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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>Schools that support Teach First NZ and provide 'away practicums' in Year 2 for participants in schools in another context (mid to high decile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 13</td>
<td>Participants who began the programme in 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 14</td>
<td>Participants who began the programme in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 15</td>
<td>Participants who began the programme in 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-asTTle</td>
<td>An online assessment tool, developed to assess students’ achievement and progress in reading, mathematics, writing, and in pānui, pāngarau, and tuhiuhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCANZ/Education Council</td>
<td>Education Council of Aotearoa New Zealand (formerly the New Zealand Teachers Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full-time equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoD</td>
<td>Head of department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITE</td>
<td>Initial teacher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAT</td>
<td>Limited authority to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>Learning area specialist (provides faculty curriculum expertise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCEA</td>
<td>National Certificate of Educational Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLD</td>
<td>Professional learning and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT/PCT</td>
<td>Provisionally registered/certificated teacher¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SII</td>
<td>Summer Initial Intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTS</td>
<td>Visiting teaching specialist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Changes to teacher registration and certification were made in July 2015. See [https://educationcouncil.org.nz/](https://educationcouncil.org.nz/)
Executive summary

This is the third annual evaluation report of the Teach First NZ programme pilot, delivered in partnership with the University of Auckland. It confirms that the Teach First NZ programme continues to be effectively and efficiently implemented. Teach First NZ and the University of Auckland’s Faculty of Education continue to find ways to strengthen the programme and to ensure it is well known and well supported. Participants are strong ambassadors for the programme, including the mission of reducing educational inequalities. Almost all participants have made a valued contribution in their school, have supported their students to engage and progress, and intend to stay in teaching, at least in the short-term.

The Teach First NZ pilot programme is an alternative field-based Initial Teacher Education (ITE) programme. The pilot programme operates between 2013 and 2016 with three annual intakes of up to 20 participants. The third and final intake included in this evaluation is Cohort 15 (beginning at the start of the 2015 school year).

The New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) is undertaking a 4-year evaluation of the Teach First NZ pilot programme. The first report focused on the programme’s first year, Cohort 13. The second report focused on Year 2 for Cohort 13 and Year 1 for Cohort 14. This third report focuses on Year 2 for Cohort 14 and Year 1 for Cohort 15, and begins to look at the programme’s alumni pathways. It also makes some comparisons across all 3 years of the evaluation. 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 evaluation this year has confirmed that key success elements of the Teach First NZ programme are:

- the robust selection process resulting in high-calibre participants
- the responsiveness of the programme, in part made possible because of its small size, but also as a consequence of the robust partnership between Teach First NZ and the University of Auckland’s Faculty of Education (hereafter referred to as the Teach First NZ partnership)
- effective support and mentoring for participants from schools and Teach First NZ partnership personnel
- immersion in the classroom, coupled with opportunities for participants’ critical reflection on themselves and their teaching.

The successful implementation of all of these elements is critical for an employment-based ITE programme. While there is variability in the way these elements play out, particularly in relation to mentoring and in-school support, and

---

2 A full description of the Teach First NZ pilot programme can be found in previous evaluation reports.
3 The report: 2013 Annual Evaluation Report for the Teach First NZ Pilot Programme Delivered in Partnership with the University of Auckland can be found at http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/schooling/146589
participants’ match with the school, in combination they provide a powerful platform for this model of an alternative pathway into secondary teaching.

**Data collection**

In 2015 we collected data from four main sources:

- programme and participant documentation
- interviews with participants, key personnel in Cohort 15 schools and with the Teach First NZ partnership
- online surveys for Cohort 14 participants, their mentors and co-ordinators
- online survey (Me and My Class, NZCER) for students.

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

We focused our attention on evaluative criteria established at the start of the evaluation (see Appendix 1), to assess the extent to which the programme has been effectively implemented in its third year. These criteria pertained to the participants themselves (their recruitment and selection, and their intentions after the pilot programme); programme factors managed by the Teach First NZ partnership (such as the Summer Initial Intensive, termly clinics and workshops, Faculty papers, and support provided by the Teach First NZ partnership); and school factors (support for participants provided by schools, in particular by mentors). We also evaluated the viability5 of the pilot programme.

In this third annual evaluation report we continue to report that the programme has been effectively and efficiently implemented. Points we have noted in the past continue to be important. These include the selection of high-calibre—and resilient—participants; strong mentor support with time allowance; and a responsive and relevant programme with clear communication between the Teach First NZ partnership personnel and those who provide school-based support.

This year it was notable that more participants had a mentor from a department different from their own. More schools appear to be selecting mentors who can build relationships and provide strong pedagogical support, and where those mentors teach a different subject from the participant, participants are getting curriculum and subject-specific support in other ways (for example, from heads of department (HoD), visiting teaching specialists (VTS) and learning area specialists (LAS)). This year we conclude that, overall, mentoring support is more consistently strong than in previous years. The co-ordinator role also appears to have been strengthened with co-ordinators and mentors working well together.

A well-functioning department continues to be an important contributor to participant success. There still appears to be most variability for participants teaching te reo Māori, some of whom have very limited departmental support and may even be expected to take on responsibility for the department, and others who are well-supported within a strong department. This year, the importance of appropriate school placement was raised more often by interviewees. Some were concerned about schools that were isolated, and found it challenging to provide the level of support required, or to expose participants to good teaching. With this variability in school and departmental support there appears to be greater recognition from the Teach First NZ partnership that participants need different types and levels of support.

---

5 We considered that the programme would be viable if the Teach First NZ model successfully adjusted to larger numbers of participants within agreed funding arrangements. Note that Cohort 15 participants in Northland schools were funded by the Ministry as supernumerary. This is additional funding added to the Ministry contribution for Cohorts 13 and 14.
Teach First NZ partnership personnel, including VTS and LAS, have stepped in to provide additional support when required while acknowledging that participants themselves need to find ways to manage challenging situations.

The participants
One aspect of quality we judged was the extent to which the pilot programme attracted high-quality applicants, some of whom may not otherwise have undertaken teaching at this time (particularly in schools serving lower socioeconomic communities).

As in 2013 and 2014, the programme was successful in attracting high-quality applicants. Twenty participants (8.5 percent of those who filled in the online application) were selected for the 2015 cohort. Almost a third (six participants) of the 2015 intake are Māori or Pasifika and eight (40 percent) are male. Eight majored in English, six in te reo Māori, three in mathematics, and five in chemistry or physics. Ten have postgraduate qualifications, including Masters or Doctorate degrees. The evaluation team talked to different groups of people and, as a result, perceive Cohort 15 participants to be of high calibre. Under half of Cohort 15 had considered teaching prior to hearing about Teach First NZ.

Completion and retention rates
Completion rates for the 2-year programme for Cohort 13 and Cohort 14 have exceeded the expectation of 90 percent. The majority of participants are retained in teaching in New Zealand secondary schools after they complete the programme.

Cohort 13: In 2015, 13 (of the 15 participants) have been employed in New Zealand secondary schools. In 2016 all 15 will be employed in teaching, 14 of them in New Zealand. Five are teaching in decile 1–3 schools, and nine in decile 4–9 schools.

Cohort 14: At the end of the second year of the programme, 19 of the 20 participants remain, although two have been on parental leave. As at March 2016, 15 have been appointed to permanent positions in New Zealand secondary schools. Nine of these are with their original host school (deciles 1–4), four in other decile 1–4 schools, and two at decile 7 schools. At the end of the programme one is going into full-time study, one will be overseas, and another will be doing relief teaching.

Cohort 15: At the end of the first year of the programme, 17 of the 20 participants remain. The 17 remaining expect to complete the programme and stay in teaching, at least to gain full certification. Many have plans to stay in teaching much longer than that.

Participant connections with the Teach First NZ community
This year we were particularly interested in the connections at different layers of the Teach First community. Interviews and surveys confirmed that participants’ connections are strongest with their own cohort, followed by other cohorts, the wider Teach First NZ partnership community, and finally the global network of Teach For All. All participants from Cohort 14 and Cohort 15 were connected with their cohort, about half had strong connections with other cohorts and the

---

6 One English-major participant left the programme in the first term; one te reo Māori-major participant left the programme in Term 3; one mathematics-major participant left the programme in Term 3, after the evaluation team had completed fieldwork.

7 Previous annual evaluation reports have presented destination data as at the end of the school year, usually November. This year we have updated the information so it is accurate at March 2016.
partnership, and only a few are strongly connected with the global network of Teach For All. These data were collected before the Teach For All Global Conference was held in Auckland in October 2015.

The programme: Teach First NZ and faculty components

The taught programme
Participants continue to feel well prepared by the SII. Areas where participants would like more preparation are each raised by just a few people. One area we highlight is more opportunities to learn about Pasifika education in preparation for teaching in schools with large numbers of Pasifika students.

As in previous years, participants from both cohorts commented on the relevance of their university papers and assignments as a strength of the programme. All Cohort 14 participants found the coursework useful, and most found it appropriately challenging. Overall, Cohort 14 participants were more positive than Cohort 13 participants about the usefulness of different components of the programme.

All Cohort 15 participants commented positively on aspects of the taught programme, and many commented on multiple aspects: usefulness of clinics, relevance of assignments, and time with curriculum specialists. Participants highlighted the value of ongoing course work and assignments as a way of connecting theoretical understanding with the practicalities of working in the classroom. Improvements suggested by Cohort 15 were seen by them as minor adjustments, and reflected individual participant preferences.

Specialist support
As in earlier years, the vast majority of participants from both cohorts reported that they found visits and feedback from both their VTS and LAS useful. The provision of resources, curriculum knowledge and subject-specific strategies were particularly important for participants whose school mentors taught in another curriculum area.

Programme responsiveness
The Teach First NZ partnership has actively sought feedback on how the programme could be improved and continues to reflect on and make changes to the programme.

Affiliate schools
Due to changes in the timing and implementation of the ‘away practicum’, we have not given affiliate schools a strong focus in the evaluation. Most Cohort 13 participants completed their 3-week ‘away practicum’ in the affiliate schools in Term 4 2014, after senior students left (four completed it earlier than that). Teach First NZ described these practicums as “positive and productive”, but also reported that the required 3-week block (an Education Council requirement) was very challenging for host schools because of the length of time participants must be released for. Most Cohort 14 participants undertook their ‘away practicum’ in Term 4 2015.
The programme: school components

Support for participants from host schools
Nearly all Cohort 15 participants reported positively on the way their school community had responded to them as a Teach First NZ participant. All but one Cohort 14 participant told us that they felt fully accepted as a staff member at their school.

