Four things stood out as being crucial for participant success:

- the capability of the mentor and quality of the mentoring relationship

- a timetable that allowed participants and mentors to work together

- the assignment of participants to classes that were likely to respond well to them[10]

- a well-functioning subject department.[11]

---

[9] Teach First NZ arranged for all participants to have a 2-day visit to a secondary school before the SII began in Auckland.

[10] This aspect is discussed in the following chapter.

[11] This aspect is discussed in the section concerning mentor teachers.

A supportive, caring, and knowledgeable mentor appeared to be critical to the participants' professional development and their wellbeing. Participants who were most positive about mentoring reported that their mentor was in the same department and was able to support them through team teaching, joint planning, and inclusion in PLD. This, they felt, was just as important as weekly observations and feedback which could leave participants wanting more continuity and overall support. Mentors acknowledged the importance of their role and the relationship with participants, but were also conscious of workload issues.

Timetabling appeared critical in the efficacy of the programme for both participants and school staff. In situations where a suitable timetable was provided, participants reported being able to observe mentors and other teachers, having time to study, sharing classes and tutor groups, and taking a variety of classes and levels. Having participants in the same department was viewed as a good way for them to be able to support each other.

Principals and co-ordinators understood the timetabling constraints and put them down to the late notice that a participant would be joining the school. In many cases the timetable had already been drawn up and there was not much choice about classes that the participant would teach. Some staff who would become mentors already had very full workloads. A small number of interviewees commented that Teach First NZ requirements that the participants teach only one subject limited the participants' learning opportunities in the school.

Participants typically reported teaching three year levels in one subject area. Where timetables were constrained or not carefully planned, the difficulties reported included limited access to, or not being able to observe mentor's classes, workload, and being assigned to "difficult" classes.

Ongoing school support for participants

Participants were treated as PRTs and almost all of them were included in the PRT programme, which included appraisal towards full registration. In practice this meant that they received additional support, outside the Teach First NZ programme itself. In two schools the participants were invited to join the PRT programme but chose not to be involved fully in it in their first year at the school.

Participants identified the range of support they had access to in their schools, including: PRT meetings, staff PLD sessions (sometimes with guest speakers), hakapiki reo, kura reo clinics, Virtual Learning Network groups, Positive Behaviour for Learning (PB4L), "well-organised department staff and caring HoD", and Specialist Classroom Teachers (SCTs). A few participants also had expert support from a subject specialist outside of the school or from subject associations.

Observations of others' teaching

Participants are expected to observe their mentor and other teachers teaching. Only two participants reported observing their mentor "a lot", and four had not observed their mentor teaching at all, mostly because of timetable clashes or because the mentor did not teach the same subject. Others reported that parts of lessons they had observed had been useful, particularly if the teacher being observed was able to pass on and discuss strategies they used. With one exception, participants told us they observed other teachers in their own subject area, in other areas of the school, and in other schools.

Participants used observation in a number of different ways; for example, one liked to observe his students in their other classes, looking for classroom management styles and models to emulate. There is some evidence that a few participants were initially reluctant to or even intimidated by watching experienced teachers, and chose to observe other PRTs or go to another school. They considered they would feel the gap between experience and their own teaching would be too difficult for them to bridge.

Host schools' preparation for, and support in, their roles

We looked at the extent to which host schools thought the preparation and support for their roles by the partnership was high quality and how well supported they felt.

Key findings. Principals reported the Teach First NZ partnership had prepared them well for their roles in the programme. Within a small number of schools inadequate communication meant that a minority of departments were not well prepared for having a new staff member. Most co-ordinators felt well prepared, although in some schools the co-ordinator role was not established until after the participants had begun in the schools. Once-a-term co-ordinator meetings were appreciated, although difficult for Northland co-ordinators to attend. The majority of HoDs who were not also mentors felt well informed and were happy with the level of information and communication with the Teach First NZ partnership.

Teach First NZ support to, and communication with, host school

The Teach First NZ team anticipated that their main point of contact with the school would be with the mentor, once initial contact with the principal had been established. Early in the year, the importance of the co-ordinator role was recognised and, with one exception, principals devolved this responsibility, usually to a member of the senior leadership team. There were different perspectives from staff in schools about how well they felt supported and communicated with by Teach First NZ.

We were told that within the same department teachers could have very different experiences of Teach First NZ. The implication is that communication should involve all of those responsible for participants. Even a strong well-functioning department benefited from the "freshness" and "youth" of the participant. Participants energised departments and raised expectations. One mentor suggested that "Teach First NZ is going to make more people more effective, more quickly."

All principals were very happy with their interactions with Teach First NZ, as were most co-ordinators, but half the mentors would have liked more support. The principals' comments all indicated that their communication with Teach First NZ was considered effective, and that any concerns raised were readily addressed. Six co-ordinators suggested that the information provided to them through meetings and documentation, and general communication with Teach First NZ, was adequate. One co-ordinator commented that roles and expectations could be clearer.

Mentors' comments about with their communication with the Teach First NZ partnership were evenly divided, with half reporting that they got what they needed from the Teach First NZ partnership, and the others considering that communication was not as clear or effective as it might be. They suggested it would be helpful to have a clearer indication of what the Faculty expectations were, where the assignment pressure points were, what the assessment criteria for assignments were, and when clinics and workshops were to be held. HoDs who were not mentors were less positive, claiming that roles and expectations were not clearly communicated with them. While they acknowledged that most of the communication, quite rightly, is with the mentors, they felt their position of overall responsibility for a department was sometimes overlooked.

Mentor teachers

We reviewed to what degree mentor teachers were: well supported by the partnership; provided regular high-quality observation, mentoring, and feedback to participants; and helped participants to become part of the wider school community.

Key findings. Levels of mentor satisfaction with their support from the Teach First NZ partnership were mixed: half were very satisfied and the other half, while also generally satisfied, said they would have liked more direction about observations and expectations for participants. The mentor meetings twice a term provided valuable opportunities to learn what others were doing and to learn more about mentoring. A few mentors considered that mentor training should take more account of their previous experiences as mentors, and of other approaches to mentoring already operating in schools. This was particularly the case for some mentors who had pivotal roles in their school's Te Kotahitanga programme.

The quality of mentoring and the relationships between participant and mentor were variable. All mentors conducted observations of participants and provided feedback to them. Most mentors provided weekly observations, although in a very few cases observations were irregular or the feedback did not meet participants' needs. Sometimes this was a consequence of timetabling that we were told made it difficult for the mentor to meet with the participant or to conduct observations, or because the mentor was not in the same subject area as the participant. Where mentors were not in the same subject area, participants required subject-area support from additional sources. As this programme is reliant on school personnel to support participants to learn to teach the New Zealand curriculum, participants require strong mentoring in their subject area.

The mentor was pivotal in helping the participant become part of the wider school community. In a very few instances participants relied on the co-ordinator or another staff member to help with this integration into the school.

The selection, training, and ongoing communication with the mentor are critical to the success of the programme and to participants' progress. Mentors were selected by the schools (usually the principal). The Faculty required that they undertake 3 days of training and provided two meetings a term and ongoing readings and support for them. The mentors, as a group, had very different perceptions about the training, and not all had attended regularly. We did not observe mentor training, but saw examples of materials used in training in some participants' portfolios and amongst mentors' resources, and these appeared in our view to have the potential to assist mentors to develop deeper understandings of effective mentoring.

In all instances, school principals and co-ordinators were aware if there had been less than optimal selection of mentors or where the relationship between a participant and a mentor was not ideal. Mentors reported that their ability to effectively use the time allowance (0.2 per mentor for each participant) was dependent on the school timetable. Likewise, apart from the required weekly observations and feedback sessions, mentors adjusted their support to suit their own availability and, in the most successful situations, to adjust to the needs of the participants. Three schools had changed mentors for a participant in term 2 or 3. These changes appeared to be beneficial for all concerned.

The majority of mentors felt well supported by their school, with critical time allowances for the extra responsibilities and workload. In one ideal situation the mentor and participant had adjoining classrooms, shared a workspace, and team-taught a class. They had multiple opportunities to interact on a daily basis, with that interaction focused on teaching and learning.

In the very few instances where mentors felt less well supported, one mentor described feeling under pressure to justify their time allowance; another did not receive the time allowance because of their timetable (a situation that others considered would make the task unmanageable); and one had to defend their participant's time to prevent participants having to cover relief classes, instead of being assured of their 0.6 status.

Views on mentor training

Mentors mostly found their training (and the accompanying resources) a positive and helpful experience—some said that it made them think about new ideas and approaches that they could use in other situations, such as with other staff in their departments. Suggestions for improvement were to:

- provide more mentor training, particularly in regard to carrying out observations, and more written guidance about carrying out observations

- acknowledge the strengths within the group of mentors (particular reference was made to the skills and approaches of those involved with Te Kotahitanga)

- reconsider the timing of the first part of the training.

Principals reported mixed reactions from teachers to the mentor training, with five commenting that teachers had found it good or very good, and three making comments ranging from "useful" to "not impressed".

