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Executive Summary

Introduction

From February to May 2012, the Teaching Agency (formerly the Training and Development Agency for Schools) surveyed newly qualified teachers (NQTs) who had successfully completed their initial teacher training (ITT) in England during the 2010/11 academic year.

The survey questionnaire (appendix 3) was mailed to approximately 33,000 NQTs registered with the General Teaching Council for England\(^1\) in December 2011. The survey asked them to:

- Assess the quality of their initial teacher training in a number of key areas;
- Tell us about their induction experiences; and
- Tell us about their current employment circumstances.

A summary of the key findings is included in this report. More detailed analyses of the sector level results are available at: [http://dataprovision.education.gov.uk/public](http://dataprovision.education.gov.uk/public) and provider level analyses will be available on this site from September 2012.

Around 12,000 NQTs completed and returned their questionnaires, a response rate of 36 per cent. The NQTs who responded were broadly representative of the total NQT population (approximately 34,000) who completed their training and were awarded qualified teacher status in the 2010/11 academic year.

---

\(^1\) Not all NQTs are registered with the GTCE, however, NQTs teaching in a maintained school in England had to be registered at the time of this survey.
Key findings

Amongst primary trained NQTs

- Eighty-nine per cent gave a very good or good rating when asked about the overall quality of their training; a significant increase\(^2\) of two percentage points compared with the 2011 survey, and the highest quality rating received in the annual survey.

- Of the twenty questions common to the 2012 and 2011 surveys; eighteen received higher ratings\(^3\) than last year. These have been ranked by the highest percentage point increase in very good or good ratings:
  - Preparation to teach reading including phonics and comprehension
  - Help to teach pupils with special educational needs
  - Preparation to share responsibility for continuing professional development
  - Preparation for their statutory responsibility for the welfare and safety of pupils
  - Preparation to communicate with parents and carers
  - Preparation to work with teaching colleagues as part of a team
  - Help to establish and maintain a good standard of behaviour in the classroom
  - Preparation to work with learners with English as an additional language
  - Preparation to teach learners from minority ethnic backgrounds
  - Preparation to work with teaching assistants to achieve learning objectives
  - Preparation to use information and communication technology more effectively in teaching
  - Integrating the university-delivered elements with the school-based placements
  - Preparation to teach across the range of abilities

\(^2\) Statistically significant at the 95 per cent level

\(^3\) Differences in the percentage of very good and good responses that were statistically significant at the 95 per cent level
o Help to plan teaching to achieve progression for learners

o Overall quality of training

o Understanding how to monitor, assess, record and report learners’ progress

o Preparation to teach a specialist subject

o Using a range of teaching methods that promote learning

- The question relating to the preparation to teach primary mathematics received a lower rating compared with the previous year (80 per cent of respondents rated this as very good or good compared with 82 per cent in 2011)

**Amongst secondary trained NQTs**

- Ninety per cent rated the overall quality of their training as very good or good. This was a three percentage point increase compared with the 2011 survey and is the highest rating received since the survey was introduced.

- All of the eighteen questions common to the 2012 and 2011 survey received significantly higher ratings than last year. These have been ranked by the highest percentage point increase in very good or good ratings:

  o Integrating the university-delivered elements with the school-based placements

  o Help to teach pupils with special educational needs

  o Preparation for their statutory responsibility for the welfare and safety of pupils

  o Preparation to work with learners with English as an additional language

  o Preparation to teach learners from minority ethnic backgrounds

  o Help to establish and maintain a good standard of behaviour in the classroom

  o Preparation to teach across the range of abilities

  o Preparation to work with teaching assistants to achieve learning objectives

\(^4\) Differences in the percentage of very good and good responses that were statistically significant at the 95 per cent level
- Preparation to communicate with parents and carers
- Preparation to share responsibility for continuing professional development
- Preparation to use information and communication technology more effectively in teaching
- Using a range of teaching methods that promote learning
- Help to understand the national curriculum
- Overall quality of training
- Preparation to teach a specialist subject
- Understanding how to monitor, assess, record and report learners’ progress
- Help to plan teaching to achieve progression for learners
- Preparation to work with teaching colleagues as part of a team
Primary sector analysis

This section contains an analysis of the responses to the NQT survey 2012 from 5,200 primary-trained NQTs. Throughout this section the term ‘primary-trained NQTs’ refers to respondent NQTs who were trained on primary ITT courses and does not necessarily reflect the phase or age range they are teaching. Detailed analyses of responses to each question are included in figures 101 and 102 in appendix 2.

For the questions relating to the quality of training, respondents were given four options: very good, good, satisfactory and poor. The measure used throughout this report is the number of very good and good responses expressed as a percentage of the total number of valid responses. Analysing statistically significant changes in comparison to the 2011 survey, and taking into account year on year trends, the key findings of the NQT survey 2012 are as follows:

Overall quality of training

Eighty-nine per cent of of primary trained NQTs rated the overall quality of their training (graph1) as very good or good; a significant increase compared with 2011 and the highest overall rating since the survey began.

Analysis of the 2012 primary responses to this question showed that:

- School -centered (SCITT) provision continues to achieve the highest ratings (94 per cent of very good and good responses) followed by employment-based (EBITT) provision (90 per cent of very good and good responses) and university-based (HEI) provision (89 per cent of very good and good responses)

- NQTs aged 25 and under gave higher ratings (92 per cent of very good and good responses) compared with older NQTs (88 per cent for NQTs aged 35 to 44 and 82 per cent for NQTs aged 45 and over)

- Female NQTs gave higher ratings than male NQTs (90 per cent compared with 86 per cent of very good and good responses)

---

5 At the 95 per cent level
Graph 1 (primary)

Please rate the overall quality of your training

2003: 27% Good, 27% Very good
2004: 25% Good, 26% Very good
2005: 26% Good, 27% Very good
2006: 27% Good, 29% Very good
2007: 29% Good, 28% Very good
2008: 29% Good, 29% Very good
2009: 30% Good, 32% Very good
2010: 35% Good, 55% Very good
2011: 52% Good, 52% Very good
2012: 52% Good, 52% Very good
Subject knowledge

Eighty-one per cent of primary-trained NQTs rated their understanding of the national curriculum as very good or good (graph 2). Undergraduate primary-trained NQTs continued to rate this aspect of their training higher than postgraduate trained NQTs (92 per cent compared with 89 per cent of very good and good responses), although the difference as reduced since the 2011 survey (three percentage points different compared with eight percentage points in the 2011 survey).