This year, the importance of appropriate school placement was raised more often by interviewees discussing Cohort 15. Some were concerned about schools that found it challenging to provide the level of support required, were isolated, and could not expose participants to good teaching. Timetabling and assignment of participants to classes that were likely to respond well to them appeared to be less of an issue in 2015.

Mentor support to participants
Mentoring is a critical component of the programme and ineffective mentoring can impact negatively on participants’ learning and, therefore, on the overall quality of the programme. Through mentor and participant interviews and surveys, we reviewed how mentors were selected; perspectives on their role; and the extent to which they provided regular high-quality observation, mentoring and feedback to participants, and helped participants to become part of the wider school community. This year we report that, overall, mentor support is strong, and appears less variable than in previous years.

More Cohort 14 participants have had the same mentor for years 1 and 2 of the programme than we reported for Cohort 13. There are a number of possible reasons for this, but one may be that Cohort 14 schools have been able to make good matches between mentors and participants.

Schools continue to weigh up a number of factors before assigning a mentor to a participant. For Cohort 15 it is notable that more participants were in a department different from their mentor. On the whole this was working well, with mentors providing core support supplemented by others providing more subject-specific support.

As in previous years, the frequency of classroom observations (and mentors’ individual approaches to them) varied, as did the extent and nature of the feedback given. Participants valued mentors’ pedagogical knowledge, help with pastoral support, feedback from observations, and help with student behaviour management. Many of the mentors commented on their own learning from the experience.

Preparation and support for host schools’ roles
Most mentors and co-ordinators considered they were well supported by the Teach First NZ partnership in terms of initial preparation and ongoing support. Clarity and timing of communications continued to be an issue for a few mentors and co-ordinators.

All mentors and co-ordinators felt valued by programme participants, and nearly all felt valued by others in their schools.
Viability of the programme

We considered that the programme would be viable if the Teach First NZ model can successfully adjust to larger numbers of participants within agreed funding arrangements.

In 2013 there were nine schools in the programme, in 2014 there were 16, and in 2015 there are 20. Seven schools joined the programme for the first time in 2015, six decile 1 and one decile 2. We judge that the programme has successfully adjusted to the larger number of schools and participants, although some schools found it harder in 2015 to provide the level of support participants needed.

While most of the schools in the programme are positive about ongoing involvement, some are likely to limit this involvement to one cohort at a time. This could have implications for the proposed expansion of the programme. Reasons for this include the level of support required (the demand for and on mentors), falling rolls, and hopes to be able to retain participants at the end of the 2-year programme, having to do so within staffing entitlements.

There does not appear to have been an issue for 2015 Auckland schools in funding Cohort 14 and Cohort 15 (who, unlike Cohort 13, are not supernumerary), although funding continues to be raised by a few principals as a potential barrier to participation. The Ministry funded the four Northland participants in Cohort 15 as supernumerary, which allowed those schools to accept participants.

We will report more on alumni pathways in the final evaluation report in 2016. This year, we report that nine Cohort 14 participants have been employed in their host school as PCTs in 2016, with a further four in other decile 1–4 schools. Two have been employed in decile 7 schools. Cohort 13 participants are now entering their PCT2 year. Nearly all (14 out of 15) will be teaching in New Zealand secondary schools in 2016, five in decile 1–3 and nine in decile 4–9 schools. (Information accurate at March 2016.)

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

To answer the second evaluation question, we 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 (see earlier in this summary), and programme impact on quality of teaching and learning in participating schools and the status of teaching. Based on the data from the Me and My Class survey we considered that most students in participants’ classes were engaged in their learning and that they were not disadvantaged by being in participants’ classes, in the first or second year of participants’ teaching.

Effectiveness of participants’ teaching

Informed professional judgement was one of the key measures we used to ascertain the effectiveness of participants’ teaching. We asked co-ordinators and mentors, and triangulated their considerable experience and expertise with the judgements made by the participants themselves. Judgements included evidence of student engagement and academic progress and achievement.

Participants are valued by their schools for their confidence, ability to take responsibility for leading change and a “sense of maturity” about their practice. Almost all co-ordinators and principals considered that students responded

---

8 For Cohort 14, this includes two alumni teaching in a decile 4 school.
‘very positively’ or ‘positively’ to the participants with many commenting on the impact participants were having with students, both academically and in a pastoral role. Some mentors considered a few participants lacked pedagogical and subject knowledge, and, for Cohort 15, behaviour management strategies. Cohort 15 participants rated lesson planning, behaviour management and assessment knowledge as their most frequent challenges.

Everyone surveyed about Cohort 14 considered that participants had made considerable progress and were more confident, had stronger relationships with students, and were playing a stronger role in their department and often in the school than they had in their first year of teaching. Cohort 15 participants were also felt to be making progress, with almost all of these at least making ‘expected’ progress.

Support by participants for pastoral life of school
Participants reported being involved in a variety of aspects of school life allowing them to strengthen relationships with students from their own classes and throughout the school. Cohort 15 participants tended to support rather than lead these types of activities. One interesting difference from previous years was the high number of participants from both cohorts who were involved in running or assisting with dance and drama activities.

Leadership development strand
All but three of the Cohort 14 participants took on significant leadership roles in 2015. Participants attributed their leadership roles to their Teach First NZ leadership project, the school giving them responsibility, encouragement from their mentor or HoD, and their own knowledge and initiative. Unlike Cohort 13, most participants’ leadership projects related to curriculum and departmental leadership where participants’ in-depth knowledge and skills in e-learning, te reo Māori, or aspects of mathematics or English were highly valued.

Programme impact on quality of teaching and learning in participating schools and the status of teaching
All Cohort 14 co-ordinators and principals considered that participants had had either a “high positive impact” or “some positive impact” on teaching and learning in the school. Almost all school personnel in Cohort 15 schools noted the contribution participants made to different activities in the school, their department and in staff meetings, and their willingness to share new ideas. All co-ordinators thought that Teach First NZ has had a ‘very positive’ or ‘positive’ impact on the perceived status of teaching as a “competitive profession attracting top graduates and talented individuals”. Mentors were more muted in their responses with a small number identifying no impact or a negative impact on the status of teaching as a competitive profession. All but one participant thought Teach First NZ has had a ‘very positive’ or ‘positive’ impact on the perceived status of teaching as a competitive profession.

---

9 This is Teach First NZ’s term.
Background and scope of the evaluation

The Teach First NZ pilot programme is an alternative field-based ITE programme. The pilot programme operates between 2013 and 2016 with three annual intakes of up to 20 participants. The third and final intake included in this evaluation is Cohort 15 (beginning at the start of the 2015 school year). The programme is administered by the non-profit Teach First NZ Trust in partnership with the University of Auckland’s Faculty of Education (the Faculty). Some of the funding for the programme is philanthropic, although many of the core aspects of the programme (e.g. university tuition and mentoring) are funded by the Ministry of Education (the Ministry). After the Summer Initial Intensive (SII), participants teach in schools serving low socioeconomic communities on a 0.6 FTE loading for 2 years on a limited authority to teach (LAT). At the end of successful completion of 2 years’ teaching, participants are eligible to apply for registration and to become provisionally certificated teachers.

The New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) is undertaking a 4-year evaluation of the Teach First NZ pilot programme. The first report focused on the programme’s first year, Cohort 13. The second report focused on Year 2 for Cohort 13 and Year 1 for Cohort 14. This third report focuses on Year 2 for Cohort 14 and Year 1 for Cohort 15, and begins to look at the programme’s alumni pathways. It also makes some comparisons across all 3 years of the evaluation. 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 evaluation is designed to provide timely and relevant information to:

- support decision making about ongoing implementation of the Teach First NZ programme pilot
- develop a deeper understanding of alternative pathways into the teaching profession, particularly pathways for talented potential teachers
- 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 for students.

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. Nor is

10 A full description of the Teach First NZ pilot programme can be found in previous evaluation reports.
11 The report: 2013 Annual Evaluation Report for the Teach First NZ Pilot Programme Delivered in Partnership with the University of Auckland can be found at http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/schooling/146589
the purpose of this evaluation to compare Teach First NZ with the Exemplary Models of Postgraduate ITE programmes, which began in 2013. Value for money is also not within scope for this programme evaluation.

We developed evaluation criteria and identified possible data sources to address both key evaluation questions. This approach was endorsed by the Teach First NZ partnership. The criteria are set out in Appendix 1, along with other details of the evaluation approach. Interview and survey questions (see Appendices 3 and 4) are based on these criteria.
Methodology

In 2015 we collected data from four main sources:

- programme and participant documentation
- interviews with participants, key personnel in Cohort 15 schools and with the Teach First NZ partnership
- online surveys for Cohort 14 participants, their mentors, and co-ordinators
- online survey (*Me and My Class*, NZCER) for students.

The evaluation data for the third year of the Teach First NZ pilot programme were collected differently for the two cohorts, as shown in Table 1. Response rates for the Cohort 14 online surveys ranged from 74 to 79 percent. At the site visits for Cohort 15, we spoke with 95 percent of participants, all principals of schools new to the programme, all co-ordinators, and 90 percent of mentors. A limitation of the evaluation design is that it does not include data from participants who have left the programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort 14</th>
<th>Online surveys: participants, mentors, co-ordinators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 15</td>
<td>Site visits and interviews in 15 schools: participants, their mentors, co-ordinators, principals new to the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation of Summer Initial Intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 14 and 15</td>
<td><em>Me and My Class</em> survey (Year 9 or 10) with comparison class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with Teach First NZ and Faculty staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation of mentor meeting and co-ordinator meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no clear pattern of non-response.
Cohort 14 surveys

Surveys for Cohort 14 respondents were emailed in September 2015. The surveys are attached as Appendix 3. Table 2 gives survey response rates. The overall response rate was 76 percent, and there was no clear pattern in the school context of those participants, co-ordinators and mentors who did not complete the survey, indicating that we have data from across the range of Teach First NZ experiences.

Table 2 Online survey responses 2015 for Cohort 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Number approached</th>
<th>Number returned</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinator</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the small sample size, survey data were analysed according to frequencies and we did not do further (for example, cross-tabular) analysis.