Impact of mentor training on practice

On the whole mentors thought that mentor training had improved their abilities to effectively mentor. One principal told us that the time allocation for mentors had had an impact on perceptions and implementation of the role: mentoring was receiving the recognition it deserved. Eleven mentors identified positive effects ranging from revisiting basic support strategies to conducting learning conversations and reinvigorating their own reflections. For some it was valuable to reinforce listening and questioning roles: "What did you expect to happen from this lesson?" The most positive mentors were having a significant impact on other staff in the school and in how schools were thinking about mentoring, for example, at departmental level. Three already experienced mentors claimed minimal or no impact of the training.

Mentors in same curriculum area as Teach First NZ participant

In six out of nine schools the mentors and participants were in the same subject department. This was seen by participants as "ideal" as they could access more relevant and immediate support. In two schools one participant was in the same department as their mentor, another was not, and in another school one mentor was mentoring two participants, neither of whom was in the same department as she was. The school had made this arrangement part-way through the year to optimise mentoring of the participants.

While mentors can be effective working across departments, there was inevitably some reliance on department teachers to contribute to supporting the participant with content and curriculum. In the least favourable situation there seemed to be little in the way of a shared purpose, and consequently the relationship between mentor and participant was not strong. An ideal (and arguably necessary placement in terms of a field-based-approach programme) situation was to place a participant in a well-functioning department with an effective mentor. We did, however, observe instances of effective mentor/participant relationships within departments that were not strong, and it appeared that the participant was making good progress in a safe environment. However, greater progress could be expected in a situation where effective teaching was normative practice. We also talked to a very few participants who were experiencing some difficulties communicating with their mentor. They would perhaps have been better placed with another mentor, even though the department they were in was functioning well in terms of relationships among staff members and student achievement was not of concern.

Mentors' support from Teach First NZ

Three quarters of the mentors considered that they received effective support from the Teach First NZ partnership, noting that they had regular meetings with Teach First NZ partnership staff, usually once or twice a term. A handful of respondents (three) indicated that they would appreciate more meetings, suggesting "clearer direction", "feedback from the university", "more practical advice", and opportunities to share information with other schools. Mentors in Northland felt more isolated, as the meetings were less accessible to them. Visits from VCSs and Faculty liaison staff were very much appreciated by participants and mentors.

Observations of participants

Mentor support for participants is focused on very regular observations of them with the same class(es) and written and oral feedback. In the main, feedback to participants from mentors was provided as a running record of classroom activities and interactions. Mentors also helped participants to set goals for their next lessons. We did not analyse these documents in relation to whether or not the participant was making the desired progress, or whether each mentor was following a similar approach. Our aim was to ascertain the extent to which the frequent observations (once a week suggested for mentors) were providing the support the participants or their mentors told us they needed.

Observations were conducted with varying degrees of formality between schools, and by different mentors within schools. Most mentors reported observing the participant once a week at first but less often as time passed. Some planned, or agreed on, a specific focus for observations with the participant, kept records, made notes, and provided feedback. (Two mentors referred specifically to the training or guidance from the Teach First NZ partnership.) Others took a more casual approach, discussing anything that arose from the observation. This sometimes depended on how many others observed the participant (in some cases up to three per week). Participants also reported varying levels of formality in the feedback they received from mentors' observations. They particularly appreciated practical advice that helped with planning, classroom management, or content delivery.

One mentor noted that approaches to observation and feedback differed within the Teach First NZ team, and two referred to expectations (specifically focusing on inquiry learning) that were often beyond the inexperienced teachers' capabilities while they were still coming to terms with the basics of classroom management, pastoral care, and administration.

The observation-discussion cycle, when reported as working well, was reported to build confidence and resilience in participants.

Mentors, as a group, had a number of suggestions for improving the programme both within schools and as provided by Teach First NZ. These suggestions included:

- ensuring there was consultation within a department about whether they should have a participant or who should mentor that participant

- locating mentors and participants in the same department

- ensuring mentors had enough time for mentoring, including observations and face-to-face feedback

- ensuring participants have a "realistic training environment", which includes time spent prior to arriving in the school in planning and practising teaching and getting to grips with the New Zealand curriculum.

Visiting Curriculum Specialists

For the programme to work well, VCSs need to provide regular high-quality observation, mentoring, and feedback to participants. There should also be explicit links between the curriculum papers in the qualification and the feedback provided by the specialists in schools.

Key findings. For the programme to work well, VCSs need to provide regular high-quality observation, mentoring, and feedback to participants. There should also be explicit links between the curriculum papers in the qualification and the feedback provided by the specialists in schools.

In some instances, the VCS feedback clearly showed the links to curriculum papers; in others, attention to immediate classroom practice was foregrounded, especially earlier in the year. Participants appreciated ongoing relationships with VCSs, as did most mentors. VCSs were seen to be very responsive to participants' needs. Co-ordinators appreciated receiving the summary statements from VCSs after observations. A small number of HoDs who were not mentors wanted more involvement with the VCS. A small number of participants found that VCSs provided different, and sometimes conflicting, advice to that provided by mentors, which left them unsure about whose advice to follow. A few participants said the VCS visits did not allow sufficient time for discussion. All VCSs really enjoyed their roles and thought the amount of time allocated to visiting was adequate. A number of participants commented positively on the learning for them during the formal observations conducted by the mentor and the VCS together.

VCSs visited each participant four times in terms 1 and 2 and three times in term 3 to observe a lesson and discuss it with the participant. Three times a year, the VCS and the mentor did a formal observation together, which is assessed against Faculty criteria and contributes towards the completion of one of the Faculty courses. Apart from the participants, it is the mentors who have most communication with the VCS during their visits. Almost all participants valued the VCS observations and feedback. Two participants drew a valuable distinction between the value of the VCS visits and weekly mentor observations, noting that the VCS observation offered a view of the bigger picture—of a whole lesson, and of change over time between visits, in contrast to the weekly mentor observations.

We did not analyse VCS observation notes in relation to whether or not the participant was making the desired progress, or whether each VCS was following a similar approach. Our aim was to ascertain the extent to which the frequent observations were providing the support the participants or their mentors told us they needed. The VCS feedback clearly showed the links to curriculum papers; however, attention to immediate classroom practice was foregrounded, especially earlier in the year. VCSs' notes were very thorough and the summary sheet provided (and copied to mentors and co-ordinators) provided very useful succinct feedback about a participant's strengths and areas they needed to work on.

Co-ordinators appreciated the summary observation sheets that VCSs emailed them after each visit. They felt that the support, feedback, and communication about observations was useful, and in some schools hoped to introduce similar approaches more widely. Although VCSs have time constraints, it appeared important that they ensure that courtesies when visiting colleagues are observed; for example one HoD reported that he had not met the VCS.

Programme responsiveness

We looked for evidence that the programme was responsive to feedback from participants and participating schools.

Key findings. The small size of the cohort, the considerable staffing allocated to the programme, and the excellent relationships between Teach First NZ and the host schools has made it possible for the programme to be very responsive to participant and school needs. Evaluations conducted regularly by the partnership and made available to the researchers provided ample opportunity for participants to have input into the programme, and for programme staff to respond to these suggestions. Teach First NZ has been able to quickly accommodate requests for information and to arrange resources and information to suit individuals and groups. Participants reported that they had been very well supported by the Teach First NZ partnership when difficulties arose. In turn, many schools have adapted their approaches to provide more effective support and better opportunities for participants' learning to teach.

Schools' and other stakeholder perceptions of the programme have helped shaped it. Teach First NZ has been aware of these perceptions from the outset and has been very effective in working with different groups (including, for example, PPTA) to redress negative perceptions and to enhance programme factors that are working well.

Teach First NZ has actively sought feedback on how the programme could be improved, both in 2013 and in future years, at principal, co-ordinator, and mentor meetings.

Schools worked hard to make the first term in school proceed smoothly and to acknowledge staff reservations, including the small number who thought it was unfair that participants were being paid when student teachers were not.

Issues that the evaluators recognised in August and September had also clearly been identified by the Teach First NZ partnership and by many schools earlier and, where feasible, were already being addressed at the time of our visit. The programme components continued to evolve during the rest of 2013. Our brief visits to the SII for cohort two during December 2013 and January 2014 indicated that suggestions made by the 2013 cohort had been noted and fully incorporated into the design and implementation of the second SII.

5. Evaluation question two: To what extent has the programme achieved its overall outcomes and objectives?

This section of the report focuses on those evaluation criteria for evaluation question two that can be addressed at this stage of the evaluation. Evaluation question two is an impact or outcomes question, and many of its aspects will not be possible to answer until the end of the pilot. The second evaluation question looks at how well and to what extent the programme achieved its overall outcomes and objectives.

To answer this question, the evaluation focused on: the effectiveness of participants' teaching, their level of support for the pastoral life of the school, the leadership development strand of the programme, the ongoing involvement and/or retention of participants, programme impact on quality of teaching and learning in participating schools, status of teaching, enablers and barriers to success, and alumni engagement. On the basis of the data we have collected so far, we can make some preliminary judgements about the 2013 cohort's teaching, engagement in the pastoral life of the schools, and leadership development.