NQTs trained on SCITT routes rated this aspect of their training the highest (90 per cent), followed by those on HEI routes (81 per cent) and those on EBITT routes (79 per cent of very good and good responses).

Graph 2 (primary)
Seventy-one per cent of primary-trained NQTs rated their **preparation to teach their specialist subject** as very good or good (graph 3); a significant increase of three percentage points compared with the 2011 survey. Undergraduate primary-trained NQTs continued to rate this aspect of their training higher than postgraduate trained NQTs (77 per cent compared with 69 per cent of very good and good responses).

NQTs trained on SCITT routes rated this aspect of their training the highest (79 per cent), followed by those on HEI routes (71 per cent) and those on EBITT routes (70 per cent of very good and good responses).

**Graph 3 (primary)**

![Graph showing how good the training was in preparing NQTs to teach their specialist subject over years from 2003 to 2012. The x-axis represents the years with bars indicating percentages of students rating their preparation as very good or good. The y-axis represents percentage values from 0% to 100%. The graph shows an increase in the percentage of very good responses from 2003 to 2012.](image-url)
Teaching and learning

Primary-trained NQTs' ratings of how well their training prepared them to establish and maintain a good standard of behaviour in the classroom (graph 4) increased by six percentage points (79 per cent of very good and good responses compared with 73 per cent in the 2011 survey). This builds on the similar improvement recorded between the 2010 and 2011 surveys and results in the highest rating since the survey was introduced.

Notably; the percentage rating this aspect as very good has doubled since 2003 (31 per cent compared with 15 per cent in 2003 and 18 per cent in 2010).

NQTs on SCITT routes continue to rate this aspect of their training the highest (92 per cent) followed by NQTs on EBITT routes (86 per cent) and NQTs on HEI routes (76 per cent).

Graph 4 (primary)
Similarly, NQTs’ ratings of how well their training prepared them to use a range of teaching methods that promote pupils learning (graph 5) increased by three percentage points (87 per cent compared with 84 per cent of very good and good responses in the 2011).

Undergraduate-trained primary NQTs rated this aspect of their training higher than those on postgraduate routes (88 per cent compared with 85 per cent of very good and good responses).

NQTs on SCITT routes continue to rate this aspect of their training the highest (92 per cent) followed by NQTs on EBITT routes (89 per cent) and NQTs on HEI routes (86 per cent).

**Graph 5 (primary)**

![Graph showing the percentage of responses rated very good and good for each year from 2003 to 2012.](image)

- **How good was your training in helping you use a range of teaching methods that promote pupil's learning?**
- **Graph 5 (primary)**
Seventy-six per cent of primary-trained NQTs rated their help to plan their teaching to achieve progression for learners as very good or good; a significant increase of three percentage points compared with the previous year (graph 6).

Undergraduate-trained primary NQTs rated this aspect of their training higher than those on postgraduate routes (78 per cent compared with 75 per cent of very good and good responses).

NQTs on SCITT routes continue to rate this aspect of their training the highest (88 per cent) followed by NQTs on EBITT routes (81 per cent) and NQTs on HEI routes (73 per cent).

Graph 6 (primary)
Seventy-six per cent of primary-trained NQTs rated their help to understand how to monitor, assess, record and report learners’ progress as very good or good compared with 72 per cent in the 2011 survey (graph 7). There was no difference between the ratings of undergraduate-trained NQTs compared with postgraduate-trained NQTs.

NQTs on SCITT routes continue to rate this aspect of their training the highest (81 per cent) followed by NQTs on EBITT routes (74 per cent) and NQTs on HEI routes (63 per cent).

Graph 7 (primary)
Preparation to teach reading, comprehension and writing

Primary-trained NQTs were asked to rate the quality of their training in preparing them to teach reading, including phonics and comprehension (graph 8). Sixty-eight per cent of NQTs gave a very good or good response compared with 58 per cent last year and 51 per cent in the 2010 survey. There was no difference between the ratings of undergraduate-trained NQTs compared with postgraduate-trained NQTs.

NQTs on SCITT routes continue to rate his aspect of their training the highest (79 per cent) followed by NQTs on EBITT routes (71 per cent) and NQTs on HEI routes (67 per cent).

Graph 8 (primary)
In 2012, three new related questions were introduced: specifically preparing them to teach systematic synthetic phonics, specifically preparing them to teach language comprehension and preparing them to teach writing. Fifty-nine per cent of NQTs rated their preparation as very good or good to the systematic synthetic phonics question, 55 per cent to the language comprehension question and 62 per cent to the writing question.

Postgraduate primary-trained NQTs rated the systematic synthetic phonics question higher than undergraduate-trained NQTs (60 per cent compared with 56 per cent of very good and good responses).

NQTs on SCITT routes rated these three aspects of their training the highest (73 per cent for the systematic synthetic phonics question, 69 per cent for the language comprehension question and 71 per cent for the writing question), followed by EBITT trained NQTs (62 per cent, 57 per cent and 65 respectively) and HEI trained NQTs (58 per cent, 54 per cent and 60 per cent respectively).
Preparation to teach primary mathematics, addition, subtraction, multiplication and division

In 2011 a new question was introduced about NQT’s preparation to teach primary mathematics. Responses to the same question in 2012 indicate that NQTs were less well prepared, although 80 per cent of primary-trained NQTs rated this as very good or good (82 per cent rated this as very good or good in the 2011 survey).

NQTs trained on undergraduate primary programmes rated this aspect of their training higher than those trained on postgraduate programmes (82 per cent compared with 79 per cent of very good and good responses).

NQTs on SCITT routes rated this aspect of their training the highest (87 per cent) followed by NQTs on HEI routes (80 per cent) and NQTs on EBITT routes (75 per cent).