Cohort 15 interviews

Cohort 15 interviews were conducted at the 15 schools between 28 July and 14 August 2015, with interviewers spending one half to one full day in each school. The interview schedules are attached as Appendix 4. In September 2015 we interviewed five Teach First NZ partnership staff in one group interview. All together we conducted interviews with 62 people (see Table 3).

Table 3 Interviewees July–August 2015 for Cohort 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Number interviewed</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>95(^{14})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal (seven schools new</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(one principal was also a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-ordinator)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinator</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor (one participant had</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two mentors; two mentors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were not able to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interviewed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach First NZ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partnership personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interview schedules included a range of questions to elicit people’s views and experiences of the programme. Interviews were recorded and collated on a spreadsheet, by interviewee role. Responses relevant to each evaluation

---

\(^{14}\) When we started our visits to schools, there were 19 participants. During the fieldwork period, one left the programme, and was not able to be interviewed.
criterion were independently coded and cross-checked by two researchers. This process made it possible to gain a reliable thematic overview of responses across the conversational style of interview.

**Me and My Class student survey**

*Me and My Class* is a survey designed by NZCER for Years 4 to 13 students (see Appendix 5). It explores students’ perspectives on learning in their classroom. We used this survey to gain student perceptions of participant teachers’ effectiveness in providing pedagogically rich learning opportunities and in engaging students in their learning.

The survey was administered by NZCER’s Products and Services Assessment Team in September 2015, 8 months after Cohort 15 participants began teaching and near the end of Cohort 14’s 2-year programme. 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 Year 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. Initially we anticipated that the comparison class would be similar to the participant class and that therefore we could compare like data sets of classes which had teachers with similar experience. However, this proved impossible in many schools. Where there was a comparison class the teacher was usually fully registered/certificated and often significantly more experienced. Year 9 and 10 classes were chosen because all participants had at least one Year 9 or Year 10 class.

We obtained results from the *Me and My Class* survey for 2315 Year 9 or 10 classes and for seven comparison classes. Table 4 shows the number of students surveyed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class surveyed</th>
<th>Number of students responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 14 Year 9</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 15 Year 9</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison class Year 9</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 14 Year 10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 15 Year 10</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison class Year 10</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>609</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We would caution against placing too much emphasis on the survey data. Caveats include:

- We are unable to make useful comparisons between the participants’ and the comparison classes, as comparison student numbers are low (only seven classes) and we do not have data explaining the nature of the “comparison”.
- The number of students is low, especially for Cohort 14 Year 10. We do not have data to explain these low numbers.

---

15 Some participants only had results for senior classes and we did not include these in our analysis as not all participants had senior classes at the same level.
Evaluation question 1: How well (effectively and efficiently) has the programme been implemented?

This chapter describes the 2015 cohort and provides evidence for both Cohort 14 and Cohort 15 in answer to evaluation question 1. Evaluation question 2 is answered in the following chapter. We work through each aspect of the programme implementation from attracting and selecting participants (where we describe the Cohort 15 participants and the schools they are working in), to the SII and the ongoing programme (aspects managed by the Teach First NZ partnership), to support from schools including mentoring. The chapter concludes with some discussion about the viability of the programme.

Who the programme attracted

Key findings

One aspect of quality we judged was the extent to which the pilot programme attracted high-quality applicants, some of whom may not otherwise have undertaken teaching at this time (particularly in schools serving lower socioeconomic communities).

As we reported in previous years, the programme was successful in attracting high-quality applicants. Twenty participants (8.5 percent of those who filled in the online application) were selected for the 2015 cohort. One completed the SII and started teaching, but left in Term 1. Another two resigned from their roles in Term 3.\(^\text{16}\) Almost a third of the 2015 intake are Māori or Pasifika (six participants) and 40 percent (eight participants) are male. Eight majored in English, four in te reo Māori, three in mathematics, and five in chemistry or physics. Half of Cohort 15 have a postgraduate qualification including Masters or Doctorate degrees. The evaluation team talked to different groups of people and, as a result, perceive Cohort 15 participants to be of high calibre.

Fewer than half of Cohort 15 had considered teaching before they knew about Teach First NZ. As with Cohorts 13 and 14, they were attracted to the Teach First NZ programme for a range of reasons, most commonly the programme’s mission and the opportunity to learn on the job, which for some includes the financial incentive.

\(^{16}\) One of these participants was still teaching when the evaluation team visited.
Cohort 15

The main thing [that attracted me] was the kaupapa of inequality—I felt like I had been paddling the waka by myself. (Cohort 15 participant)

Teach First NZ reported that 8.5 percent of applicants (20 out of 234) were accepted for the 2015 cohort (compared with 7.3 percent in 2014). The selection process comprises an online application form, a telephone interview and an assessment centre day.

Almost a third of the 2015 intake are Māori or Pasifika (six participants) and 40 percent (eight participants) are male. Eight majored in English, four in te reo Māori, three in mathematics, and five in chemistry or physics. Half of Cohort 15 have a postgraduate qualification including Masters or Doctorate degrees. In the final evaluation report in 2016 we will discuss the cohort composition across all three cohorts. This information is also available on the Teach First NZ website.17

As with the previous cohorts, participants had heard about Teach First NZ through a number of avenues including word of mouth from family or friends, online in social media such as Facebook, or in other media while looking for jobs, courses and scholarships, or from notices around campus advertising a presentation by Teach First NZ.

Similar to the 2014 cohort, fewer than half (eight) of the participants were thinking of going teaching, and thought they would have applied to other teacher education programmes if they had not been accepted by Teach First NZ. Most of the rest (seven) would have stayed in a current job or taken other employment.

Participants identified the Teach First NZ mission and the opportunity to learn on the job as the top reasons for applying to this programme, followed by the financial incentive. The latter two are closely entwined as many participants had already spent a long time studying and were keen to get into the workplace and reluctant to spend more time and money on further traditional avenues of study.

The selection process

New inexperienced teachers in the classroom, with brief training, so it’s still a shock. This would be a weakness if they didn’t select the right applicants. (Cohort 15 co-ordinator)

We did not directly focus on the selection process in our interviews with Cohort 15 participants and school staff as we are confident that we have sufficient evidence from the previous 2 years of the evaluation to be able to comment on this in the final evaluation report in 2016. However, when asked about the strengths of this way of preparing teachers, most principals and co-ordinators we spoke with continued to highlight the selection process as a critical component of the success of Teach First NZ.

I like the social conscience aspect—choosing people who value working in communities with higher needs. I like the selection process with strict criteria for quality. (Cohort 15 principal)

We talked to different groups of people and, consequently, as in previous years, perceived the participants to be of high calibre. All involved (co-ordinators, mentors, principals) saw the opportunity to have “vibrant” participants, who may not have thought of teaching as a career before, as one of the strengths of the programme.

---

17 See http://teachfirstnz.org/organisation/our-impact
Participating schools in 2015

The 2015 participants were placed in 12 decile 1–2 schools, and three decile 3 schools located in Northland (2), East Auckland (2), South Auckland (8), and Central South Auckland (3) (see Figure 1). Of the 20 schools participating in the programme in 2015, five are hosting Cohort 14 participants only, eight have Cohort 14 and Cohort 15 participants, and seven are participating in the programme for the first time with Cohort 15 participants only (see Table 5).

Figure 1  Location of 2014 and 2015 participants’ schools

18 The Cohort 15 participants in three of these schools resigned during the year.
19 Map supplied by Teach First NZ.
Table 5  Participant placements 2014 and 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating schools (decile)</th>
<th>Cohort 14 subject placements</th>
<th>Cohort 15 subject placements</th>
<th>Total number of participants placed in each school 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alfriston College (2)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Te reo Māori</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papatoetoe High School (3)</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Cross Campus (1)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamaki College (1)</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangaroa College (1)</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikipunga High School (2)</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorere College (2)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Te reo Māori</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelston Boys High School (3)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massey High School (4)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Te reo Māori</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland College (1)</td>
<td>Te reo Māori</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onehunga High School (3)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Tree Hill College (3)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere College (3)</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewater College (2)</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland 7th Day Adventist High School (1)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otahuhu College (1)</td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De La Salle College (1)</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa High School (1)</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Cook High School (1)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Te reo Māori</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whangaroa College (1)</td>
<td>Te reo Māori</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programme factors: Teach First NZ and Faculty components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The taught programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants continue to feel well prepared by the SII. Areas where participants would like more preparation were each raised by just a few people. One area we highlight is more opportunities to learn about Pasifika education in preparation for teaching in schools with large numbers of Pasifika students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As in previous years, participants from both cohorts commented on the relevance of their university papers and assignments as a strength of the programme. All Cohort 14 participants found the coursework useful, and most found it appropriately challenging. Overall, Cohort 14 participants were more positive about the usefulness of different components of the programme than Cohort 13 participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Cohort 15 participants commented positively on aspects of the taught programme, and many commented on multiple aspects: usefulness of clinics, relevance of assignments, and time with curriculum specialists. Participants highlighted the value of ongoing coursework and assignments as a way of connecting theoretical understanding with the practicalities of working in the classroom. Improvements suggested by Cohort 15 were seen as minor adjustments, and reflected individual participant preferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning area specialists and visiting teaching specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As in earlier years, the vast majority of participants from both cohorts reported that they found visits, feedback and support from VTS and LAS useful. The provision of resources, curriculum knowledge and subject-specific strategies were particularly important for participants with mentors in different departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We looked for evidence that the programme was responsive to feedback from participants and participating schools. Responsiveness has continued to be evident in 2015. The Teach First NZ partnership has actively sought feedback on how the programme could be improved and continues to reflect on and make changes to the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliate schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher exchange aspect of the ‘away practicum’ in affiliate schools proved too hard to implement in the way it was originally intended, where Year 2 participants swapped jobs with a colleague at the affiliate school. Due to changes in the timing and implementation of the ‘away practicum’, we have not given this much emphasis in the evaluation. Most Cohort 13 participants completed their 3-week ‘away practicum’ in the affiliate schools in Term 4 2014, after senior students left (four completed it earlier than that). Teach First NZ described these practicums as “positive and productive”. Cohort 14 participants undertook their ‘away practicum’ in Term 4 2015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 mentoring), and is focused around delivery of the Faculty courses and related university assignments.
Summer Initial Intensive
This year, we focused on the evaluation criterion of how well the SII prepared participants to begin teaching. Consistent data from previous years indicated we did not need to further explore the other criteria relating to the SII (see Appendix 1).