Effectiveness of participants' teaching

To gauge the effectiveness of participants' teaching we evaluated the extent to which participants' students are engaged in learning (particularly Māori and Pasifika students), how well participants' teaching aligns with the Teach First NZ model, and student achievement.

Key findings. Most of the cohort was perceived to be teaching as well or better than a 'typical' first year provisionally registered teacher (PRT). Two of the 16 participants were reported by VCSs and school mentors in September to be finding the transition into teaching more difficult than the other participants. All participants were enjoying positive relationships with some or all of their classes.

Participants were reported to be extremely hard working and resilient and in most cases to have 'won over' difficult classes. The NZCER survey *Me and My Class* was used to provide an indication of the extent to which students in participants' and similar classes experienced teaching strategies and reported their engagement. There was no statistically significant difference between participant and comparison classes at Year 9 or 10. Although we would caution against placing too much emphasis on the *Me and My School* survey results, there were indications that participants' Year 9 students may have been more engaged than students in comparison classes and more engaged than Year 10 classes. Students in Year 10 comparison classes indicated greater engagement and students in participants' classes responded more positively to some items about teaching strategies. These tentative findings suggest that students report their engagement in participants' classes as similar to student engagement in classes taught by more experienced colleagues. There was evidence shown to us by some participants that NCEA or standardised (for example, e-asTTle) assessment results for participants' classes compared favourably with other classes, and this was endorsed by other staff members.

Relationships with students

It was acknowledged by participants, and by staff who worked closely with them, that building relationships with classes in terms 1 and 2 was a significant challenge (as is typical with many beginning teachers). By the time of our visits in term 3, all but two were seen to be managing classroom behaviour well. Participants acknowledged that building relationships with difficult classes was challenging at first, but that they could now see their progress and to some extent how they had established a good relationship with their classes. Some participants reported still struggling with one of their classes but enjoying a very positive relationship with the others.

Co-ordinators and HoDs acknowledged that earlier help with classroom management would have helped participants make more progress earlier. This was seen to be an issue for the school and the Teach First NZ partnership. Half of the teachers in the schools (other than the participants) told us that students were responding positively to the participants, even in those cases where there were some initial challenging behaviours or negative student attitudes.

We were told by mentors and co-ordinators that many of the participants had been assigned particularly difficult Year 10 classes, and that had the school had time to look carefully at some classes' makeup, they would not have given the class to the participant. (In at least one instance, both participants and a PRT taught the same 'difficult' Year 10 class for three of their four core subjects.)

Participants used a range of strategies to build relationships, and many had taken on extra duties, such as coaching or assisting with sports teams or cultural activities, as a way to improve classroom relationships. Almost all of them offered NCEA classes extra tutorials or homework classes. We mostly relied on interview data for this information but also read about activities in participants' portfolios and other documentation. On a few occasions we observed interactions between participants and students and participants and staff members that endorsed how participants were involved outside of their classroom teaching. Two mentors also reported instances of good contact and relationship building with parents, which had turned students around in their learning.

A VCS told us that two co-ordinators had commented that the participants were beacons—proving to be resilient, positive, and engaging. Another said: "They are focused on student learning—discussions are always about that." Mentors commented that they think "participants are having an impact. The VCSs are seeing amazing teaching: young teachers who are really putting in place stuff they're taught. They are positive, well prepared, and have good relationships with learners."

Another VCS commented: "The data shows kids think the participants care about them, feel connected, and have good relationships. Staff have said in unsolicited ways that they have had an impact, through their energy, passion, belief, and the questions they ask."

Principals and co-ordinators reported being well informed about participants' progress and the impact they were having on students, although only a few referred to evidence from student data to support their belief that students were achieving well. In most departments staff reported that they noticed comparable, if not improved, levels of student achievement for participants' classes. They were able to justify this by standardised literacy test results, NCEA moderated internal assessments, completion rates for achievement and unit standards, as well as informal judgements about student engagement and lack of negative results, and seeing some of the work the students were producing. There was some anticipation about the potential positive impact on future level 1 NCEA results, although two mentors expressed concern that students in a participant's class were not achieving at expected levels or that lessons were pitched too low.

Student engagement: Results from *Me and My Class* survey

Me and My Class is a survey designed by NZCER for Year 4 to Year 13 students. The items are based on research into the key competencies, which are an integral part of *The New Zealand Curriculum*. The survey provides indicators of students' views of the quality of teaching rather than student achievement data.

The survey is new and we do not have national data for a large number of students as yet. However, it has been rigorously piloted and tested for psychometric validity and reliability. The survey explores students' perspectives on learning in their classroom. We chose to use the survey to help us assess one of the evaluation criterion for effectiveness of participants' teaching: High engagement of students, especially Māori and Pasifika.

The *Me and My Class* survey has two sections:

- Me and My Class: The first section has 24 questions that explore students' views on the extent to which learning opportunities in their class reflect effective teaching pedagogy.

- Me in My Class: This section contains 10 questions that explore students' personal responses to learning in their class.

The survey was administered by NZCER's Products and Services Assessment Team in September, 8 months after participants began teaching. All teachers involved were sent information about the survey, instructions for its administration, and intended or potential uses of the survey data, as well as consent forms for their participation. For the evaluation, participants chose a Year 9 or 10 class, and schools were asked to choose a 'comparison' class where the students were in the same year level and preferably in the same subject area and taught by another teacher (normally who was fully registered and often significantly more experienced). We obtained results from the *Me and My Class* survey for 13 of the 16 participants (seven out of nine schools) for a Year 9 or 10 class taught by the participant and a comparison class. For the purposes of this evaluation, the aggregated and anonymised results are used to assess the student perceptions of participant teachers' effectiveness in providing pedagogically rich learning opportunities and in engaging students in their learning. We would strongly caution too much emphasis being placed on the results of the survey in 2013. Factors to consider are the small sample size, the fact that three participants' data are not included, and the fact that this was the first time students had attempted this survey and may have been exposed to different instructions and conditions.

Both Me and My Class and the Me in My Class data is presented in two types of reports:

- Items at a Glance

- Items in Depth

The Items at a Glance report provides the ability to compare the average response for a group to each statement with the average response for all students in the school who have taken the survey. The strip graphs include a 95 percent confidence interval to indicate when a difference between the group (usually a class) and all students is more than a random occurrence. When the red triangle is **outside** the 95 percent confidence interval, the data indicate the difference between the average scores is unlikely to represent the random variation we would expect from different groups of students within the school. In other words, the difference is probably **statistically significant**. The Items in Depth report displays the survey statements on the left hand side of the page. Next to each statement is a bar graph showing the proportion of students who chose each of Strongly disagree, Disagree, Agree, and Strongly agree.

For Year 9 we have the aggregated and anonymised results for 107 'participant class' learners and 116 'comparison class' learners. For Year 10 we have the aggregated and anonymised results for 101 participant class learners and 89 comparison class learners. All teachers whose classes took part in the survey were sent their individual data, as the survey is designed to assist teachers with improving aspects of their teaching. **In no items related to Me in My Class or Me and My Class was there likely to be a statistically significant difference between the participant and the comparison class.** We have commented on some items where, in the Items in Depth graphs, participant and comparison classes differed by more than 7 percentage points. We were particularly interested in those items related to culture and identity, as trying to uncover the extent to which students consider participants teach in culturally intelligent ways is one focus of the evaluation. These tentative preliminary results indicate that there is no disadvantage for students taught by participants after 8 months as teachers.

Year 9

Participant classes were more likely than comparison classes to **strongly agree** with the following items from Me and My Class:

- My teacher helps me understand how other people might be feeling or thinking (44 percent compared with 29 percent).

- I get to explain my thinking; how I worked something out (36 percent compared with 26 percent).

- We work on real-life projects that make our school or community a better place (26 percent compared with 16 percent).

- I get to do things that are about my family and culture (36 percent compared with 28 percent).

- We learn about things that are important to different cultures (37 percent compared with 30 percent).

- We use our learning to devise or make new things (38 percent compared with 25 percent).

Comparison classes were more likely to **agree** and **strongly agree** that "we use ideas and skills from different parts of our learning to solve problems" (85 percent compared with 74 percent).

Items about student engagement (Me in My Class) showed a different pattern. Participant classes were slightly more likely to **strongly agree** with the items:

- I always try my hardest (45 percent compared with 40 percent).

- My culture is respected and valued (59 percent compared with 54 percent).

They were considerably more likely to **strongly agree** with:

- I'm really interested in what we learn (49 percent compared with 32 percent).

- I have surprised myself with what I can achieve (49 percent compared with 41 percent).

- I always want to go to class (39 percent compared with 29 percent).

- I want to tell other people about what I'm learning in this class (36 percent compared with 23 percent).

We could tentatively extrapolate that students in participants' Year 9 classes are engaged in their learning and that their learning includes contexts that are relevant to their identity and culture.

Year 10

The Year 10 data tells a different story. It is worth noting here that several participants were teaching Year 10 classes that were described by school personnel as being particularly challenging. Participant classes were more likely than comparison classes to **strongly agree** with the following items from Me and My Class:

- I can make mistakes and learn from them without getting told off (36 percent compared with 25 percent).