Graph 9 (primary)

In 2012, a new question about preparation to teach addition, subtraction, multiplication and division was introduced.

Seventy-four per cent of primary-trained NQTs rated this aspect of their training as very good or good. There was no difference in the way undergraduate and postgraduate-trained NQTs rated this aspect of their training, but NQTs on SCITT routes did rate it higher (85 per cent) than NQTs on HEI routes (76 per cent) and NQTs on EBITT routes (66 per cent).
Diversity

Graphs 10 and 11 show that primary-trained NQTs rated their preparation to teach learners from minority ethnic backgrounds and work with learners with English as an additional language significantly higher than in the previous year (54 per cent and 49 per cent respectively compared 48 per cent and 45 per cent respectively).

NQTs trained on postgraduate routes rated both these aspects of their training significantly higher than those trained on undergraduate routes (56 per cent and 52 per cent respectively compared with 50 per cent and 46 per cent respectively).

NQTs on SCITT routes rated both these aspects of their training the highest (72 per cent for the former question and 69 per cent for the latter), followed by EBITT trained NQTs (59 per cent and 56 per cent respectively) and HEI trained NQTs (51 per cent and 47 per cent respectively).

There were large variations in responses from NQTs when analysed by the government office region in which the initial teacher training provider was located. In the case of the minority ethnic backgrounds question; NQTs trained by London based providers rated this aspect of their training higher than NQTs trained by providers based in the south west government office region (68 per cent of very good and good responses compared with 38 per cent of very good and good responses). There were similar variations in the responses to the English as an additional language question with 61 per cent of NQTs trained by providers based in London compared with 39 per cent of NQTs trained by providers based in the south west region, rating their training as very good or good.

Graph 10 (primary)
There was also a significant increase in the way that primary-trained NQTs rated their preparation to teach pupils with special educational needs in your classes, with appropriate support and to teach across the range of abilities (graphs 12 and 13).

Fifty-nine per cent of primary-trained NQTs responded very good or good to the SEN question compared with 52 per cent in the 2011 survey.

There was no significant difference between the ratings of undergraduate-trained NQTs compared with postgraduate-trained NQTs, but NQTs on SCITT routes continue to rate this aspect of their training the highest (76 per cent) followed by NQTs on EBITT routes (67 per cent) and NQTs on HEI routes (57 per cent).

Seventy-four per cent of primary-trained NQTs rated their preparation to teach across the range of abilities as very good or good compared with 71 per cent in the 2011 survey.

There was no significant difference between the ratings of undergraduate-trained NQTs compared with postgraduate-trained NQTs, but NQTs on SCITT routes continue to rate this aspect of their training the highest (80 per cent) followed by NQTs on EBITT routes (67 per cent) and NQTs on HEI routes (73 per cent).

---

6 Question modified in 2012 to include: with appropriate support
Graph12 (primary)

How good was your training in preparing you to work with learners with special educational needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph13 (primary)

How good was your training in preparing you to teach across the range of abilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The role of the teacher

Eighty-two per cent of primary-trained NQTs rated their preparation to work with teaching colleagues as part of a team (graph 13) compared with 78 per cent in 2011. NQTs trained on undergraduate programmes rated this aspect of their training higher than those trained on postgraduate programmes (85 per cent compared with 81 per cent of very good and good responses).

NQTs on SCITT routes continue to rate this aspect of their training the highest (89 per cent) followed by NQTs on EBITT routes (85 per cent) and NQTs on HEI routes (81 per cent).

Graph14 (primary)
The survey also asked NQTs about their preparation to communicate with parents and carers and for their statutory responsibility for the welfare and safeguarding of pupils (graphs 15 and 16).

In response the communication question, 60 per cent of NQTs rated their preparation as very good or good compared with 53 per cent in 2011.

There was no significant difference between the ratings of undergraduate-trained NQTs compared with postgraduate-trained NQTs, but NQTs on SCITT and EBITT routes rated this aspect of their training the highest (76 per cent) compared with NQTs on HEI routes (55 per cent).

Graph 15 (primary)
In response to the **welfare and safeguarding** question, 81 per cent of NQTs rated their preparation as very good or good compared with 77 per cent in 2011.

There was no significant difference between the ratings of undergraduate-trained NQTs compared with postgraduate-trained NQTs, but NQTs on SCITT routes continue to rate this aspect of their training the highest (89 per cent) followed by NQTs on EBITT routes (87 per cent) and NQTs on HEI routes (81 per cent).

**Graph16(Primary)**

*How good was your training in preparing you for your teacher's statutory responsibility for the welfare and safeguarding of pupils?*
**Integrated training**

In 2012, a new question on the integration of the university-delivered elements of programmes with the school-based placements, was introduced.

Graph 17 shows that primary-trained NQTs rated this aspect of their training higher in the 2012 survey (77 per cent compared 72 per cent of very good and good responses).

Undergraduate primary-trained NQTs rated this aspect of their training higher than postgraduate-trained NQTs (82 per cent compared with 79 per cent of very good and good responses).

NQTs on SCITT routes rated this aspect of their training higher (90 per cent) than NQTs on HEI routes (76 per cent) and NQTs on EBITT routes (75 per cent).

**Graph17 (primary)**
Continuing professional development

Primary-trained NQTs were also asked how well their training had prepared them to share responsibility for their continuing professional development. Sixty-seven per cent of primary trained NQTs rated this as very good or good compared with 60 per cent in the 2011 survey.

There was no difference between the ratings of undergraduate and postgraduate-trained NQTs, but NQTs on SCITT routes rated this aspect of their training the highest (78 per cent) followed by NQTs on EBITT routes (72 per cent) and NQTs on HEI routes (65 per cent).

Graph18 (primary)
New questions in 2012

A number of new questions were introduced in 2012 about the training the NQTs received and how it helped them to understand: subject knowledge, pedagogy and the assessment process.

Eighty-four per cent of primary-trained NQTs rated the subject knowledge aspect of their training as very good or good and 83 per cent rated the pedagogy aspect as very good or good. Sixty-nine rated the assessment process aspect as very good or good.