Preparation for teaching

In the short amount of time it did everything it could to get us in the headspace … [I] don't know what else we could have done. (Cohort 15 participant)

Overall, Cohort 15 participants felt the SII prepared them for teaching. This is consistent with findings from Cohort 14 and Cohort 13 that participants feel prepared, overall, whilst also recognising that nothing can really fully prepare people for the reality of being in the classroom. As one participant said, “we have to go through it, feel it, to understand it”.

We also asked Cohort 14 participants how useful (to their development as a teacher), various aspects of the programme were. Reflecting back from halfway through their second year of teaching, all but one rated the SII as useful or very useful.

Areas where participants wanted more preparation

In previous annual evaluation reports, we reported that participants wanted more subject specific preparation in the SII including understanding NCEA assessment standards, and more preparation for classroom and behaviour management. These areas came up again in interviews with the Cohort 15 participants, but again these were each raised by only a few participants, and were part of an overall picture of being well prepared by the SII.

Two participants wanted more opportunities to learn about Pasifika education in preparation for teaching in schools with large numbers of Pasifika students. Although this was not raised by all participants, it does appear to be an area that warrants further consideration by the Teach First NZ partnership, given the school communities in which many participants are teaching.

One area that was noted by at least two participants—and which we hadn’t heard so explicitly from previous cohorts—was that the SII could have prepared participants better for “dealing with failure—understanding that you will fail at things when teaching”, or as another participant put it, “resilience training”. This participant suggested that the SII could focus on what to do when you’re under pressure, and how to cope.

There is a strong and fluid partnership between the Faculty and Teach First NZ in relation to programme implementation. While the Faculty programme leader developed and administers course materials and assignments for the postgraduate diploma, other aspects such as the SII, the clinics, the leadership component, and ongoing communication are very much shared responsibilities. This year the last cohort began the pilot programme. Partners we spoke with in a group interview reflected on this, and how over the 3 years they had built up the team, and put systems and processes in place that are working well.

There's a rhythm to what we do, we're accustomed to things. (Teach First NZ partners)

We were building a plane as we were flying it, but we can now say we've built it and it's ticking over quite nicely. (Teach First NZ partners)
Strengths of the programme

The ongoing course work is really helpful. It would be easy to moan about having to do it, but it is important to learn the theory and the pedagogy as you go along. (Cohort 15 participant)

All Cohort 14 participants found their course work useful this year, and more than half rated it more useful than their course work in Year 1 of the programme. We asked Cohort 14 participants and mentors whether they thought that the course workload had been appropriately challenging in 2015 and how it compared with 2014. Most participants considered the course workload was “about right”, with just two saying it was “too challenging” (none thought it wasn’t challenging enough). Mentors had a similar perspective, although one considered the course workload was not challenging enough.

Only one participant thought their course workload was greater in 2015, nine thought it was about the same, and four thought it was less than in 2014. This differs from the views of Cohort 13 when participants were asked this question (Cohort 13 participants were more likely to say that the course workload was greater in the second year of the programme). This is not due to a change made by the Teach First NZ partnership, or to changes in staffing, so may be due to individual differences in perception or to subtle differences in the way the partnership personnel presented the material and supported learning for the second cohort.

In 2014 the Teach First NZ partnership made a distinction between the learning area specialists (LAS) who through their university role provide curriculum support at the clinics and throughout the year, and the visiting teaching specialists (VTS) who are employed by the Teach First NZ partnership and visit participants in specific curriculum areas but do not teach within the programme.

We asked Cohort 14 participants about the usefulness of different components of the programme. All but one rated the following aspects as useful or very useful: clinics, Teach First NZ subject meetings, visits from VTS, formal assessments, and the professional inquiry. Other aspects also rated as useful by well over half of participants were: workshops, intensives, and visits from LAS. Overall, Cohort 14 participants were more positive about the usefulness of different components of the programme than we reported for Cohort 13 participants. Similar to Cohort 13, the online community and the portfolio were seen to be least useful.

We asked Cohort 15 participants to reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of the taught programme, as well as to identify any areas that could be improved. As in previous years, positive comments far outweighed the negative. All Cohort 15 participants commented positively on aspects of the taught programme, and many commented on multiple aspects, for example, usefulness of clinics, relevance of assignments, and the supportive network of people around them. The focus on tikanga Māori was also highlighted as a strength of the programme. Two key strengths were the network of support, and the combination of theory and practice.

The network of people: Most participants referred to the calibre of the people involved in the programme as a notable strength. These included Teach First NZ personnel, lecturers, VTS and LAS, and mentors, as well as fellow participants in this and previous cohorts, who all contribute to a supportive network. Clinics were particularly valued as a way of reconnecting with the cohort and sharing experiences, as well as a chance to address specific issues.

Assignment work alongside the hands-on experience in the classroom: Participants expressed the value of ongoing course work and assignments as a way of connecting theoretical understanding with the practicalities of working in the classroom. Some participants (from both cohorts) particularly highlighted the assignment (introduced in 2015) and triadic conversations between the mentor, participant and VTS on a video-recorded lesson.
That’s a really good assignment. [The] video shows you things you’re not aware of. I have seen things I didn’t know I did. It all came down to planning so I have now changed the entire way I plan lessons. (Cohort 15 participant)

I prefer the triadic discussions we have for our teaching assessments rather than the formal observations we had last year. The focus seems to be on our own inquiry, research, and reflection, rather than assessing us each time solely based on one standalone lesson. (Cohort 14 participant)

Areas for improvement

When asked about weaknesses or areas for improvement in the programme, fewer than half of the Cohort 15 participants identified issues. These were of a similar type and magnitude to the improvements suggested by last year’s participants in their first year:

- timing of clinics (three participants), including recognising and considering the travel time for Northland participants
- the content of clinics (three participants)—described by one as a ‘mixed bag’, although it was recognised that the relevance depends on whether the topics align with what is happening in your own teaching at that time. Another participant again highlighted the need for more of a focus on teaching Pasifika students in the taught programme.
- more ongoing support for assignments (one participant)
- more individual follow up to deal with information overload (one participant).

In 2014, we reported on the need for more focus on strategies that are relevant for maths and science classrooms. This was not raised by participants this year, possibly suggesting that the Teach First NZ partnership have addressed this in the SII and clinics.

We asked Cohort 14 participants what changes might improve the programme in the future. Some took this opportunity to highlight important factors in the programme that are working well and need to be retained (supportive schools, well-matched mentors, caring co-ordinators, good communication and role clarity, a programme that is adaptive, a common goal). A few suggested improvements that tended to take a bigger picture view of the programme than those suggested by Cohort 15 participants, and are issues that we draw attention to in other parts of this report:

- the need for careful choice of schools and mentors—and better support from the Teach First NZ partnership when aware of challenging placements
- better ‘education’ for schools before participants arrive (so they understand the programme)
- more curriculum support including time with curriculum specialists and practical tools for teaching. One suggested that alumni could have a role in supporting participants with this at the SII and clinics.

Learning area specialists and visiting teaching specialists

The VTS gives me really good feedback and I value his expertise. The more I teach, the more I open myself up to learning. (Cohort 15 participant)

VTS visited each participant in Cohort 14 8–10 times and in Cohort 15 10–15 times to observe a lesson and discuss it with the participant. Three times in the year, the VTS and the mentor did a formal observation together. The first two of these were led by the participant and based around a video they had made for the purpose of identifying and sharing an aspect of their teaching practice. All three ‘triadics’ were assessed against Faculty criteria and contribute towards the completion of one of the Faculty courses.
Nearly all (all but one) Cohort 14 participants thought they had been “supported” or “very supported” by LAS and VTS in 2015. This is very consistent with the Cohort 13 participants’ views we reported last year. Cohort 15 participants were also positive about their visits from specialists, and the extent to which this was helping them to develop their expertise as teachers.

There is no box ticking, but fostering of good practice. (Cohort 15 participant)

Overwhelmingly Cohort 15 participants reported that they found visits and feedback from VTS and LAS helpful (just one felt they did not have a strong relationship or get as much as they might have liked). Participants said that VTS and LAS provided them with a range of supports, the first two of which are particularly important if participants have mentors who are not in their own subject area. VTS and LAS provide:

- resources, content and ideas
- strategies for classroom management and subject teaching—this was often complementary with VTS providing one and the LAS the other
- feedback from observations
- general and emotional support.

Last year we reported that some participants said they would like more visits, and others felt that too many perspectives complicated and fragmented the directions they could take. Neither of these issues was very evident this year, in our conversations with Cohort 15 participants.

Programme responsiveness

We asked Cohort 14 participants, co-ordinators and mentors how the programme had changed in response to their feedback. Participants considered that the Teach First NZ partnership had become more responsive to feedback over the course of the programme, although changes could be slow to be implemented. Mentors who responded to this question were most likely to comment positively on the changes to the triadic observation and discussion. One mentor described this change as leading to participants being “more self-reflective and responsible for their assessment”.

The Teach First NZ partners we interviewed described how this year they have been clearer about how they have responded to participant voices, for example, being specific about how they have made changes to clinics. They see this as modelling for participants what it means and looks like to listen to student voices. Two examples of new areas of focus in 2015 were the introduction of voluntary professional learning groups, and a focus on engagement with mentors—how participants can proactively engage and use the support they have.

Affiliate schools

Affiliate schools are those in which participants spend a 3-week ‘away practicum’ in Year 2 of the programme. It has been a New Zealand Teachers Council—followed by its successor the Education Council—requirement that all student teachers in ITE programmes have practicum experiences in a range of schools. The stipulation that Teach First NZ participants do a practicum in a school other than their host school is to meet the criterion of “range”. Originally we planned to evaluate the extent to which affiliate schools were aware of their responsibilities to the participants and their ability to provide useful learning experiences for participants. We also wanted to know if affiliate schools felt well supported by the Teach First NZ partnership and how useful the planned teacher exchange was judged by the affiliate school.

The expectations for the practicum were that it would be an opportunity for participants to:

- engage in professional networking with colleagues in the host department
- reflect on their developing philosophy of teaching
engage with a very different school culture (usually where the socioeconomic status of the community is very different)

• teach some lessons as and when appropriate

• talk about teaching and learning with hosts.