- My teacher helps me understand how other people might be feeling or thinking (28 percent compared with 15 percent).

- My teacher likes it when I ask questions and try out new things (49 percent compared with 35 percent).

- We are allowed to disagree with others and to change our minds if someone has a better idea (36 percent compared with 26 percent).

Participants' classes were more likely than comparison classes to **agree or strongly agree** that:

- I get to do things that are about my family and culture (69 percent compared with 58 percent).

- We learn about things that are important to different cultures (76 percent compared with 66 percent).

Comparison classes were more likely than participant classes to **strongly agree** with the items:

- Students and the teacher respect and help each other (39 percent compared with 24 percent).

- We help each other to think about how to make our work better (33 percent compared with 20 percent).

- We talk about how we are learning and different ways of learning (34 percent compared with 23 percent).

- My teacher encourages us to keep trying especially when we get stuck (54 percent compared with 46 percent).

- My teacher encourages us to try new things, even if they feel a bit hard at first (51 percent compared with 37 percent).

- We learn that things we read or see can have more than one meaning (43 percent compared with 30 percent).

Items about student engagement (Me in My Class) also showed a different pattern. Comparison classes were more likely to report engagement in class. For example:

- I always try my hardest (36 percent strongly agreed compared to 23 percent).

- I am always on time and organised (20 percent *dis*agree compared to 34 percent).

- My culture is respected and valued (47 percent strongly agreed compared to 37 percent).

- I want to tell other people about what I'm learning in this class (25 percent strongly agreed compared with 12 percent).

With caution, especially given the school personnel description of the challenging nature of some of the participants' Year 10 classes, we could interpret these data as suggesting that students in Year 10 comparison classes are more engaged in their learning than those in participants' classes. Likewise the data could suggest that in the participants' classes, students feel able to debate issues and make mistakes. They are also more likely to be learning about things that have to do with their culture. In the comparison classes, students and the teacher are focused on learning together and appear to have developed a stronger respectful relationship.

Support by participants for pastoral life of school

This evaluative criterion relates to the expectation that participants will contribute positively to wider school activities.

Key findings. In their first year, participants have been cautious about becoming involved in too many activities outside of teaching. At the same time, they are seen by school staff to be very well integrated into the schools and to be supporting sports and cultural events and activities, staff PLD, and homework and NCEA revision centres.

Participants were advised by Teach First NZ to "develop their teaching skills first" before becoming too involved in extra activities, recommending limiting extra activities to homework groups or similar. Nevertheless, most participants told us they were involved in other activities, and school personnel endorsed that. Participants reported taking leading roles in school-based PLD (Te Kotahitanga, literacy, PB4L), whānau tutoring, revision classes, and being on committees. They also participated in sports activities, kapa haka and Polyfest, language clusters, and drama groups.

All the principals said that participants contributed to school life through engagement with school activities; for example, Tongan Language Week, sharing knowledge with staff leading PLD sessions, or helping with extracurricular activities. Other staff positively acknowledged the additional efforts of the participants in coming to terms with teaching and studying as well as joining in the wider life of the schools, but also tended to caution them on not overdoing it.

Leadership development strand

The leadership development strand is a key element of the programme. The aim is to produce teachers who, in the long term, will provide "a network of leaders in education and across all fields, who are committed to addressing educational inequality". In the first year participants are expected to demonstrate effective leadership of students.

Key findings. Almost all participants were showing leadership in the classroom, with some taking strong leadership roles within their department. Participants in two schools were expected to take responsibility for a tutor/form class, while others shared the responsibility. For the most part, participants reported enjoying this role, although a few reported they were left to cope on their own, without additional support and guidance. Principals and co-ordinators reported that all participants were having a positive impact on the school, particularly in their departments. Participants' content knowledge, the resources they developed and shared, their facility with technology, and their attitude towards wanting to do the best for all students were all seen to make a valued contribution to the school.

Teach First NZ identifies that leadership development in the first year should be focused on developing leadership in the classroom. All participants were seen to be making a contribution to their department. The most frequently referred to contribution to departments was the creation and sharing of resources. Participants were also praised for bringing innovative ideas and "fresh thinking". A co-ordinator commented that a participant had "unintentionally given the others a bit of a kick up the backside. [He] brings new ideas, new approaches."

Principals unanimously judged the participants to be performing extremely well in the classroom—as one principal put it, "streets ahead of student teachers", although it was acknowledged that they got more support than PRTs. Almost all others we interviewed concurred that participants were more like a good PRT in their first year of teaching and, in two cases, participants were seen as to be functioning as well as a PRT in their second year. Not all staff realised that the Teach First NZ participants had a different status from PRTs, and this may have led to some misunderstanding about expectations, particularly about dealing with behaviour-management issues. However, on the whole, the participants had clearly 'won over' the majority of staff. The participants themselves reported being generally accepted and supported.

6.   Discussion

In this section of the report we provide some general observations about the Teach First NZ programme in 2013 in relation to the evaluation questions. We describe some strengths of the programme and some issues with its implementation, as at November 2013. This evaluation is investigating similar questions to those of the UK and Australian evaluations, and early findings are similar in relation to the high quality of the participants, implementation teething problems— especially in relation to communication (mainly within schools)—and caution in making assertions about the impact of participants on student achievement.[12] This is possibly not surprising given that Teach First NZ borrows some elements from its UK sister programme, although has distinct differences and constraints. We are not undertaking classroom observations that are a focus of some UK studies. And, unlike the Australian evaluation, this evaluation is not tasked with establishing value for money. In the final year of the evaluation we will consider the impact on the status of teachers. We have relied on documents that we had access to, data from the NZCER *Me and My Class* surveys, site visits (which consisted of interviews with key stakeholders, including school principals, mentors, and co-ordinators, and looking at available documents), and interviews with the Teach First NZ partnership and Faculty staff, including VCSs.

About the schools

The nine schools that had participants in 2013 have one thing in common: they are deciles 1–3 schools. They have high proportions of Māori or Pasifika students. While each school was very different in the way it had welcomed and was nurturing its participant(s), we were struck by the number of initiatives that were underway in all the schools and the impact that this was having on the school environment and ethos in terms of providing focus for school activity and staff PLD. Some participants were strongly involved in one or more of these initiatives, while others were engaged as part of 'normal' staff development. Almost all schools had a combination of Te Kotahitanga or He Kakano, Starpath, and PB4L. Other schools were working with Student Achievement Function advisers (SAFs) on improving data collection and analysis or were part of literacy or numeracy PLD. Tamaki College was involved in Network for Learning (N4L) and PowerUp. All schools were very focused on raising NCEA literacy and numeracy achievement so that 85 percent of their students could achieve level 2 credits. The many initiatives aimed at improving student achievement make it very difficult to factor in the extent to which the Teach First NZ programme was impacting on participants (as opposed to their participation in a range of school and nationally led PLD programmes).

One of the things that we noted was the different, and often incomplete, understandings of the Teach First NZ mission and goals held by school personnel. We had anticipated that these would have been widely shared and discussed within schools, given the schools' involvement in supporting the mission and goals.

---

[12]   Muijs, D., Collins, A, & Armstrong, P. (2010). *Maximum impact evaluation: The impact of Teach First teachers in schools*. Manchester: Manchester University.

Ofsted. (2008). *Rising to the challenge: A review of the Teach First initial teacher training programm*e. London: Author.

Ofsted. (2011). *Teach First initial teacher education inspection report*. London: Author.

Weldon, P. M., Kleinhenz, E., & Reid, K. (2012). *Teach for Australia Pathway: Evaluation Report Phase 2 of 3*. Camberwell, VIC: ACER.

Principals, co-ordinators, and mentors were more likely than other school-based personnel to see the programme as a strategy for getting quality teachers into schools that serve low-decile communities. Co-ordinators were able to describe it as an alternative pathway for top graduates to get into teaching, targeting high-calibre people who may not have otherwise been attracted to teaching.

Schools' perceptions of the programme

Two thirds of principals were unreservedly enthusiastic about Teach First NZ and felt that the benefits outweighed the challenges. Charged with the responsibility of ensuring adequate and quality staffing, the perceived benefits clearly included the opportunity to have new, talented, fresh thinkers in the school, for little cost. All principals were keen to employ more participants in 2014, but due to budget constraints only some would do so.

The Teach First NZ programme was initially greeted with scepticism by some staff in schools, but almost all respondents in the interviews reported that the participants were accepted by other staff and fitted in well. They were frequently described as "high calibre", "hard working", "friendly", "resilient", and "well liked". We were told by one teacher: "The kids have gained a fantastic, dedicated learning leader—the joy is contagious." Many teachers considered that students were responding positively to the participants even in those cases where there were some initial challenging behaviours or negative attitudes. Other teachers who were not in the same department as a participant were not able to comment.

School personnel indicated that the programme strengths were:

- communication with a well-respected person in the Teach First NZ partnership
- that the participants were seen to be talented and hard working
- that it aims to raise the profile and status of schools that serve low-decile communities
- the PLD opportunity for current staff, especially mentors
- the benefits for students of having renewed levels of enthusiasm and reflection amongst some staff.