Undergraduate-trained NQTs rated all three aspects higher than postgraduate-trained NQTs (87, 85 and 71 per cent of very good and good responses compared with 83, 82 and 67 per cent of very good and good responses respectively).

There were some variations across the training routes. SCITT-trained NQTs rated all three aspects the highest (90 per cent for subject knowledge and pedagogy and 84 per cent of very good and good responses for assessment) followed by HEI-trained NQTs for subject knowledge and pedagogy (85 per cent and 84 per cent respectively) and EBITT-trained NQTs for assessment (73 per cent of very good and good responses). The lowest ratings for subject knowledge and pedagogy were given by NQTs trained on EBITT routes (80 per cent and 78 per cent of very good and good responses respectively) and HEI trained NQTs on assessment 67 per cent of very good and good responses).

There were some regional variations. For the question on subject knowledge; 89 per cent of NQTs trained by providers in the north east government office region rated this aspect of their training as very good or good compared with 81 per cent of NQTs trained by providers in London.

For the question about pedagogy, 88 per cent of NQTs trained in the south west region rated this aspect of their training as very good or good compared with 81 per cent of NQTs trained in the north west government office region.

For the question on assessment, 76 per cent of NQTs trained in the south west region rated this aspect of their training as very good or good compared with 63 per cent of NQTs trained in the north west government office region.

---

7 Based on the regional location of the training provider
Secondary sector analysis

This section contains an analysis of responses to the NQT survey 2012 from approximately 6,300 secondary (including key stage 2/3)-trained NQTs. Throughout this section the term 'secondary-trained NQTs' refers to respondent NQTs who were trained on secondary and key stage 2/3 ITT courses, and it does not necessarily reflect the phase they are teaching.

For the questions relating to the quality of training, respondents were given four options: very good, good, satisfactory and poor. The measure used throughout this report is the number of very good and good responses expressed as a percentage of the total number of valid responses. Analysing statistically significant changes in comparison to the 2011 survey, and taking into account year on year trends, the key findings of the NQT survey 2012 are as follows:

Overall quality of training

Secondary trained NQTs were asked to rate the overall quality of their training (graph19). Ninety per cent of respondents rated it as very good or good; a significant increase on the 2011 result (87 per cent).

NQTs on HEI routes rate this aspect of their training the highest (91 per cent) followed by SCITT routes (90 per cent) and EBITT routes (89 per cent).

Graph19 (secondary)

---

8 At the 95 per cent level
Subject knowledge

Eighty per cent of secondary-trained NQTs rated their training as very good or good in helping them understand the national curriculum compared with 77 per cent in the 2011 survey. NQTs trained on HEI and SCITT routes rated this aspect of their training the highest (81 per cent of very good and good responses) followed by NQTs trained on EBITT routes (76 per cent of very good and good responses).

Graph 20 (secondary)
Eighty-six per cent of secondary-trained NQTs rated *their preparation to teach their specialist subject* as very good or good compared with 83 per cent in the 2011 survey.

NQTs trained on HEI programmes rated this aspect of their training the highest (88 per cent of very good or good responses) followed by NQTs trained on SCITT routes (86 per cent of very good or good responses) and NQTs trained on EBITT routes (79 per cent of very good or good responses).

**Graph 21 (secondary)**
Teaching and learning

Seventy-six per cent of secondary trained NQTs rated *their preparation to establish and maintain a good standard of behaviour in the classroom* as very good or good compared with 71 per cent in the 2011 survey.

NQTs trained on EBITT and SCITT programmes rated this aspect of their training highest (81 per cent of very good and good responses) followed by NQTs trained HEI programmes (74 per cent of very good and good responses).

**Graph 22 (secondary)**
Eighty-eight per cent of secondary-trained NQTs rated their training as very good or good in **helping them use a range of teaching methods that promote pupils’ learning**, compared with 85 per cent in the 2011 survey.

NQTs trained on SCITT programmes rated this aspect of their training highest (90 per cent of very good and good responses) followed by NQTs trained on EBITT and HEI programmes (88 per cent of very good and good responses).

**Graph 23 (secondary)**

![Graph showing percentage of NQTs rated their training as very good or good in helping them use a range of teaching methods that promote pupils’ learning over years from 2003 to 2012. The percentage for each year is as follows: 2003 - 48%, 2004 - 50%, 2005 - 53%, 2006 - 49%, 2007 - 52%, 2008 - 51%, 2009 - 50%, 2010 - 50%, 2011 - 47%, 2012 - 45%. The graph indicates a steady increase over the years.](image-url)
Eighty per cent of secondary-trained NQTs rated their training as very good or good in helping them plan teaching to achieve progression for learners compared with 78 per cent in the 2011 survey.

NQTs trained on SCITT routes rated this aspect of their training the highest (86 per cent) followed by NQTs on EBITT routes (82 per cent) and NQTs on HEI routes (80 per cent).

**Graph 24 (secondary)**

![Graph showing the percentage of NQTs who rated their training as good or very good in helping them plan teaching to achieve progression for learners from 2003 to 2012.](image)
When asked about their training in relation to **helping them to monitor, assess, record and report learners’ progress**, 75 per cent of secondary-trained NQTs rated this aspect of their training as very good or good compared to 73 per cent in the 2011 survey.

NQTs on EBITT routes rated this aspect of their training the highest (79 per cent) followed by NQTs on SCITT routes (73 per cent) and NQTs on HEI routes (73 per cent).

**Graph 25 (secondary)**
Diversity

Fifty-two per cent of secondary-trained NQTs rated their preparation to teach learners from minority ethnic backgrounds as very good or good and 49 per cent rated their preparation to teach learners with English as an additional language as very good or good (graphs 26 and 27), compared with 47 per cent and 44 per cent respectively in the 2011 survey.

NQTs trained in London rated their preparation to teach learners from minority ethnic backgrounds the highest (65 per cent of very good or good responses) compared with NQTs trained in the south west government office region (41 per cent of very good and good responses).

Regional differences were not so marked in the case of the English as an additional language question. There were differences, and NQTs trained by providers based in London and the north east government office regions rated this aspect of their training the highest compared with NQTs trained by providers based in the north west and Yorkshire and The Humber government office regions (59 per cent and 57 per cent of very good and good responses for London and the north east compared with 43 per cent for both the north west and Yorkshire ad The Humber).