The original goals of the practicum, where an ‘affiliate fellow’ swapped places with a participant, were, however, unable to be realised in 2014 or 2015 and the Teach First NZ partnership reverted to a more simplified model which met the Education Council’s requirements.

As with Cohort 13, Cohort 14 participants undertook their ‘away practicum’ once senior students had left in November. This means that we are unable to report on their experiences in this annual evaluation report. Teach First NZ partnership personnel described these practicums as “positive and productive”, but also reported that the required 3-week block (an Education Council requirement) was very challenging for host schools because of the length of time that they must release participants for.

Support for participants from host schools

**Key findings**

Nearly all Cohort 15 participants reported positively on the way their school community had responded to them as a Teach First NZ participant. All but one Cohort 14 participant told us that they felt fully accepted as a staff member at their school.

Mentoring is a critical component of the programme and ineffective mentoring can impact negatively on participants’ learning and, therefore, on the overall quality of the programme. This year we report that, overall, mentor support is strong. Schools continue to weigh up a number of factors before assigning a mentor to a participant. This year it was notable that more mentors were in a different department from their participant mentee. On the whole this was working well, with mentors providing core support supplemented by others (such as HoD or VTS/LAS), providing more subject-specific support. As in previous years, the frequency of classroom observations (and mentors’ individual approaches to them) varied, as did the extent and nature of the feedback given.

In general, participants valued mentors’ pedagogical knowledge, help with pastoral support, feedback from observations, and help with behaviour management. Many of the mentors also commented positively on their own learning from the experience.

This year, the importance of school placement was raised more often by interviewees discussing Cohort 15. Some were concerned about schools that found it challenging to provide the level of support required, were isolated, or found it challenging to expose participants to good teaching. Timetabling and assignment of participants to classes that were likely to respond well to them appeared to be less of an issue in 2015.

School response to participants

Nearly all of Cohort 15 (15 out of 18 participants) responded positively when we asked how the school community had responded to them as a Teach First NZ participant. The other three gave more qualified responses, but no one replied negatively. Two reported some tension around them receiving more support than other beginning teachers (i.e., PCTs) and one reported that they had not been welcomed onto their school’s PCT (previously PRT) programme. We know that in many schools Teach First NZ participants are part of the wider PCT programme, but this is not universal.

Because I’m not a PRT, I don’t do the PRT programme. I was included in an induction programme, but the leader of the PRTs made it clear s/he was not paid to look after me ... it would be good for schools to be
clearer about this. I assume the PRT programme would have things that would be useful for me as a first year teacher. (Cohort 15 participant)

All but one Cohort 14 participant told us they felt fully accepted as a staff member at their school. (Last year we reported that all Cohort 13 participants felt fully accepted.) Participants from both cohorts were positive about the support they received from teachers in their schools.

Quality of school support for participants

Teach First participants are not the same as those who have been through the year long course who have had at least some real school and classroom time. It requires a bit of a mind-shift and is an organisational responsibility. (Cohort 15 principal)

This quote from a principal emphasises the responsibility the school has in supporting participants. In the first two annual evaluation reports, four school-based aspects were identified as being crucial for participant success. In this section we report how each of these is being played out in schools in 2015:

· 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
· a well-functioning subject department (and this year we add, in a well-functioning school).

Capability of the mentor and quality of the mentoring relationship

Overall, we perceived mentor relationships to be consistently stronger than in previous years. In one school, staff changes meant that participants did not get adequate mentor support until Term 2. When we visited them in September, participants were very positive about their new mentor. Teach First NZ partnership personnel also commented that mentoring has become more stable, with less variability in the mentor role. Later in this section we give a fuller discussion of the mentor role in 2015.

Timetabling allowing participants and mentors to work together

Nearly all mentors were positive about the school support for their role as mentors, although a couple thought that beyond having scheduled time there was little school support for the role, and expressed a sense of isolation: “Feel like it’s just me and [participant]” and “Basically left to get on with things.”

Assignment of classes likely to respond well

This was less of an issue in 2015. Schools appeared to have worked hard to assign appropriate classes to participants.

A well-functioning department in a well-functioning school

We once again observed the importance of a well-functioning department for supporting participant success. There still appears to be most variability for participants teaching te reo Māori, some of whom have very limited departmental support and may even be expected to take on responsibility for the department, and others who are well-supported within a strong department.

This year, the importance of appropriate school placement was raised more often by interviewees discussing Cohort 15. One principal, when asked about the weaknesses or challenges of this way of preparing teachers highlighted issues with placing participants in small or isolated schools. We heard this from other respondents too. There are a number of potential challenges including being able to select an appropriate mentor, very small departments, the participant being
more isolated from their cohort and finding it harder to access Teach First NZ events, and the additional cost of travelling for PLD opportunities.

A large majority of participants were happy with their placement and the support they received in their schools. However, in addition to the expected challenges, a few were faced with some significant difficulties early in their placements including school factors such as lack of departmental or mentoring support, or issues impacting on personal lives such as inadequate accommodation arrangements. Some interviewees queried whether these schools were in a position to take Teach First NZ participants, without Teach First NZ providing considerable additional support.

Should Teach First participants only be placed in supportive schools? There is an argument for yes [place them in less supportive schools], provided Teach First can provide supplementary support perhaps withdrawing money to use elsewhere … LAS and VTS have been stepped up for some schools. (Cohort 15 participant)

This is a really tough school and I query sending participants here. The beginning of the year is crucial for getting students' buy in and the participants were not experienced enough to get that. It isn't really fair putting them into a school like this—not fair on the participants or the students. In their first couple of years a teacher needs to be exposed to models of good practice, having good experiences. (Cohort 15 mentor)

The Teach First NZ partnership personnel recognised the tension and balance between putting participants in environments where they have support, and wanting to have an impact in schools where for some participants the support is “not that great”. This is something that needs to be considered in relation to the viability of the programme as it grows. We will continue to focus on this in the final year of the evaluation, in 2016.

Opportunities to observe other teachers

I would have liked it to have happened more than it has. I see it as my responsibility to organise it and to negotiate with other teachers. It’s valuable and adds to the range of experiences. (Cohort 15 mentor)

Participants are expected to observe their mentor and other teachers teaching. Most Cohort 15 participants had this opportunity to observe other teachers, including those in other departments. Some mentors were particularly proactive about this and ‘negotiated’ with teachers in other departments to enable it to happen. As was reported last year, a theme notable in mentor responses was that participants had not taken up this opportunity as much as they could have.

It is worth considering how much emphasis this should be given. One mentor suggested it could be seen as an expectation for participants, and could contribute to coursework on a Faculty course.

Mentor teachers

It was a deliberate decision to assign mentors who were first of all great coaches and communicators about pedagogy. Subject content is relatively easy [to address], so being in the same department or subject area was not a priority. (Cohort 15 principal)

The mentor role was found to be critical to the success of the programme and to participants’ progress in the 2013 and 2014 annual evaluation reports, and this is further confirmed in 2015.

Selection of Cohort 15 mentors

Last year we reported that most schools, when selecting mentors for participants, started with the department in which they would be working. This was less evident in 2015. More participants had a mentor from a different department. Most co-ordinators commented that their schools recognised the main priority for selecting mentors was choosing
people who were themselves quality teachers with strong pedagogical knowledge, and with the experience, skills and qualities that would make them a good mentor (e.g., experience at coaching others, good at communicating and building relationships with new teachers). Subject expertise and being in the same department was also a high priority, and when this was available choices were often obvious. However, when this was not available, or not the ‘best fit’, the subject expertise was covered by other teachers or by VTS and LTS. Time allocation and workload were considered in the selection process in some schools. In smaller schools with fewer staff the options were more limited.

This year, nine Cohort 15 mentors were not in the same department as their participant (compared with five in Cohort 14). One of the nine shared the 0.2 FTE with a teacher from the participant’s department; two others had taught the participant’s subject in the past, but were currently teaching in another department.

All participants and mentors were positive about the mentoring relationships they were in with regard to being in the same department or not. Those mentors who were in the same subject area said it worked well as the participant could observe not only their teaching strategies, but also focus on curriculum and subject-specific aspects. They clearly felt it was an advantage to be in the same subject area.

I feel this is important [to be in the same department] [recalls a particular observation]. I would not have been able to give feedback on how to respond to a student’s question in a way that led to the next point of the lesson. (Cohort 15 mentor)

Equally, those mentors who were not in the same subject area as their participant did not see any disadvantages. In most of these cases there were formal or informal arrangements for participants to spend time with teachers who could help them with subject content.

I like [mentor] not being in the department. It gives me some space where I feel she’s not constantly on my back watching what’s going on. We don’t get too focused on content all the time. I get lots of support for general pedagogy, classroom management, giving instructions, classroom matters. I get content support from VTS. (Cohort 15 participant)

[Participant] co-teaches a class with the subject HoD and gets good content and subject support within the department. I feel it works well for [participant] to have support for pedagogical concepts and a ‘point of contact’ outside the department. (Cohort 15 mentor)

**Participants’ perspectives on their mentor relationship**

Nearly all Cohort 15 participants were positive about their relationship with their mentor and the way they worked. Those who offered comments about possible improvements included two references to subject specific help (but in both cases they got this from other teachers or the VTS/LAS). Any other comments were about adapting to different personalities or styles.

As in previous years, participants valued the range of support they received from mentors including teaching strategies, feedback on lesson observations, and advice and strategies for managing behaviour and student engagement.

Participants also appreciated the practical help they received from their mentors with general organisation, planning, providing resources, developing routines, administrative requirements, and familiarisation with the school. They also frequently commented that they valued their mentor’s attention and availability. They felt that their mentors cared about them and paid attention to their needs.

Being someone I can email silly little questions. That’s a huge help. The fact that he’s consistently viewing me teach and viewing the learning in my classroom, I know that he understands better than anyone the context of my classroom. Can give me advice. (Cohort 15 participant)
In Cohort 14, more participants have had the same mentor for both years of the programme than we reported for Cohort 13. There are a number of possible reasons for this. One may be that Cohort 14 schools have been able to make good matches between mentors and participants. Another reason could be the growing maturity of the mentoring programme and schools’ appreciation of the role of mentoring in supporting new teachers. Cohort 14 participants found most aspects of mentor support helpful. The most helpful aspects of their mentor’s support were feedback after classroom observation (all but one found this helpful), encouragement to observe other teachers (again, all but one found this helpful), pastoral support, advice on classroom management and feedback on lesson planning (all rated helpful or very helpful by all but two participants). The majority also found observing their mentor teach, pedagogical knowledge, and specialist subject knowledge to be helpful.