Most teachers and departments expressed a willingness to support new teachers no matter where they came from and acknowledged that the success of the programme was reliant on the high-calibre of the participants.

Some school personnel expressed concerns about:

- early media coverage focusing on negativity (especially "fast tracking", "on-the-job training" and "untrained teachers")
- employment and ongoing funding issues, especially for cohorts two and three, in relation to sustainability
- schools being used for experimentation, with students from poorer communities being used as guinea pigs
- the availability of suitable mentors, the level and sustainability of support for participants and mentors, and the additional workload for mentors and co-ordinators
- lack of communication in some schools.

How well (effectively and efficiently) has the programme been implemented?

The 2013 Teach First NZ programme has been implemented effectively and efficiently. The factors that we conclude have contributed to this are:

- the mission and vision of the Teach First NZ partnership and its processes for communicating this to participants

- the rigorous selection process—this enabled high-calibre participants to be offered positions

- the willingness of a group of principals to be involved[13]

- the high quality, responsiveness, and nimbleness of the Teach First NZ partnership team[14]

- the Ministry of Education supernumerary funding for the 2013 participants and for the mentor time allowance.

In general, the programme was effectively implemented due to hard work and flexibility by all stakeholders concerned. As is to be expected with any new programme, especially one that was implemented in a very tight time frame, teething problems occurred.

Implementation variability, in general, depended on the "readiness for beginning teaching" of the participant, the quality of the mentor, the location of the participant (whether co-located in the same department as the mentor), and the extent to which the school principal had prepared the school's staff for the participant, and was able to apply flexibility and creativity to the school's timetable.

It appears that the more involved someone is with the programme, the more satisfied they are with its implementation. In November 2013 all participants were still in the programme, and almost all were making a strong contribution to their schools and as ambassadors for the programme and for teaching as a career option. Teach First NZ staff members were very pleased with the way the year had progressed, "given all the things that might have gone wrong". People we interviewed who told us they knew nothing about the programme appeared most negative and sceptical about it. While other teachers in the school were supportive of the participants, our conversations with them indicated that they were often misinformed about Teach First NZ and the participants, with many believing they were PRTs.

The participants

To date, the data from this programme evaluation highlight the importance of attracting high-calibre candidates for teaching. The evidence suggests that Teach First NZ has been successful in selecting resourceful and committed participants who are showing considerable resilience in their chosen careers. It is unclear whether the academic profiles of Teach First NZ candidates differ from those in the Graduate Diploma of Teaching. At this stage, the Teach First NZ programme has attracted a minority of candidates who may not otherwise have chosen teaching at this time. Ten of the 16 participants had planned to undertake ITE in 2013 or the near future. Teach First NZ, however, has succeeded in attracting a number of candidates away from the Graduate Diploma of Teaching, by presenting a clear and compelling mission— to "make a real impact, inspire others and positively contribute to future generations of New Zealanders" (source: *Lead the Way*, Teach First NZ promotional material). There are other incentives, such as being able to start teaching after a short period of preparation, gaining a fully funded postgraduate qualification, and being paid a salary while they

---

[13] They became involved partly because they trusted and respected specific Teach First NZ partnership staff. They were also keen to attract able teachers into subject areas that had traditionally been hard to staff.

[14] By September communication problems (inevitable with any new venture) had mostly been addressed. Trust in key personnel has been pivotal to school engagement.

learn to teach. At this stage Teach First NZ has yet to attract many suitable chemistry, physics, and mathematics candidates for teaching, although this may change with the 2014 cohort.

The programme

There have been two main factors which we think have affected the quality of the programme's implementation:

- As is typical of many beginning teachers, almost all participants found it difficult in their first 6 months to establish sound relationships with some of their classes. Understandably, participants had not developed sufficient pedagogical content knowledge to plan effectively, which led to behaviour management issues. A minority had been placed in departments that were themselves facing challenges or with a mentor who did not give them the support they needed. For some this was because of inadequate timetabling decisions.
- Communication glitches within the Faculty, between Teach First NZ and schools, and within some schools led to negative or misleading perceptions about the programme. This created unnecessary tensions for some participants. Where principals involved the staff in decisions about placing a participant or appointing a mentor there were more likely to be positive experiences for participants and those who worked closely with them.

Teach First NZ, and principals in particular, expressed concern about sustainability of the programme, especially with future cohorts needing to be funded by the schools. Given that many schools had falling rolls and some were facing the possibility of Curriculum and Pastoral Needs Analyses (CAPNAs), there were significant tensions about whether a school could fund a participant, even though all principals we spoke to would like to be able to.

In addition, there has been some lack of clarity about the participants' registration status. Participants are working towards the GTS and the RTC. Many of them are part of school PRT processes, including appraisal. There is uncertainty about the amount of time it will take participants to become fully registered. This has led to confusion and, at times, possibly detracted from the central task of learning to teach.

To what extent has the programme achieved its overall outcomes and objectives?

We are able to make some early observations in answer to this question, on the basis of our information about the first year of the programme with its first cohort of participants. Participants were seen to be leaders in their classrooms and to be making an impact within their departments. Some participants were seen to have had an impact in the school either through the contribution they were making to extracurricular activities or through the ideas they shared at staff meetings and in PLD sessions. *Me and My Class* survey results indicated that participants' Year 9 classes are more engaged than comparison classes and more engaged than Year 10 classes. In Year 10 the comparison students reported higher levels of engagement than students in participants' classes. There are, however, probably no statistically significant differences between participant and comparison classes at Year 9 or 10. The survey data will be more useful for the evaluation when there is time series data from 2014.

A small number of those school and university staff interviewed (about 10 percent of the total number interviewed) believed that there was no need for this programme because there was no longer a teacher shortage, and schools that serve low-decile communities did not have difficulty attracting potentially high-calibre novice teachers. Some others believed that attracting suitable chemistry, physics, and mathematics teachers to these schools remains a challenge.

The Teach First NZ programme aims to build strong partnerships between schools and the Faculty. This is also a goal of the traditional pathway, although it is approached differently because of where student teachers (or participants) spend most of their time. Building relationships between schools and universities is challenging and time-consuming, and the Teach First NZ programme is no exception to this. A number of respondents (most commonly co-ordinators or principals) queried the sustainability of the model, given the level of time, effort, and resources required.

This study does not set out to compare the Teach First NZ model with the model used in the University of Auckland's Graduate Diploma of Teaching, but it is already generating information on the factors that support or constrain learning to teach in this field-based model. The main factor which supports the development of teachers who positively impact on student engagement and learning appears to be that the 'right' participants are placed in the 'right' subject departments.

We have reported that on the whole the evidence is that the 'right' participants were selected, although they were not always placed in the 'right' places to learn to teach in the ways required by *The New Zealand Curriculum*. Nor were all of them teaching the subject that they had expected to teach when they applied for the Teach First NZ programme (because of Teachers Council requirements).

Subject departments appear more crucial than the choice of schools. Principal willingness to accept a participant is not a guarantee that the learning environment for the participant will be educative. Consultation within the school and with the Faculty about the support that the department is able to provide, before placing participants in contexts which are highly challenging and which may not support their learning, is therefore important.

If the department is the key factor, perhaps it is more important to find well-functioning departments that are willing and able to support participant learning, than to prioritise locating participants in schools primarily because they are deciles 1–3. While learning to teach diverse learners (particularly Māori and Pasifika) is a very important goal, it is also important that participants are in settings where they learn to teach well. In a school-based ITE programme, fledgling teachers require learning environments where teachers act in ways that transcend "traditional" practice, and where all teachers share accountability for improving their practice. We saw evidence that some participants were in this kind of environment, but for some their learning was less efficient and required more effort than it might have in a better situation. The VCS role is intended to strengthen subject knowledge and skills and can help ameliorate the problem of less than ideal placement.

For participants, "It very much matters which class you teach." Making careful decisions about the classes that participants teach would seem to be a critical element in supporting participants' success.

It is important that participating schools and departments are forewarned and prepared for providing high levels of initial support for the participants, and supported to do this. This includes participants being supported from the outset in behaviour management, lesson planning, curriculum knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge, assessment, and routine and procedural tasks.