Graph 26 (secondary)
Graph 27 (secondary)

How good was your training in preparing you to work with learners with English as an additional language?

- **Good**
- **Very good**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Good (%)</th>
<th>Very Good (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sixty-five per cent of secondary-trained NQTs rated their training as very good or good in helping to teach pupils with special educational needs in classes, with appropriate support\(^9\) compared with 59 per cent in the 2011 survey.

NQTs trained on SCITT routes rated this aspect of their training the highest (71 per cent of very good and good responses) followed by those trained on EBITT routes (70 per cent of very good and good responses) and those trained on HEI routes (64 per cent of very good and good responses).

There were some regional variations\(^10\) and NQTs trained at providers based in the north east government office region rating this aspect the highest (72 per cent of very good and good responses) compared with NQTs trained at providers based in Yorkshire and The Humber government office region (60 per cent of very good and good responses).

**Graph 28 (secondary)**

---

\(^9\) Question modified in the 2012 survey to include: with appropriate support

\(^10\) Based on the regional location of the training provider
When asked about *preparation to teach across a range of abilities*, 78 per cent of secondary-trained NQTs rated this aspect of their training as very good or good compared with 73 per cent in the 2010 survey.

There was very little difference across the training routes.

**Graph 29 (secondary)**

![Graph showing the percentage of secondary-trained NQTs who rated their training as very good or good in preparing them to teach across the range of abilities from 2003 to 2012.](image)
The role of the teacher

Eight-three per cent of secondary-trained NQTs rated their preparation to work with teaching colleagues as part of a team as very good or good compared with 81 per cent in the 2011 survey.

NQTs trained on SCITT routes rated this aspect of their training the highest (86 per cent of very good or good responses), followed by NQTs trained on HEI routes (83 per cent of very good or good responses) and NQTs trained on EBITT routes (82 per cent of very good or good responses).

Graph 30 (secondary)
When asked about their preparation to communicate with parents and carers, sixty-four per cent of secondary-trained NQTs rated this aspect of their initial teacher training as very good or good compared with 61 per cent in the 2011 survey.

NQTs trained on EBITT routes rated this aspect the highest (73 per cent of very good and good responses) followed by NQTs trained on SCITT routes (70 per cent of very good or good responses) and NQTs trained on HEI routes (62 per cent of very good or good responses).

There were some regional variations and NQTs trained at providers based in the eastern government office region rating this aspect the highest (70 per cent of very good and good responses) compared with NQTs trained at providers based in the north west government office region (59 per cent of very good and good responses).

**Graph 31 (secondary)**

![Graph showing how good was training in preparing to communicate with parents or carers](image)

---

11 Based on the regional location of the training provider
Eighty-six per cent of secondary-trained NQTs rated their preparation for their teacher’s statutory responsibility for the welfare and safeguarding of pupils as very good or good compared with 82 per cent in the 2011 survey.

There was very little difference across the training routes and across the government office regions.

**Graph 32 (secondary)**

![Graph showing the percentage of secondary-trained NQTs rated their preparation for teacher's statutory responsibility as very good or good from 2003 to 2012.](image)
Continuing professional development

Seventy-two per cent of secondary-trained NQTs rated their preparation to share responsibility for their continuing professional development as very good or good compared to 69 per cent in the 2011 survey.

There was very little difference across the training routes and across the government office regions.

Graph 33 (secondary)
Integrated training

In 2012, a new question on the integration of the university-delivered elements of programmes with the school-based placements, was introduced.

Seventy-six per cent of secondary-trained NQTs rated this aspect of their training as very good or good compared with 76 per cent in the 2011 survey.

NQTs trained on HEI and SCITT routes rated this aspect of their training the highest (78 per cent of very good and good responses) followed by NQTs trained on EBITT routes (71 per cent of very good and good responses).

There was very little regional variation12.

Graph 34 (secondary)

How good was your training in integrating the university-delivered elements of your programme with the school-based placements?

12 Based on the regional location of the training provider
New questions in 2012

A number of new questions were introduced in 2012 about the training the NQTs received and how it helped them to understand: subject knowledge, pedagogy and the assessment process.

Eighty-four per cent of secondary-trained NQTs rated the first two aspects as very good or good and 80 per cent rated the third aspect as very good or good.

There were some variations across the training routes and HEI trained NQTs rated the first two aspects the highest (87 per cent and 86 per cent of very good and good responses, respectively) followed by SCITT trained NQTs (84 per cent of very good and good responses, for both aspects).

In relation to their understanding of the assessment process, there was less variation and 84 per cent of SCITT trained NQTs rated this aspect as very good and good followed by NQTs trained on HEI and EBITT routes (80 per cent of very good and good responses).

There were some regional variations\textsuperscript{13} in the response to the questions on pedagogy and the assessment process. In the case of the former question, 86 per cent of NQTs trained by providers based in the east midlands government office region rated this as very good or good compared with 79 per cent of NQTs trained by providers based in the north east government office. For the latter question; 83 per cent cent of NQTs trained by providers based in the east midlands government office region rated this as very good or good compared with 74 per cent of NQTs trained by providers based in the north east government office.

\textsuperscript{13} Based on the regional location of the training provider
NQTs’ current employment circumstances

The survey included questions about NQTs’ current employment status and experiences. The key findings are detailed below:

- Ninety-two per cent of primary-trained NQTs and 91 per cent of secondary-trained respondents were in employment compared with 93 per cent for primary and secondary in the 2011 survey.

- As in previous years the pattern of employment of primary-trained NQTs was different from secondary-trained NQTs. For example:
  
  o Forty-five per cent of primary-trained NQTs had permanent teaching contracts compared 58 per cent of secondary trained NQTs (in the 2011 survey the figures were 42 per cent and 63 per cent respectively).

  o Thirty-three per cent of primary-trained NQTs had fixed term teaching contracts compared with 25 per cent of secondary-trained NQTs (in 2011 the figures were 36 per cent and 22 per cent respectively).

  o Fourteen per cent of primary-trained NQTs had teaching supply contracts compared with eight per cent of secondary trained NQTs (In the 2011 survey the figures were 15 per cent and eight per cent respectively).