**Mentors’ perspectives on their role**

Mentors’ perspectives on their role are consistent with those of participants. Figure 2 presents the words used by Cohort 15 mentors when we asked them to describe the main purpose of their work with participants. In the word cloud, the size of the word is relative to how many times it was mentioned. What this emphasises is how the role goes well beyond curriculum or subject related support, which is why it is not always essential for mentors and participants to be in the same department.

**Figure 2  Word cloud based on mentors’ responses when asked about the main purpose of their work with participants**

Mentors generally felt their role was to ‘guide and support’ the participants as they work towards becoming effective, independent teachers. The types of support participants need clearly changes over time and one mentor summed this up.

> At first it meant really being physically present to answer all the immediate questions, and being really supportive with everything including admin, sharing resources and ideas, planning and so on. Now she does most things independently e.g., planning, and she often directs the focus of the observations. She now knows what she wants to ask about. (Cohort 15 mentor)

All mentors of Cohort 14 participants reported that they were able to support the participant well, and were positive about their role, how they had developed expertise as mentors and teachers, and what they had gained from it. Nearly all would be a mentor again if they had the opportunity.

> I have been a better mentor this year, and hopefully a lot more helpful. (Cohort 14 mentor)
It has been an enriching and challenging (in a good way) experience, and I am a better teacher for it. (Cohort 14 mentor)

Some Cohort 14 mentors reported challenges in their role, but each challenge was only identified by a couple of mentors:

- time, particularly when they had other management responsibilities in the school
- timetabling
- providing curriculum expertise (if not in the same department)
- communication with others in the school
- managing participant expectations.

A few mentors also reflected on the challenge of providing appropriate mentoring support for participants in their second year.

Moving into a different phase of mentoring and making sure that I was guiding [participant] in the appropriate ways. (Cohort 14 mentor)

As the participants evolve from survival mode to something better, they tend to be harder to shift in their practice. Learning why I was having trouble moving [participant] along and what to do about it towards the end of the two years would have been beneficial. (Cohort 14 mentor)

Teach First NZ partnership personnel commented that one of the aspects of mentoring they would like to improve was guidance for mentors working with participants in their second year. As reflected in the mentor comments above, mentoring in the second year may change in nature and scope, but is still essential for participant development.

**Observation of participants**

The focus on mentor observations and feedback continues to be noted as a strength of the programme. As we reported in previous years, the frequency of classroom observations and mentors’ individual approaches to them varied, although most aimed for fortnightly or weekly observations. These formal observations were often combined with more informal ‘walk throughs’ or ‘pop-ins’.

Most mentors reported decreasing the frequency of observations as the participants gained confidence and experience in the second or third term and certainly in the second year, although five Cohort 14 mentors still reported observing the participant teach once a week (two made fortnightly observations, five once a month, and two twice a term). The frequency of formal observations also varied depending on the number of scheduled observations from VTS, how busy the participant was with assessments, and the level of support from others in the department—for example, the HoD.

The focus of observations also changed from routines and classroom management (common at the beginning), to planning, and strategies such as questioning, group work and active listening.

Although more than half of the mentors of Cohort 15 participants said they had been able to model their own teaching approach for the participant, nearly all said they would like this to happen more often. Barriers to this appeared to be that the mentor was in a non-teaching role, timetable constraints, or participants being too busy or appearing reluctant to prioritise this opportunity.

**Benefits for mentors**

Most mentors of both cohorts said that one of the best things they gained from the mentoring role was the opportunity and impetus to reflect on their own practice, and teaching and learning more broadly. It had also provided some with a
greater understanding of being a good mentor. This was good professional learning for their own career development and in a few cases mentors reported that the professional learning had had an effect on other staff as well.

Helped me to balance my understanding of what ‘good teaching’ or ‘good pedagogy’ is. Lots of time to discuss readings, the nuts and bolts of learning and what has been working in your class, another local school, and overseas. Some of the best PD you can have. (Cohort 14 mentor)

A way to reflect on my own practice and growth after five years of teaching. It allows me to continue with my professional growth. Helps me set learning goals for myself. (Cohort 14 mentor)

I hear some of my common sayings coming out in her and it’s made me reflect on my own habits. Being a role model. That has had a big impact. To model leaving school at an appropriate time. Doing the inquiries has been fantastic for both of us. Having the time to reflect on it and really discuss it with somebody. (Cohort 14 mentor)

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

Key findings
Most mentors and co-ordinators considered they were well supported by the Teach First NZ partnership in terms of initial preparation and ongoing support. Clarity and timing of communications continued to be an issue for just a few mentors and co-ordinators.

All mentors and co-ordinators felt valued by programme participants, and nearly all felt valued by others in their schools.

Support for mentors
As we have reported before, most mentors considered they were well supported by the Teach First NZ partnership (one Cohort 14 mentor said they were “not supported”). Most Cohort 14 mentors had been the mentor for their participant in 2014 as well, showing greater continuity than we reported for Cohort 13 (when 10 out of 15 had not been the mentor for year 1 of the programme). Nearly all Cohort 14 mentors felt their role as a mentor was valued or highly valued by senior management in their school and by other teachers. All felt valued by programme participants.

Most Cohort 15 mentors found the initial meetings and training useful in that they covered expectations of the role, and helped them understand the background to the Teach First NZ partnership, and the processes involved, such as selection. Many also found the ongoing meetings useful for sharing and listening to others’ experiences.

Suggestions for improvement included providing:

- more information about what participants are covering in university study, for better alignment and to avoid repetition
- some clearer guidelines of expectations—for example, a ‘checklist’ for mentors
- creation of an online forum for mentors
- specific strategies (protocols) for doing observations and giving feedback
- holding meetings nearer to some schools or rotating the venue
- greater clarity about who to contact at the Teach First NZ partnership about participant issues.

Nearly all Cohort 15 mentors (14 out of 18) said that the ongoing liaison with the Teach First NZ partnership had been effective or very effective. Those who said it was effective described what worked for them.
New system it is all on line. Just log in and put feedback in. I’m linked to [participant] so get an alert. That’s made that side of it very good. TFNZ/university is responsive [to feedback]. (Cohort 15 mentor)

Because the participant is struggling the university has put in extra support so LAS or VTS visit every fortnight. They communicate beforehand … they have been conscientious about putting all the support in place that is possible. We all want the participant to get as much out of the programme as possible. (Cohort 15 mentor)

Support for co-ordinators

All Cohort 14 co-ordinators said they felt either very supported or supported by the Teach First NZ partnership. All considered that their role was valued or highly valued by mentors, and nearly all considered it was valued by their school senior management team and other teachers.

Many Cohort 15 co-ordinators (nine out of 14) felt well prepared and supported in their role. Those who felt less prepared had all come into the role during the year as a consequence of staff changes, had missed the programme training sessions, or their feeling under-prepared was due to other factors within the school (rather than with the Teach First NZ partnership). Those who had missed training would have liked some induction process, and two of these suggested that emails and communication could be clearer and more timely. Co-ordinators would like notice of important dates early in the year so they could be timetabled.

Participants’ connections with the Teach First NZ community

[Key findings]

This year we were particularly interested in the connections at different layers of the Teach First NZ community. We confirmed that participants’ connections are strongest within their own cohort, followed by other cohorts, then the wider Teach First NZ partnership community, and finally the global network (i.e., Teach For All). All participants from Cohorts 14 and 15 were connected with their cohort, about half had strong connections with other cohorts and the partnership, and a few were strongly connected with the global network. These data were collected before the Teach For All Global Conference held in Auckland in October. Many participants from the three cohorts attended this conference.

[I feel] very much a part of it. I am proud to be part of Teach First. We are always invited to events. We are always included. We are all on a first name basis with Shaun [Chief Executive], which I think is something that is quite special. He will come and sit down in lectures. As a participant that makes me feel valued. We had people come from Teach For America and that helped us feel part of the global organisation. (Cohort 15 participant)

Last year when we asked Cohort 14 participants in their first year of the programme, to what extent they felt part of the Teach First NZ community and how important this connection was to them, all participants said they felt part of the Teach First NZ community, but it was clear that this meant different things to different people. We picked up on this again in our interviews with Cohort 15 participants and were particularly interested in the connections at different layers of the Teach First NZ experience: within the cohort, across cohorts, with the Teach First NZ partnership, and global connections.

Almost all Cohort 15 participants said they had developed close bonds with their cohort, as colleagues and often friends. Distance meant that participants in Northland were less likely to be able to join in all social occasions.
Teach First NZ partners described how they had worked on building relationships across cohorts. This was evident, with about half of the Cohort 15 participants making at least some connection with other cohorts, especially Cohort 14, at clinics and other Teach First NZ events, or within their school where they could sometimes go for advice.

Just under half of Cohort 15 participants (eight participants) referred to close connections with the “wider Teach First NZ community” including Teach First NZ and university staff. Three of these said they felt like they are part of the global Teach First / Teach For All community.

All Cohort 14 participants reported strong connections with the other participants in their cohort, and most had at least some connection with Cohort 13 and Cohort 15 participants. Belonging to the Teach First NZ alumni community was very important to three Cohort 14 participants, and important to five. It was not important to another five who responded to this question. Belonging to the Teach For All global community was only important or very important to five participants in Cohort 14. These data were collected before the Teach For All global conference held in Auckland in October. Many participants from the three cohorts attended this conference.

**Viability**

**Key findings**

We considered that the programme would be viable with its current cohort size if the Teach First NZ model can successfully adjust to larger numbers of participants within agreed funding arrangements.

In 2013 there were nine schools in the programme, in 2014 there were 16, and in 2015 there were 20. Seven schools joined the programme for the first time in 2015, six decile 1 and one decile 2. Five schools with Cohort 14 participants do not have Cohort 15 participants this year. The programme has successfully adjusted to the larger number of schools and participants.

While most of the schools in the programme are positive about ongoing involvement, some principals and co-ordinators are likely to limit this involvement to one cohort at a time. Reasons for this include the level of support required (demand for and on mentors), falling rolls, and hopes to be able to retain participants at the end of the 2-year programme, having to do so within their staffing entitlement.