Appendix 1: Ministry indicative evaluation questions

Table 4 **Ministry of Education indicative evaluation questions**

Key evaluation questions	
1. *How well (effectively and efficiently) has the Teach First NZ pathway been implemented?* **Formative/process focus: short-term and intermediate outcomes**	2. *To what extent has the Teach First NZ programme achieved its overall outcomes and objectives?* **Summative focus: long-term outcomes and objectives of programme**
Indicative subquestions	
• To what extent does the programme attract and recruit high-quality applicants? • How effective are the Teach First NZ recruitment and selection processes? • To what extent does the programme recruit participants who would otherwise be unlikely to enter teaching? • Do participants finish the programme? What are retention rates during the 2-year programme? • How well does the initial summer intensive prepare participants for working in schools? • How relevant/useful is the content and format of the overall 2-year programme, including the initial intensive and the ongoing mini intensives and initial teacher education/professional development? • To what extent are teaching and coursework loads appropriately challenging for participants? Is it a good balance? • How well does the Teach First NZ Trust support participants? • How well implemented is the host school recruitment and selection process? • How well implemented is the affiliate school recruitment and selection process? • To what extent to do host schools feel well-informed and supported by the partnership? • To what extent are appropriate mentors/university visiting specialists chosen? • How relevant/useful is the training and support that mentors/university visiting specialists receive? • How well do mentors/university visiting specialists support participants? • To what extent does the host school environment sustain/support the effective operation of the programme? • To what extent do the affiliate school arrangements support the overall goals of the programme? • How well and efficiently are implementation issues	• To what extent does the programme deliver/produce effective teacher graduates? • To what degree do participants support pastoral life within their host schools? • To what extent does the leadership development strand support, build on, and extend the concept of effective classroom teaching as leadership of learning? • To what extent do alumni of the programme stay in teaching or remain in wider education after programme completion (retention and post-training recruitment outcomes), in comparison with retention data from established programmes? • What is the programme's contribution to improving the quality of teaching and learning outcomes in participating schools? • To what extent do the features of the programme have a positive impact on the quality of teaching and learning for host schools and students? • What is the value of participating in the programme for host schools? • To what extent is the programme contributing to improving the status of teaching? • What factors appear to be associated with successful and disappointing outcomes (e.g., enablers, barriers)? • How engaged are graduates of the programme in Teach First NZ's alumni programme?

Key evaluation questions

resolved?

- How flexible has the programme been to adjusting
  to lessons learnt?

- Is the mix of programme elements optimal?

- What aspects of the programme could be refined to
  improve the overall quality of implementation?

- How sustainable[15] is the implementation model,
  including the recruitment process?

---

[15] Sustainability refers to whether the implementation model can successfully adjust to larger volumes of recruits, and implications
   for funding and resourcing. It also includes host schools' ability to support the programme when they self-fund programme
   participants' salaries from 2014.

Appendix 2: Interview questions, school personnel

Participants: Interview questions cohort one

1.0 Recruitment

1.1 What was your degree, what was your major, and what teaching subject areas did you study in your Teach First NZ (TFNZ) programme?

    1.1.1 Degree

    1.1.2 Major

    1.1.3 Teaching subjects in Postgrad Diploma of Teaching

1.2 How did you hear about TFNZ?

    1.2.1 Print advertisement

    1.2.2 Other media (specify)

    1.2.3 Seminar/presentation by TFNZ

    1.2.4 Word of mouth (specify)

    1.2.5 Careers fair

    1.2.6 Online website

    1.2.7 Social media

    1.2.8 TeachNZ website

    1.2.9 Other (specify)

1.3 And why did you apply?

    1.3.1 Opportunity to learn on the job (get out there quickly)

    1.3.2 The high challenge of the programme

    1.3.3 The postgraduate/intellectual challenge

    1.3.4 The 'mission'/vision of TFNZ (low decile, disparities in Māori/Pasifika achievement)

    1.3.5 The financial incentive (being paid a salary/no fees)

    1.3.6 Reputation of the traditional pathways to becoming a teacher

    1.3.7 Liked being part of a new approach to becoming a teacher (specify)

    1.3.8 Leadership development opportunities

    1.3.9 Being part of a global network with shared values

    1.3.10 Other (specify)

1.4 What did you think that you had to offer culturally diverse students?

1.5 Would you have applied to enter teaching *at this point in time* were it not for TFNZ?

    1.5.1 Yes

    1.5.2 No

1.6 What would you have done if you had not been accepted for this programme?

    1.6.1 Applied for the traditional pathway to becoming a teacher

    1.6.2 Further university study

    1.6.3 Travel

    1.6.4 Another job

    1.6.5 Other (specify)

1.7   What was the reaction of your family/friends to your gaining a place on this programme?

        a.   Positive (Why?)

        b.   Negative (Why?)

1.8   What impact do you think TFNZ has had on your perceived status of teaching as a profession?

1.9   To what extent do you feel TFNZ accurately assessed your ability against TFNZ selection competencies?

2.0   The SII

2.1   How useful was your 2-day SOAR experience, before joining the SII?

2.2   How was the SII?

        a.   What were the strengths of this approach?

        b.   Was there anything that you were disappointed with?

2.3   Now that you have been teaching for a while, what improvements to the SII would you recommend for the next intake? What elements of the SII would you want to ensure were retained for future cohorts?

2.4   Given the postgraduate level of the programme, how intellectually stimulating have you found the content?

2.5   To what extent to you feel part of the TFNZ cohort/community?

3.0   Your host school

3.1   How were you introduced to your host school?

3.2   How do you think the school community responded to you and the other TFNZ participant?

3.3   What was your orientation to the school?

a. Information about the unique context of this school

b. Information about the ways these students learn best

c. Who does what in the school

d. Policies and procedures (e.g., student discipline)

e. Other (specify)

3.4   What classes are you teaching? (Subjects and levels)

3.5   How is this school helping you to learn to teach? (Some suggestions below)

    a. Departmental handbooks

    b. Observing in other teachers' classes

    c. Mentor teacher modelling teaching for you

    d. Help with planning (who?)

    e. Mentor observing you teaching and providing feedback (how often does this happen?)

    f. Discussions about your learning (with whom?)

    g. Other experiences (specify)

4.0   Teaching and involvement

4.1   What have been the main challenges for you this year?

    4.1.1 How have you been able to address these challenges? (Who/what has helped you?)

4.2   How do you feel about how well you are functioning as a teacher at this stage in your development?

4.3   How do you think the students are doing?

4.4   Have you been involved in any professional learning in the school with other teachers? If so what is it, and has it had any impact on your practice?

4.5   Are you involved in other aspects of school life outside classroom teaching? If YES how are you finding this involvement?

4.6   What involvement have you had with the Visiting Curriculum Specialist from the university?

4.7   To what extent is this helping you to develop your expertise as a teacher?

4.8 How are you keeping track of your development and teaching? (How do you organise documenting progress and to what end? GTS? RTC? TFNZ goals and aims?)

5.0 General

5.1 Do you expect to complete the 2-year programme?

5.2 Do you expect to stay in teaching after the 2 years?

    a.   If YES for how long?

    b.   If NO what are the reasons for leaving?

5.3 Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your experiences so far?

Host school mentors: Interview questions cohort one

1. Background

1.1   When/how did you first hear about the TFNZ programme?

1.2   What is your understanding of the TFNZ aims and goals? (Are these different from the goals of the traditional pathway?)

1.3   What was your initial reaction to this approach to preparing teachers?

1.4   Have these views changed over time? How/why?

1.5   How did you get to be a mentor for this programme?

1.6   Did you do the mentor training provided by TFNZ?

1.7   What were your reactions to this professional learning?

1.8   Are you finding that you are able to use this learning in your work with your participant?

1.9   Has being a mentor had any impact on you? (Personally, professionally?)

1.10   Do you receive ongoing support from TFNZ for your work as a mentor?

2.0   Participants' placement and support

2.1   Are you and the participant in the same subject area?

2.2   How is this working for you?

2.3   How effective was the liaison between the programme personnel and you in terms of your respective roles and expectations?

2.4   What is your view of TFNZ's approach to mentoring participants? (Does this fit with your preferred approach?)

2.5   Have you worked as a mentor before? Is your approach different now? If YES, in what ways?

2.6   What has been the reaction of other teachers to the participants?

        a As individuals?

        b As teachers?

2.7   How supportive is the school of your role as mentor?

3.0   Participant teaching and involvement

3.1   What do you think is the main purpose of your work with the participant?

3.2   How often have you been able to formally observe the participant teaching in the classroom?

3.3   What is your approach to doing observations? How does it work in practice? How do you approach feedback?

3.4   Have you been able to model your teaching approach to your participant? How often? How does this work in practice?

3.5   Has the participant been able to observe other teachers teaching?

3.6   How have students responded to the participant(s) so far?

3.7   How else have the participant(s) been involved beyond the classroom?

3.8   Have the participant(s) had a noticeable impact in any way that you're aware of?

3.9   At this point, how do they rate against:

                        a. Student teachers on practicum?

                        b. Other PRTs in their first year?

3.10   What evidence do you have that TFNZ participants are having an impact on student/s approaches to learning and their achievement?

3.11   From what you have seen so far, do you think it is likely that the TFNZ model will produce quality PRTs at the end of 2 years? Why/not?

3.12   What feedback have you received from the wider school community about TFNZ (whānau, iwi, parents, local community)?

3.13   What feedback have you had from other teachers in your school about the TFNZ programme?

4   General

4.1   Have there been any barriers to your effective participation in the programme?

4.2   From what you have experienced so far, do you intend to continue a relationship with the TFNZ programme in the future?

4.3   Is there anything else you can tell me about your experience to date?

Host school co-ordinator: Interview questions cohort one

1.0   School involvement

1.1   When/how did you first hear about the TFNZ programme?

1.2   What were your initial reactions to the TFNZ programme?

1.3   Have these views changed over time? How/why?

1.4   What is your understanding of the TFNZ aims and goals?

1.5   In your view do the TFNZ aims and goals differ from those in the traditional pathway for secondary teaching? If YES, how and in what way?