- Primary-trained NQTs made on average 6.4 applications before taking up their current position compared with 5.7 in the 2011 survey. Twenty-nine per cent of respondents indicated that they made eight or more applications.

- Secondary-trained NQTs made on average 5.2 applications before taking up their current position compared with 4.1 in the 2011 survey. Twenty per cent of respondents indicated that they made eight or more applications.

- The survey included a question about how good their training was in helping them to apply confidently for teaching positions and 57 per cent of primary trained NQTs and 66 per cent of secondary-trained NQTs rated this aspect of their training as very good or good.

- Forty-nine per cent of primary trained NQTs and 53 per cent of secondary-trained NQTs, who responded to the survey, indicated that they had a career before starting their teacher training programme (In 2011 the figures were 46 per cent and 53 per cent respectively). A higher proportion of respondents on employment-based programmes had a previous career (79 per cent of primary trained NQTs and 63 per cent of secondary trained NQTs) compared with NQTs trained on mainstream routes (44 per cent of primary trained NQTs and 51 per cent of secondary trained NQTs).

- Thirteen per cent of primary-trained NQTs and 20 per cent of secondary-trained NQTs indicated that they relocated to take up their current teaching position.
• The pattern of employment for primary trained NQTs showed large regional variations. For example:

  o Sixty-six per cent of NQTs trained in the London region had permanent teaching contracts compared with 25 per cent of those trained in the north west (last year the figures were 62 per cent and 24 per cent respectively).

  o Forty-five per cent of NQTs trained in Yorkshire and The Humber region had fixed term contracts compared with 19 per cent in London (last year the figures were 46 per cent and 20 per cent).

  o Twenty-six per cent of NQTs trained in the north west region had teaching supply contracts compared with seven per cent in the eastern region.

• The pattern of employment for secondary trained NQTs also showed large regional variations. For example:

  o Seventy-one per cent of NQTs trained in the eastern region had permanent teaching contracts compared with 45 per cent in the north west region (last year the figures were 73 per cent and 51 per cent respectively).

  o Thirty-one per cent of NQTs trained in the south west region had fixed term contracts compared with 20 per cent in London (last year the figures were 30 per cent and 19 per cent respectively).

  o Fifteen per cent of NQTs trained in the north west region had teaching supply contracts compared with three per cent in the eastern region (last year the figures were 14 per cent and five per cent respectively).
NQTs’ current induction status and experience

- Of those respondents that indicated they were in teaching employment; 83 per cent of primary-trained NQTs and 88 per cent of secondary-trained NQTs had started induction (in 2011 the figures were 77 per cent and 83 per cent respectively).

- Of those NQTs who had started their induction:
  
  o Ninety-six per cent of primary-trained NQTs and 94 per cent of secondary-trained NQTs indicated they were receiving ten per cent free time in addition to planning, preparation and assessment (PPA). In the 2011 survey the figures were 96 per cent and 95 per cent respectively.

  o Eighty-eight per cent of primary-trained NQTs and 83 per cent of secondary-trained NQTs indicated that they had a personalised programme of planned professional development. In the 2011 survey the figures were 88 per cent and 85 per cent respectively.

  o Ninety-eight per cent of primary-trained NQTs and 97 per cent of secondary-trained NQTs indicated they had the support of an induction tutor. The figures were the same in the 2011 survey.

  o Ninety-seven per cent of primary-trained NQTs and 96 per cent of secondary-trained NQTs indicated they were receiving observations followed by reviews with their induction tutor. In the 2011 survey the figures were 98 per cent and 96 per cent respectively.

New questions on induction

- The 2012 survey included four new questions on induction. They were: Does your induction to date support you:

  o to teach pupils with special educational needs in your classes?

    Eighty-six per cent of primary-trained NQTs and 83 per cent of secondary-trained NQTs answered yes to this question.

  o to teach reading including phonics and comprehension?

    Eighty per cent of primary-trained NQTs answered yes to this question.

  o to teach primary mathematics?

    Eighty-nine per cent of primary-trained NQTs answered yes to this question.
to establish and maintain a good standard of behaviour in the classroom?

Ninety-four per cent of primary-trained NQTs and 91 per cent of secondary trained NQTs answered yes to this question.
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Figure 101  The newly qualified teacher survey
Primary courses.

Q 1 How NQTs rated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z score = -4.3210

At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.
Figure 102  The newly qualified teacher survey

Primary courses.

Q. 2  How NQTs rated their training in:

a  helping them to understand the national curriculum.

2011  24  56  19  6,032
2012  27  54  18  5,212

Z score = -0.8072

At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

b  preparing them to teach their specialist subject.

2011  23  45  28  5,566
2012  28  45  24  4,788

Z score = -3.8332

At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

c  preparing them to use information and communication technology (ICT) more effectively in their teaching.

2011  21  48  27  6,032
2012  25  47  23  5,213

Z score = -2.0502

At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

d  helping them to plan their teaching to achieve progression for learners.

2011  21  51  25  6,032
2012  25  51  21  5,214

Z score = -4.3071

At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.
o preparing them to teach across the range of abilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5,207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z score = -4.8540
At the 0.05% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

f preparing them to teach learners from minority ethnic backgrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z score = -0.0740
At the 0.05% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

g helping them to establish and maintain a good standard of behaviour in the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5,217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z score = 0.0398
At the 0.05% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

h helping them to use a range of teaching methods that promote pupils' learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5,220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z score = -0.7008
At the 0.05% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

i helping them to understand how to monitor, assess, record and report learners' progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5,212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z score = -4.2308
At the 0.05% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
j. preparing them to share responsibility for their continuing professional development (CPD).

2011: 16% 'very good', 41% 'good', 33% 'satisfactory', 22% 'poor'
2012: 21% 'very good', 46% 'good', 25% 'satisfactory', 18% 'poor'

Z score = -7.8810
At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

k. helping them to teach pupils with special educational needs in their classes, with appropriate support.