There does not appear to have been an issue for 2015 schools in funding Cohort 14 and Cohort 15 (who, unlike Cohort 13, are not supernumerary), although funding continues to be raised by a few principals we interviewed as a potential barrier to participation. This includes not only the participants’ staffing costs, but the associated costs such as PLD, travel and provision of laptops.

This year we did not survey principals in Cohort 14 schools, and we did not ask Cohort 14 co-ordinators directly whether their school would have more participants in the future. However, some commented on this in response to other questions. These comments ranged from the positive to those few with concerns about viability, particularly in relation to the demand on mentors.

We are strong supporters of the programme and would love to have more participants in the future. (Cohort 14 co-ordinator)

All the mentors associated with TFNZ are reluctant to take it on again because it’s so demanding, so emotionally involved and so long-term ... TFNZ mentoring falls well outside anything our mentors have been used to and they have found it a major stretch. (Cohort 14 co-ordinator)

The mentor time takes our best teachers out of the classroom. (Cohort 14 co-ordinator)
We spoke with the seven principals in schools new to the programme in 2015. Consistent with what we reported in previous years, most would like to continue their involvement with the programme (one would not). Two principals referred to funding either as a current or potential barrier to participation. This was not only funding the participant’s salary, but the associated costs such as PLD, travel and provision of laptops. The Ministry of Education funded the four Northland participants in Cohort 15 as supernumerary, which allowed those schools to accept participants they could not have afforded otherwise.

Two principals were clear that their school would not want to take on too many Teach First NZ participants at one time, either to be able to accommodate and support them, or because of being able to offer participants permanent work at the end of their 2 years:

   I’d prefer to see more schools have fewer participants than fewer schools taking on more. (Cohort 15 principal)

Co-ordinators reiterated the importance of selecting “great” participants and matching them with “great” mentors. Most would be happy to continue in the programme, especially if it came with funding, but some concurred with the principal view above, limiting the number of participants at any one time, to support a single cohort through the 2 years of the programme.
Evaluation question 2: To what extent has the programme achieved its overall outcomes and objectives?

This chapter focuses on the evaluation criteria for evaluation question 2, as far as they can be addressed at this stage of the evaluation. 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 outcomes criteria agreed with the Ministry of Education: the effectiveness of participants’ teaching; their levels 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; and enablers and barriers to success. To avoid unnecessary repetition, we have combined the data on programme impact on quality on teaching and the status of teaching, and reported on enablers and barriers to success in Chapter 5, Discussion.

Effectiveness of participants’ teaching

**Key findings**

Informed professional judgment was one of the key measures we used to ascertain the effectiveness of participants’ teaching. We asked co-ordinators and mentors whose considerable experience and expertise was triangulated with the judgements made by the participants themselves. Judgements included evidence of student engagement and academic progress and achievement. Participants are valued by their schools for their confidence, ability to take responsibility for leading change and a “sense of maturity” about their practice. Almost all co-ordinators and principals considered that students responded “very positively” or “positively” to the participants with many commenting positively on the impact participants were having with students, both academically and in a pastoral role. Some mentors considered a few participants lacked pedagogical and subject knowledge, and, for Cohort 15, behaviour management strategies.

Everyone surveyed about Cohort 14 considered that participants had made considerable progress and were more confident, had stronger relationships with students, and were playing stronger roles in their departments and often in their schools than they had in their first year of teaching. Cohort 15 participants were also felt to be making progress, with almost all of these making at least ‘expected’ progress. Based on the data from the *Me and My Class* survey we considered most students in participants’ classes were engaged in their learning and the survey results indicate that they were not disadvantaged by being in participants’ classes, in the first or second year of participants’ teaching.

This section discusses the effectiveness of participants’ teaching, from their own perspectives and the perspectives of those in their schools (mentors, co-ordinators and principals). It also reports on participants’ relationships with students, presenting student engagement results from the *Me and My Class* survey.
Cohort 14

They have higher levels of confidence, and are more likely to take responsibility for leading change. To a certain extent there is more of a personal responsibility taken by the participants in terms of meeting the needs of their students, and overall a sense of maturity about their practice. (Cohort 14 co-ordinator)

Cohort 14 participants were nearing the end of their second year of teaching when they, along with co-ordinators and mentors, completed surveys. We asked if participants’ confidence as a teacher had increased since 2014. All co-ordinators, mentors and participants said that it had. We asked what evidence co-ordinators had to support their ratings. The following quotation illustrates the range of sources used by co-ordinators.

"Fewer concerns from mentors, fewer concerns from participant. Happy HoD. Hardly any concerns from Deans so obviously both actual teaching and learning seem to be happening without many of the issues we had the first year. Participants themselves have come out of their shells, are more visible in the life of the wider school and they are smiling a lot more now." (Cohort 14 co-ordinator)

Twelve out of 13 co-ordinators reported that students have responded positively to the participants. They described this with terms such as “kids relate well to them”, “good rapport with students” and “respect her as much as any staff”. Several commented that the participant “had the usual struggles with Year 10” and that they were “learning to deal with them”.

Most participants considered themselves to be effective (nine participants) or very effective (four participants) in terms of helping raise student achievement. One participant thought they were not effective. All were pleased with the progress their students had made this year. Mentors were more likely than the participants to say that participants were “very effective” at helping raise student achievement (eight rated their participant as very effective, and five as effective). Only one (of the 14 mentors responding) rated their participant as not effective at helping raise student achievement. Participant ratings of themselves were much the same in 2015 as in 2014. More mentors rated participants as very effective in 2015, participants’ second teaching year.

A similar pattern is repeated in response to the question: “How confident are you that participants are culturally responsive to Māori and Pasifika students in their classes?” Nine mentors perceived the participant(s) they worked with as being “very confident” and five perceived participants as “confident”. Only three of the participants saw themselves as “very confident”, eight saw themselves as “confident” and three rated themselves as “not confident”. Participants’ lower ratings of themselves compared with mentors and with Cohort 13 could be a reflection of the strong focus Teach First NZ has put on biculturalism and working with Māori from 2014 and participants’ greater awareness of the complexities involved in their own learning.

Some of the participants had picked up more senior or more challenging classes which had added to their workload and responsibilities, although they were positive about this as it had extended their learning.

"This year I’m teaching one year level the same as last year and two “new”, which means learning new assessment standards and tasks and creating brand new lesson content for two new cohorts. By next year I’ll have experience teaching all five year levels which is great." (Cohort 14 participant)

"I have one senior class and two junior classes. All of my classes have a real range of ability and some behavioural issues that I did not encounter last year, so I have to think outside the box and use differentiation this year." (Cohort 14 participant)

Mentors rated participants’ challenges in relation to classroom teaching, perceiving that pedagogical knowledge and specialist subject knowledge were the most challenging. Three mentors also thought participants were challenged by lesson planning, relating to all students, administrative tasks, and NCEA assessment.
We asked Cohort 14 participants an open-ended question about the main rewards they had found in the process of becoming a teacher. Of 13 responses, 11 referred to developing positive relationships with students.

Feeling like I am making a difference to some students, seeing ‘lightbulb’ moments in the classroom, having some students engage and enjoy my subject and seeing confidence in students grow. (Cohort 14 participant)

**Cohort 15**

Students value the work that they do with him and he is willing to spend time after school to help them. He's built himself a profile here. (Cohort 15 mentor)

Cohort 15 mentors were able to point out areas needing development, but were quick to praise participants for their progress. Almost all mentors reported that Cohort 15 participants had developed good relationships and rapport with students, but that it took some time. A few mentors noted that behaviour management was still an issue for some participants. One felt that a participant “has trouble reading the students” and one thought that their participant was “slow to establish relationships”. However, there were many positive comments, with two examples given here.

I have seen a huge shift in the year 11 focus and their willingness to engage in learning. She has things in place for them like road maps so that they can be accountable for their learning. Which is a big thing for this school. (Cohort 15 mentor)

She’s personable, likeable and has a positive effect on staff morale. She helps fuel professional conversations. (Cohort 15 mentor)

Like their mentors, Cohort 15 participants identified areas of teaching that they found difficult. When we asked participants how well they were functioning as a teacher now, all participants indicated that they felt they were doing better now than in Term 1. This pattern was also reported for earlier cohorts, and is not unexpected for beginning teachers.

Compared with the start of the year, I’m much less focused on classroom and behaviour management. A lot of that is more natural now so I can spend time on what the purpose of the class is, and best method of achieving that goal, purpose, intention. (Cohort 15 participant)

I knew I was bad, so feel like I'm doing well now—students have had some good assessment results. Can sense a level of engagement that wasn't there in the beginning—can see where we are going and why. (Cohort 15 participant)

Most co-ordinators thought that participants were making expected progress.

Doing really well given that she is half way through the first year. No concerns about the learning, exactly where a first year teacher should be. (Cohort 15 co-ordinator)

Overwhelmed at first—is now getting her head around NCEA. The school needed to prioritise what support they gave at what time—this was a learning curve for HoD and mentor. She now especially needs guidance in pedagogy but she is gaining more confidence and learning to fly. (Cohort 15 co-ordinator)

Most Cohort 15 participants were able to describe some way in which their students’ achievement had improved. For the majority this was assessed through some formal means, such as e-asTTle or NCEA standards. Improvement was noted as better results or achievement levels, or as increased numbers turning up for assessments and passing them.

Good, judging from assessments—e-asTTle with Y9 and 10 and most of them made improvements or stayed the same in comprehension and reading. (Cohort 15 participant)
Year 11 were the first class where 50% got their numeracy credits. (Cohort 15 participant)

Most participants also had classes or students who were not doing as well, and their assessment of these students’ improvement was often based on their levels of engagement with learning, and their behaviour in class.

I know they are making progress—I get feedback from students after class, observe better behaviour, for example, taking their books out when they arrive; and there are more students submitting assignments. In the last assessment there were only four who didn’t, whereas it had previously been about half the class.

Participants also noted feedback from other teachers and students as one way they could recognise improved engagement.

Student engagement: Results from the *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* (Ministry of Education, 2007).20 The survey explores students’ perspectives on learning in their classroom. We chose to use the survey to help us assess one of the evaluation criteria for effectiveness of participants’ teaching: high engagement of students.21

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 (we refer to this as rich learning experiences).
- **Me in My Class**: This section contains 10 questions that explore students’ personal responses to learning in their class (we refer to this as engagement).