1.6   What appear to be the particular strengths/weaknesses of this way of preparing teachers?

2.0   Your role

2.1   Can you describe your role as co-ordinator?

2.2   Did you have any training/preparation for this role?

2.3   How well prepared did you think you were to support the participants?

2.4   What ongoing involvement have you had with TFNZ?

3.0   Participant placement

3.1   Would you want be involved if positions were not supernumerary (i.e., from cohort two onwards)?

3.2   How effective was the liaison between the programme and the school in terms of your respective roles and expectations?

3.3   How many of the teachers were involved in the mentor training provided by TFNZ?

         a. Are you aware of their reactions to this training?

3.4   Do you know how mentors were selected for the participants?

3.5   What has been/is the reaction of staff to the participants in your school?

4.0   Participant teaching and involvement

4.1   Do you have any information about how well the participants are teaching?

4.2   How else have the participants been involved beyond the classroom?

4.3   Have the participants had a noticeable impact in any way that you're aware of?

4.4   How have students responded to the participants so far?

4.5   At this point, how do they rate against:

         a. Student teachers on practicum?

         b. PRTs in their first year?

4.6   From what you have seen so far, do you think it is likely that the TFNZ model will produce quality PRTs at the end of 2 years? Why/not?

4.7   What feedback have you received from the wider school community about TFNZ (whānau, iwi, parents, local community)?

5.0 General

5.1 What is your overall perception (so far) of the TFNZ initiative?

5.2 What do you see the school as having gained from participation in the programme?

5.3 Have there been any barriers to your school's effective participation in the programme?

5.4 From what you have experienced so far, do you intend to continue a relationship with the TFNZ programme in the future?

5.5 Is there anything else you can tell me about your experience to date?

Host School HoD: Interview questions cohort one

1.0 School involvement

1.1 When/how did you first hear about the TFNZ programme?

1.2 What were your initial reactions to the TFNZ programme?

1.3 Have these views changed over time? How/why?

1.4 What is your understanding of the TFNZ aims and goals? (Are they different from the goals of the traditional pathway?)

1.5 Why did you choose to involve your department in the TFNZ approach to teacher preparation?

2.0 Participant placement

2.1 How much choice did you get in the placement of the participant(s) in your department?

2.2 Would you be involved if positions were not supernumerary (i.e., from cohort two onwards)?

2.3 How effective was the liaison between the programme and the school in terms of your respective roles and expectations?

2.4 How did you select mentor(s) for the participant(s)? Has this mentor participated in the mentor training provided by TFNZ?

2.5 What has been/is the reaction of other teachers in your department to the participants?

3.0 Participant teaching and involvement

3.1 Do you have any information about how well the participants are teaching? (Probe for sources of this information. Has the HoD observed any participants teaching?)

3.2 How else have the participants been involved beyond the classroom?

3.3 Have the participants had a noticeable impact in any way that you're aware of?

3.4 Any benefits for the department? Costs?

3.5 How have students responded to the participants so far?

3.6 At this point, how do they rate against:

a. Student teachers on practicum?

b. PRTs in their first year?

3.7 From what you have seen so far, do you think it is likely that the TFNZ model will produce quality PRTs at the end of 2 years? Why/not?

3.8 What feedback have you received from the wider school community about TFNZ (whānau, iwi, parents, local community)?

3.9 What feedback have you had from other staff about your decision to be part of the scheme?

4.0 General

4.1 What is your overall perception (so far) of the TFNZ initiative?

4.2 From what you have experienced so far, do you intend to continue a relationship with the TFNZ programme in the future?

4.3 Is there anything else you can tell me about your experience to date?

Host school teachers: Interview questions cohort one

1.0   Background

1.1   When/how did you first hear about the TFNZ programme?

1.2   What is your understanding of the TFNZ goals and aims?

1.3   In your view do they differ from those in the traditional pathway for secondary teaching?

1.4   What was your initial reaction to this approach to preparing teachers?

1.5   Have these views changed over time? How/why?

1.6   Have you had any professional involvement with the participant? If YES can you say a little about this?

2.0   Participants' placement and support

2.1   Are you and the participant in the same subject area?

2.2   What has been the reaction of other teachers to the participants as individuals? As teachers?

3.0   Participant teaching and involvement

3.1   Do you have any information on how students have responded to the participants so far?

3.2   Are you aware of ways the participants have been involved beyond the classroom?

3.3   Have the participants had a noticeable impact on the school in any way that you're aware of?

3.4   *(For teachers in the same department as the participant only)* At this point, how do you think they rate against:
         a. Student teachers on practicum?
         b. Other PRTs in their first year?

3.5   From what you have seen so far, do you think it is likely that the TFNZ model will produce quality PRTs at the end of 2 years? Why/not?

3.6   What feedback have you received from the wider school community about TFNZ (whānau, iwi, parents, local community)?

3.7   What feedback have you had from other teachers in your school about the TFNZ programme?

4.0   General

4.1   What is your overall perception (so far) of the TFNZ initiative?

4.2   What do you see the school as having gained from participation in the programme?

4.3   From what you have experienced so far, would you be prepared to be a mentor for a participant if you were asked?

4.4   Is there anything else you can tell me about your experience to date?

Host school principal: Interview questions cohort one

1.0   School involvement

1.1   When/how did you first hear about the TFNZ programme?

1.2   Why did you choose to involve your school in the TFNZ approach to teacher preparation?

1.3   What is your understanding of the TFNZ aims and goals?

1.4   In your view do the TFNZ aims and goals differ from those in the traditional pathway for secondary teaching? If YES, how and in what ways?

1.5   What were the initial reactions of your staff to the TFNZ programme?

1.6   Have these views changed over time? How/why?

1.7   Can you describe the relationship between TFNZ and the university? How does it play out in practice at your school?

1.8   What appear to be the particular strengths of this way of preparing teachers? Any weaknesses?

2.0   Participant placement

2.1   How much choice did you get in the placement of the participant(s) in your school?

2.2   Would you be involved if positions were not supernumerary (i.e., from cohort two onwards)?

2.3   How effective was the liaison between the programme and the school in terms of your respective roles and expectations?

2.4   How many of your teachers were involved in the mentor training provided by TFNZ?

2.5   Are you aware of their reactions to this training?

2.6   How did you select mentors for the participants?

2.7   What has been/is the reaction of your staff to the participants in your school?

2.8   How has your PPTA branch responded?

3.0   Participant teaching and involvement

3.1   Do you have any information about how well the participants are teaching? *(Probe for sources of this information. Has the principal observed any participants teaching?)*

3.2   How else have the participants been involved beyond the classroom?

3.3   Have the participants had a noticeable impact in any way that you're aware of?

3.4   How have students responded to the participants so far?

3.5   At this point, how do they rate against:
   a. Student teachers on practicum?
   b. Other PRTs in their first year?

3.6   From what you have seen so far, do you think it is likely that the TFNZ model will produce quality PRTs at the end of 2 years? Why/not?

3.7   What feedback have you received from the wider school community about TFNZ (whānau, iwi, parents, local community)?

3.8   What feedback have you had from other principals about your decision to be part of the scheme?

4.0   General

4.1   What do you see the school as having gained from participation in the programme?

4.2   Have there been any barriers to the school's effective participation in the programme?

4.3   From what you have experienced so far, do you intend to continue a relationship with the TFNZ programme in the future?

4.4   Is there anything else you can tell me about your experience to date?

Appendix 3: Interview questions: Teach First NZ and Faculty questions

VCSs: Draft interviews phase one

1.0   Overview

1.1   Please tell me a little about your background, your experience as a teacher, and your experience as a teacher educator. What is your current role as a teacher educator?

1.2   When/how did you first hear about the Teach First NZ (TFNZ) programme?

1.3   What were your initial reactions to this approach to preparing teachers?

1.4   Have these reactions changed over time? How/why?

NOTE reasons

1.5   What were the initial reactions of your colleagues to the TFNZ programme?

1.6   Have these reactions changed over time? How/why?

1.7   How did you become involved as a VCS with TFNZ?

1.8   What are the expectations for you as a VCS?

1.9   Are these expectations different from the traditional 'visiting lecturer' role?

1.10   Do these expectations align with those of the mentor? The participant? The school liaison co-ordinator?

1.11   How does the school respond to you when you visit? How do you think the school feels about the work that you do?

1.12   Have you had professional development in relation to the VCS role?

1.13   What is your understanding of the TFNZ aims and goals?

1.14   In your view do the TFNZ aims and goals differ from those in the traditional pathway for secondary teaching? If YES, how and in what ways?

1.15   What are the assessment and reporting arrangements? How do these dovetail with the school and with reports from the mentors?

1.16   How would you describe the focus on leadership? How does it fit in with the programme? How does it work in the schools?