2011: 13% 'very good', 39% 'good', 37% 'satisfactory', 21% 'poor'
2012: 16% 'very good', 43% 'good', 34% 'satisfactory', 17% 'poor'

Z score = -7.0052
At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

l. preparing them to work with learners with English as an additional language.

2011: 12% 'very good', 33% 'good', 41% 'satisfactory', 14% 'poor'
2012: 14% 'very good', 35% 'good', 30% 'satisfactory', 21% 'poor'

Z score = -5.7028
At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

m. preparing them to work with teaching colleagues as part of a team.

2011: 26% 'very good', 40% 'good', 20% 'satisfactory', 14% 'poor'
2012: 35% 'very good', 47% 'good', 16% 'satisfactory', 12% 'poor'

Z score = -8.0050
At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

n. new in 2011: preparing them to work with teaching assistants (including other adults) to achieve learning objectives.

2011: 22% 'very good', 47% 'good', 25% 'satisfactory', 16% 'poor'
2012: 27% 'very good', 47% 'good', 22% 'satisfactory', 14% 'poor'

Z score = -6.9714
At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.
o preparing them to communicate with parents and carers.

- 2011: 14 very good, 30 good, 37 satisfactory, 37 poor
- 2012: 18 very good, 42 good, 33 satisfactory, 33 poor

Z score = -0.3605
At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

p preparing them for their teacher's statutory responsibility for the welfare and safety of pupils.

- 2011: 24 very good, 53 good, 21 satisfactory, 21 poor
- 2012: 32 very good, 51 good, 16 satisfactory, 16 poor

Z score = -0.6580
At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

q.i new in 2012 (with reference to the training received from their ITT provider) helping them to understand subject knowledge.

- 2012: 32 very good, 52 good, 14 satisfactory, 14 poor

q.ii new in 2012 (with reference to the training received from their ITT provider) helping them to understand pedagogy.

- 2012: 32 very good, 51 good, 16 satisfactory, 16 poor

q.iii new in 2012 (with reference to the training received from their ITT provider) helping them to understand the assessment process.

- 2012: 22 very good, 47 good, 27 satisfactory, 27 poor

Key
- very good
- good
- satisfactory
- poor

Number of responses

Reference: 2012 / 02 / 4
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Integrating the university-delivered elements of their programme with school-based placements.

Year 2011 2012
24 28
45 51
23 20
5,981 5,135

z score = -5.0374
At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of ‘very good’ and ‘good’ responses is statistically significant.

Preparing them to teach reading including phonics and comprehension.

(Primary NQTs only)

Year 2011 2012
18 25
38 43
31 25
6,024 5,099

z score = -11.5078
At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of ‘very good’ and ‘good’ responses is statistically significant.

Specifically preparing them to teach systematic synthetic phonics.

(Primary NQTs only)

Year 2012
22
37
50
5,092

Specifically preparing them to teach language comprehension.

(Primary NQTs only)

Year 2012
14
41
36
5,098

Preparing them to teach writing.

(Primary NQTs only)

Year 2012
17
45
31
5,121

Key

very good good satisfactory poor

Percentage of NQTs (rounded to nearest 1%)

Number of responses

Reference: 20.12 / 162 / 5
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Appendix 2

Figure 201 The newly qualified teacher survey
Secondary * courses.

Q 1 How NQTs rated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z score = -4.3099

At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.
Figure 202  The newly qualified teacher survey
Secondary * courses.

Q 2  How NQTs rated their training in:

a  helping them to understand the national curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very good</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z score</td>
<td>-4.4103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

b  preparing them to teach their specialist subject.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very good</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z score</td>
<td>-0.0298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

c  preparing them to use information and communication technology (ICT) more effectively in their teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very good</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z score</td>
<td>-4.5078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

d  helping them to plan their teaching to achieve progression for learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very good</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z score</td>
<td>-3.0934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>very good</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>satisfactory</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>percentage of NQTs (rounded to nearest 1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* including key stage 2/3 courses
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e) preparing them to teach across the range of abilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z score = 5.7423
At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

f) preparing them to teach learners from minority ethnic backgrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z score = 0.0008
At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

g) helping them to establish and maintain a good standard of behaviour in the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z score = 5.7802
At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

h) helping them to use a range of teaching methods that promote pupils' learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z score = 4.0042
At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

i) helping them to understand how to monitor, assess, record and report learners’ progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z score = 3.4504
At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Percentage of NQTs (rounded to nearest 1%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6,531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference: 2013/2014
j) preparing them to share responsibility for their continuing professional development (CPD).

- 2011: 23%
- 2012: 28%

Z score = -4.7714
At the 0.5% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

k) helping them to teach pupils with special educational needs in their classes, with appropriate support.

- 2011: 17%
- 2012: 21%

Z score = -7.5296
At the 0.5% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

l) preparing them to work with learners with English as an additional language.

- 2011: 13%
- 2012: 16%

Z score = -0.0757
At the 0.5% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

m) preparing them to work with teaching colleagues as part of a team.

- 2011: 37%
- 2012: 41%

Z score = -2.8199
At the 0.5% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

n) new in 2011: preparing them to work with teaching assistants (including other adults) to achieve learning objectives.

- 2011: 17%
- 2012: 20%

Z score = -6.3306
At the 0.5% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.
providing them to communicate with parents and carers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z score = -0.1628

At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

preparing them for their teacher's statutory responsibility for the welfare and safety of pupils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z score = -0.0813

At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

q i new in 2012 (with reference to the training received from their ITT provider) helping them to understand subject knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

q ii new in 2012 (with reference to the training received from their ITT provider) helping them to understand pedagogy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

q iii new in 2012 (with reference to the training received from their ITT provider) helping them to understand the assessment process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"new in 2011" integrating the university-delivered elements of their programme with the school-based placements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>very good</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>satisfactory</th>
<th>poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the 95% level, the 2011 to 2012 change in the proportion of 'very good' and 'good' responses is statistically significant.

preparing them to teach reading including phonics and comprehension.
(primary NQTs only)

"new in 2012" specifically preparing them to teach systematic synthetic phonics.
(primary NQTs only)

"new in 2012" specifically preparing them to teach language comprehension.
(primary NQTs only)

"new in 2012" preparing them to teach writing.
(primary NQTs only)
u now in 2011 preparing them to teach primary mathematics.
(primary NQTs only)

v now in 2012 preparing them to teach addition, subtraction, multiplication and division.
(primary NQTs only)
## Appendix 3

### The newly qualified teacher survey 2012

Please use blue or black ink and indicate your response by shading the relevant box like this: □ □ □ □

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Please rate the following:</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. the overall quality of your training</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. How good was your training (not your induction) in:</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. helping you to understand the national curriculum?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. preparing you to teach your specialist subject?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. preparing you to use information and communication technology (ICT) more effectively in your teaching?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. helping you to plan your teaching to achieve progression for learners?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. preparing you to teach across the range of abilities?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. preparing you to teach learners from minority ethnic backgrounds?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. helping you to establish and maintain a good standard of behaviour in the classroom?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. helping you to use a range of teaching methods that promote pupils’ learning?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. helping you to understand how to monitor, assess, record and report learners’ progress?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. preparing you to share responsibility for your continuing professional development (CPD)?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. helping you to teach pupils with special educational needs in your classes, with appropriate support?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. preparing you to work with learners with English as an additional language?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. preparing you to work with teaching colleagues as part of a team?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. preparing you to work with teaching assistants (including other adults) to achieve learning objectives?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. preparing you to communicate with parents and carers?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. preparing you for your teacher’s statutory responsibility for the welfare and safety of pupils?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. (with reference to the training you received from your ITT provider):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. helping you to understand subject knowledge?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. helping you to understand pedagogy?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. helping you to understand the assessment process?</td>
<td>□ □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
r. integrating the university-delivered elements of your programme with the school-based placements?

s. (primary NQTs only) preparing you to teach reading, including phonics and comprehension?

i. (primary NQTs only) specifically preparing you to teach systematic synthetic phonics?

ii. (primary NQTs only) specifically preparing you to teach language comprehension?

t. (primary NQTs only) preparing you to teach writing?

u. (primary NQTs only) preparing you to teach primary mathematics?

v. (primary NQTs only) in preparing you to teach addition, subtraction, multiplication and division?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Primary modern languages (primary NQTs only)</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Which language(s) are you currently teaching (30 minutes or more per week)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. On which specialist primary language programme which included a four-week placement abroad were you trained?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. E-safety</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Did you receive e-safety training during your teacher training?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Was it relevant and effective?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Please rate the importance of the following TDA pre-ITT services and activities in helping you to make an informed decision about beginning teacher training:</th>
<th>Unaware it existed</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Did not take part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teaching Information Line (TIL) by phone/online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. TDA teaching advocate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. School Experience Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Student Associates Scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. TDA teaching recruitment event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. TDA website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Please rate the importance of the following TDA pre-ITT activities in preparing you to begin teacher training:</th>
<th>Unaware it existed</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Did not take part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Student Associates Scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Subject enhancement or extension course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Subject knowledge booster course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Employment

a. What is your employment status?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent teaching contract</th>
<th>Fixed-term teaching contract</th>
<th>Supply teaching</th>
<th>Not currently teaching but looking for a teaching post</th>
<th>Not currently teaching and not looking for a teaching post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Where did you find out about the teaching position you currently hold? N/A Yes No

i. Times Educational Supplement

ii. Eteach

iii. Local authority website or bulletin

iv. Local authority talent pool

v. Local press

vi. National press (e.g. Education Guardian)

vii. Schools Recruitment Service

viii. Offered a position by a school in which I trained

ix. Teaching agencies (including supply)

x. General jobseekers website (e.g. Jobsite or Fish4Jobs)

xi. Other (please specify)

---------------------------------------------------------------

c. Did you relocate to take up your current teaching position? N/A Yes No

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A 1 2–4 5–7 8 or more

d. How many job applications did you make before you were employed in your current position (including the application for your current position)?

e. How many interviews did you have before you were employed in your current position (including the interview for your current position)?

Very good Good Satisfactory Poor

f. How good was your training in helping you to apply confidently for teaching positions (e.g. support with job applications and interviews)?

Yes No

g. Did you have a career (other than student) prior to beginning teacher training?

If yes, what was your previous career?

---------------------------------------------------------------
8. Induction

a. Have you started your induction?

b. Is your school providing you with:
   i. 10 per cent free time in addition to planning, preparation and assessment (PPA) time?
   ii. a personalised programme of planned professional development?
   iii. the support of an induction tutor?
   iv. observations followed by reviews with your induction tutor?

c. Does your induction to date support you to:
   i. teach pupils with special educational needs in your classes?
   ii. (primary NQTs only) teach reading including phonics and comprehension?
   iii. (primary NQTs only) teach primary mathematics?
   iv. establish and maintain a good standard of behaviour in the classroom?

9. May we contact you about your experience of teacher training? (answering this question is optional)

   I consent to the TDA contacting me again about issues specifically addressed in this survey.

   I consent to the TDA contacting me again about issues which may fall outside the scope of this survey.

If yes, please provide your e-mail address (please write clearly in BLOCK CAPITALS) and telephone number below:

E-mail: _____________________________________________  Tel: ________________________________

10. If you wish to add further comments about your training or induction, write in BLOCK CAPITALS below.

   Training

   Induction

11. Disability

   a. Do you have an impairment, disability, learning difficulty or mental health difficulty?

   b. If yes, did you declare this to:
      i. your training provider?
      ii. your induction tutor?

Please return your completed survey in the envelope provided to NQT survey, PECC Ltd, PO Box 74, Chepstow NP16 5WT

The Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) will hold and use all the data supplied, including contact details, within the provision of the Data Protection Act 1998. The personal information on this questionnaire will only be used by the TDA and/or its agreed contractors, otherwise all information will be kept strictly confidential. Visit www.tda.gov.uk/privacy to view our privacy statement and/or contact us. The results of this survey will be anonymised before any publication. The TDA is committed to improving the quality and efficiency of all routes into the teaching profession, and the data from this survey will be used solely for this purpose.