2.0   SII and teaching

2.1   Were you involved in the SII? In what ways?

2.2   Do you teach any of the participants in their Postgrad Diploma of Teaching?

2.3   Can you describe what your teaching involves—is it different from the traditional programme in any way?

2.4   Have you noticed any differences between the TFNZ participants in your classes and student teachers in other programmes? If so, to what do you attribute these differences?

2.5   What evidence do you have that TFNZ participants are having an impact on student(s) (achievement) in the schools in which they teach?

3.0   VCSs and support

3.1   What is the role of the VCSs in relation to monitoring/reporting progress?

3.2   How is feedback from formative evaluation used to support participants?

3.3   What procedures are in place for helping participants who experience difficulties?

3.4   What is the process for communicating between you and the mentor and the school co-ordinator?

3.5   To what extent is this communication working well? Can you identify ways that it could be strengthened?

4.0   General

4.1   What is your overall perception (so far) of the TFNZ initiative?

4.2   What do you see the schools as having gained from participation in the programme?

4.3   What do you see the participants as having gained from participation in the programme?

4.4   What in your view are the strengths of this approach?

4.5   In what ways might the programme be strengthened?

4.6   From what you have experienced so far, do you intend to continue a relationship with the TFNZ programme in the future?

4.7   Is there anything else you can tell me about your experience to date?

Teach First NZ partnership: Interview questions phase 1

1.0   Overview

1.1   When/how did you first hear about the Teach First/Teach for all programme?

1.2   What were your initial reactions to this approach to preparing teachers?

1.3   Have these reactions changed over time? How/why? *Note reasons*

1.4   What were the initial reactions of your colleagues to the TFNZ programme?

1.5   Have these reactions changed over time? How/why?

1.6   In your view do the TFNZ aims and goals differ from those in the traditional pathway for secondary teaching? If YES, how and in what ways?

1.7   To what extent have you been able to implement the programme as planned? What have been the major enablers and barriers to this?

1.8   Were you satisfied with the recruitment and selection processes? How have these been adapted for the 2014 intake?

2.0   SII and teaching

2.1   In what ways were you involved in the SII?

2.2   Have you had PLD in relation to this involvement?

2.3   Describe the process for communicating between you and mentors/other host school staff? You and the programme leader? You and other TFNZ staff?

2.4   To what extent is this communication working well? Can you identify ways that it could be strengthened?

2.5   (Have you noticed any differences between the TFNZ participants in your classes and student teachers in other programmes? If so, to what do you attribute these differences?) (What impact, if any, has the TFNZ programme had on other programmes in the university?)

2.6   Do you have any evidence yet that TFNZ participants are having an impact on student learning in the schools in which they teach?

2.7   What procedures are in place for helping participants who experience difficulties?

3.0   General

3.1   What is your overall perception (so far) of the TFNZ initiative?

3.2 What do you see the schools as having gained from participation in the programme?

3.3 What do you see the participants as having gained from participation in the programme?

3.4 What in your view are the strengths of the TFNZ approach?

3.5 In what ways might the programme be strengthened?

3.6 What changes for 2014 and beyond will you make based on your experiences to date?

3.7 Is there anything else you can tell me about your experience to date?

Faculty: interview questions phase 1

1.0   Overview

1.1   Please tell me a little about your background, your experience as a teacher, and your experience as a teacher educator. What is your current role as a teacher educator?

1.2   When/how did you first hear about the TFNZ programme?

1.3   What were your initial reactions to this approach to preparing teachers?

1.4   Have these reactions changed over time? How/why? *Note reasons*

1.5   What were the initial reactions of your colleagues to the TFNZ programme?

1.6   Have these reactions changed over time? How/why?

1.7   What is your understanding of the TFNZ aims and goals?

1.8   In your view do the TFNZ aims and goals differ from those in the traditional pathway for secondary teaching? If YES, how and in what ways?

1.9   What are your assessment and reporting arrangements relating to participants? How do these dovetail with the school and with reports from the mentors?

1.10   How would you describe the focus on leadership? How does it fit in with the programme? Do you know how it works in the schools?

Questions for those who are not teaching on the TFNZ programme

1.11   Would you be interested in contributing to this programme in the future?

1.12   Are there any comments you would like to make about the programme? (EXIT INTERVIEW HERE)

2.0   SII and teaching (those who teach on TFNZ programme)

2.1   Were you involved in the SII? In what ways?

2.2   How did you become involved as a lecturer with TFNZ?

2.2   What are the expectations for you as a lecturer?

2.3   Are these expectations different from the traditional lecturer role?

2.4   Have you had PLD in relation to this role?

2.5   Can you describe what your teaching involves—is it different from the traditional programme in any way?

2.6   What are the links between the programme and what participants do in schools?

2.7   Is there a process for communicating between you and mentors/other host school staff? You and the programme leader? You and other TFNZ staff?

2.8   To what extent is this communication working well? Can you identify ways that it could be strengthened?

2.9   Have you noticed any differences between the TFNZ participants in your classes and student teachers in other programmes? If so, to what do you attribute these differences?

2.10   Do you have any evidence yet that TFNZ participants are having an impact on student learning in the schools in which they teach?

2.11   What procedures are in place for helping participants who experience difficulties?

3.0 General

3.1 What is your overall perception (so far) of the TFNZ initiative?

3.2 What do you see the schools as having gained from participation in the programme?

3.3 What do you see the participants as having gained from participation in the programme?

3.4 What in your view are the strengths of the TFNZ approach?

3.5 In what ways might the programme be strengthened?

3.6 From what you have experienced so far, do you intend to continue a relationship with the TFNZ programme in the future?

3.7 Is there anything else you can tell me about your experience to date?

Appendix 4: *Me and My Class* Survey

Me in My Class

Tell us how you feel and behave in this class by showing how much you agree with each of these statements. Shade one circle for each statement.

1 I always try my hardest.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

2 I am always on time and organised.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

3 I'm really interested in what we learn.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

4 I have surprised myself with what I can achieve.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

5 I always want to go to this class.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

6 I learn things I can use outside of school.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

7 My culture is respected and valued.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

8 I want to tell other people about what I'm learning in this class.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

9 I have fun.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

10 I work well with others.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

© NZCER

Me and My Class

About Me   *Required information

Gender:*   Male ○   Female ○

Year level:*   Y4 ○   Y5 ○   Y6 ○   Y7 ○   Y8 ○
   Y9 ○   Y10 ○   Y11 ○   Y12 ○   Y13 ○

Ethnic group:*   NZ European ○   Māori ○   Pacific ○   Asian ○   Other ○

Instructions

This survey helps your teachers understand what students think about the learning they do in class. Over the page are some sentences. You need to shade in one circle to show how much you agree (or disagree) with each sentence. The circles mean: "strongly disagree", "disagree", "agree", and "strongly agree". Below are two examples to show you what to do.

E1 I like this class.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ● ○ Strongly agree

For E1 the person **agrees** that they like this class, but they don't strongly agree.

E2 I work hard in this class.

Strongly disagree ○ ● ○ ○ Strongly agree

For E2 the person **disagrees** that they work hard in this class, but not enough to shade "strongly disagree".

It is best to use a pen to shade in the circles. If you want to change your answer, put a cross through the circle you want to change (⊗) and fill in another circle.

Please answer all the questions. If you are not sure which circle to shade in, choose the one closest to how you feel.

Confidentiality

This survey is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. You do not need to write your name on this form, and no one else will be able to know how you answered each question.

© NZCER

Me and My Class

Tell us about the learning in your class by showing how much you agree with each of these statements. Shade one circle for each statement.

1 Students and the teacher respect and help each other.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

2 I can make mistakes and learn from them without getting told off.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

3 The teacher uses my ideas and things I know about to help me learn new things.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

4 My teacher helps me understand how other people might be feeling or thinking.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

5 My teacher likes it when I ask questions and try out new things.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

6 We work with people from outside school (like students from other schools, scientists, writers, sports people or other experts).

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

7 We help each other to think about how to make our work better.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

8 We talk about how we are learning and different ways of learning.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

9 We use ideas and skills from different parts of our learning to solve problems (like using ideas from reading and maths, or art and science, mixed together).

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

10 We learn good ways to co-operate while we learn.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

11 I get to explain my thinking – how I worked something out.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

12 My teacher encourages us to keep trying, especially when we get stuck.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

© NZCER

Me and My Class

Tell us about the learning in your class by showing how much you agree with each of these statements. Shade one circle for each statement.

13 My teacher encourages us to try new things, even if they feel a bit hard at first.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

14 We learn how things like words, pictures, symbols, sounds and movements can show the same ideas in different ways.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

15 We work on real life projects that make our school or community a better place.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

16 I get to do things that are about my family and culture.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

17 We are allowed to disagree with others, and to change our minds if someone has a better idea.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

18 We learn about things that are important to different cultures.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

19 We learn ways to work out problems or challenges together.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

20 We use our learning to design or make new things.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

21 We think about how our new learning changes what we already know.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

22 We learn good ways to say what we are thinking in different situations.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

23 We learn that things we read or see can have more than one meaning.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

24 We talk about how we could use our learning in new situations.

Strongly disagree ○ ○ ○ ○ Strongly agree

© NZCER