Students are asked to give their level of agreement with a statement on a 5-point scale, ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”.

In September 2015, 8 months after Cohort 15 began teaching and near the end of Cohort 14’s programme, participants chose a Year 9 or Year 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 certificated and often significantly more experienced). Some schools were unable to administer the survey in September and did so at the beginning of Term 4 (end of October). Unfortunately some schools did not provide a comparison class and so our comparison sample is quite small and we have therefore not used any of the results to compare with participant classes. It is likely that schools did not prioritise collecting data from a comparison class (as they did with participant classes).

We would caution against too much emphasis being placed on the results of the *Me and My Class* survey in 2015. However, we can make some comment about the overall results for participants’ classes and some differences in ratings of Cohort 14 and Cohort 15 classes.

---


21 We did not disaggregate the data by ethnicity, because the majority of students in the participating schools are Māori and Pasifika.
Engaging students in their learning

Most students selected “agreed” or “strongly agreed” in response to almost all items. We therefore considered that students in participants’ classes were engaged in their learning and that they were not disadvantaged by being in participants’ classes, in the first or second year of participants’ teaching.

In Year 10, with exceptions for two items, between 20 and 50 percent of students strongly agreed with the items related to their engagement in their learning. Results for the two cohorts were similar. (Note, however, that we have results for only 37 Year 10 students in Cohort 14 participants’ classes.)

All students were most likely to strongly agree with these items:

- I have surprised myself with what I have achieved
- I learn things I can use outside of school
- My culture is respected and valued
- I work well with others.

On almost all items Cohort 14 and 15 Year 9 students were more likely than Year 10 students to select “strongly agree”. In addition to the items listed above they also strongly agreed with:

- I always try my hardest
- I’m really interested in what we learn.

On most items students in Year 9 Cohort 14 participants’ classes were slightly more likely to strongly agree than students in Year 9 Cohort 15 participants’ classes.

Rich learning experiences

As with engagement, about two-thirds of the students agreed or strongly agreed with almost all items. The data indicates that the majority of students in participants’ classes are enjoying rich learning experiences. Overall there is no statistically significant difference in responses between Cohort 14 and Cohort 15 classes. We report some differences in individual items in Appendix 3.

For both cohorts, there was a much wider range of responses to the survey items related to learning experiences than there was for items related to engagement (from 5 to 52 percent selecting “strongly agree” for different items). Year 9 students were slightly more likely to strongly agree than Year 10 students. Items with strong positive agreement included:

- I get to explain my thinking—how I worked something out
- My teacher encourages us to keep trying especially when we get stuck
- My teacher encourages us to try new things, even if they feel a bit hard at first.

High numbers of Year 9 students also strongly agreed that:

- My teacher likes it when I ask questions and try out new things
- We are allowed to disagree with others and change our minds if someone has a better idea.

---

22 This wider range of responses may be related to the subject taught. We were not able to explore this from the data we had.
Participants’ contribution to school pastoral life

Key findings

Cohort 14 participants reported being involved in a variety of aspects of school life allowing them to develop relationships with students from their own classes and throughout the school. They said their involvement in other activities (for example, revision for NCEA and scholarship and homework centres, sports coaching, Education Outside the Classroom (EOTC) and cultural events) had strengthened their relationships with students. Cohort 15 participants tended to support rather than lead these types of activities. One interesting difference from previous years was the high number of participants from both cohorts who were involved in running or assisting with dance and drama activities.

The Teach First NZ partnership advises participants to develop their teaching skills first before becoming too involved in extra activities, and in their first year to limit extra activities to homework groups or similar. We therefore focused more on this criterion in relation to Cohort 14. However, it was clear from our interviews with mentors and coordinators that participants from both cohorts take part in a wide range of activities and become involved in the life of the school.

Cohort 14 participants reported being involved in a variety of aspects of school life with revision/NCEA and scholarship, Arts/Drama (eight of the 15 participants), and EOTC (six of 13 participants) being most common. Smaller numbers of participants were also involved in sports coaching, kapa haka, school clubs, science fair and fundraising. Nine of the participants said that this involvement had strengthened their relationships with students.

Leadership development strand

Key findings

The Leadership Development Strand is a key element of the programme. Its 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”. All but three of the Cohort 14 participants took on significant leadership roles in 2015. Participants attributed their leadership role to their Teach First NZ leadership project, the school giving them responsibility, encouragement from their mentor or HoD, and their own knowledge and initiative. Unlike Cohort 13, most participants’ leadership projects related to curriculum and departmental leadership where participants’ in-depth knowledge and skills in e-learning, te reo Māori, or aspects of mathematics or English was highly valued.

Teach First NZ identifies that leadership development in the first year should be focused on developing leadership in the classroom. We did not ask Cohort 15 about their involvement in leadership in 2015. In their second year participants are encouraged to take on more leadership beyond the classroom and one of the requirements of the programme is a leadership project.

The Leadership Project required three related sections:

1. an outcomes-focused description of the project
2. evaluation: an evaluation of progress
3. reflections: planning and managing a leadership project; leading through and with others; building relational trust.
All but three of the Cohort 14 participants thought they had been able to take on wider school leadership roles in 2015, with three considering that they had done so to a high extent. Their mentors were more likely to consider that participants’ leadership had been to a high extent (six mentors) and only one mentor did not think the participant had been able to show leadership within the school. Participants attributed their leadership role to their Teach First NZ leadership project, the school giving them responsibility, encouragement from their mentor or HoD, and their own knowledge and initiative. Mentors particularly highlighted qualities of the participant themselves (taking initiative, confidence, intelligence, openness).

Unlike Cohort 13, most Cohort 14 participants’ leadership projects related to curriculum and departmental leadership where participants’ in-depth knowledge and skills in e-learning, te reo Māori, or aspects of mathematics or English were highly valued. A few participants mentioned other roles, for example, taking a lead role in arts and cultural events.

Departmental meetings. My HoD and closest departmental colleagues have really valued my input on the curriculum, particularly my inquiry research on reading for pleasure at year 10, and my prolific production of new resources, e.g. a new novel study and new film study at year 11, which they have adopted with gusto.

Programme impact on quality of teaching and learning in participating schools and the status of teaching

Key findings

All Cohort 14 co-ordinators and principals considered that participants had had either a “high positive impact” or “some positive impact” on the teaching and learning in the school. Almost all school personnel in Cohort 15 schools noted the contribution participants made to different activities in the school, their department and in staff meetings and their willingness to share new ideas. Almost all co-ordinators thought that Teach First NZ has had a very positive or positive impact on the perceived status of teaching as a competitive profession attracting top graduates and talented individuals, although mentors were more muted in their response with a small number identifying no impact or a negative impact. All except one participant thought Teach First NZ has had a very positive or positive impact on the perceived status of teaching as a competitive profession.

The two previous sections outline many contributions that participants have made in their schools. In this section we consider the impact that participants are perceived to have had in their schools and the extent to which Teach First NZ is seen to be having a positive impact on the perceived status of teaching as a competitive profession attracting top graduates and talented individuals.

All co-ordinators were positive about the impact Cohort 14 participants had made in their school. Half of the co-ordinators considered that the Cohort 14 participants had made a high impact in their school and the other half considered participants had made some impact.

Involvement in the PRT programme has been great, supporting the first year teachers in particular. There has been involvement in extra-curricular activities and school clubs. Both are active contributors to their respective departments, and collaborate in school-wide PLD.

Co-ordinators also reported that Cohort 15 participants had had some noticeable impact on students, staff or the school in general. The participants were described as “enthusiastic” and “dynamic” and willing to be involved in sporting, cultural, arts and musical activities, in addition to making an impact on students’ learning in the classroom. Impact on staff was sometimes through the increased awareness and reflection on practice, and the participants’ awareness of culturally responsive pedagogy.
Almost all mentors also described ways in which Cohort 15 participants had made an impact on the school including: contributing to staff discussions and initiating wider reflection on practice; new initiatives such as e-learning; developing resources; being active in extracurricular activities; and improved student attendance and achievement in a few cases. One mentor thought it was too early to tell if their participant had made an impact but that she was certainly “visible and present around the school.” Only one thought that their participant had made a minimal impact.

The evaluation criterion for the status of teaching is that the programme attracts growing numbers of high-calibre applicants, including Māori, Pasifika and male applicants. Earlier in this report we discussed the selection process, the number of applicants, and the demographic profile of those who are accepted onto the programme. We also asked Cohort 14 survey respondents (co-ordinators, mentors and participants) to what extent they consider Teach First NZ is making an impact on the perceived status of teaching as a “competitive profession attracting top graduates and talented individuals”.\textsuperscript{23}

Overall, co-ordinators and mentors consider Teach First NZ is making a positive impact on the status of teaching. A few consider there has been no impact, with a sense from some that it was still too early to judge. One mentor considered there had been a somewhat negative impact. Some respondents commented on how good other beginning teachers were and another queried the fact that some participants have “ended up teaching in high decile schools which might be good for the participant but goes against the intention of the programme”. We provide information about participant destinations in the next section.

Participants’ responses were similar to co-ordinators’ with three considering Teach First NZ has had a very positive impact on the perceived status of teaching, 10 reporting a somewhat positive impact and one no impact. One participant gave a personal example:

People (in and out of teaching) are surprised and impressed to hear I moved from a corporate career into the travails of a “worthy and meaningful” job like teaching. I think this enhances one’s (their) view of the profession generally. My stories and anecdotes bring social issues to people who otherwise hold a dim view of teaching and our low decile communities. Teach First’s vision and commitment to change highlights the problems in our society and enlightens people, helping also to reduce prejudice and ignorance.

\textsuperscript{23} This is Teach First NZ’s term.
Completion and retention rates

Key findings

A successful completion rate over the two years of the programme for each 2-year cohort was set at 90 percent. The retention rate for the first two cohorts has exceeded this expectation.

Early indications are that nearly all participants are staying in teaching after completing the programme and are gaining permanent positions in New Zealand secondary schools. These levels of employment are particularly high in relation to the national picture where 22 percent of new secondary teachers gain fulltime employment in their first year. However, we do not have national-level data specific to the ‘hard to staff’ subjects included in the Teach First NZ programme. Those data would enable a better comparison.

In 2016, 14 of the 15 Cohort 13 participants will be teaching in New Zealand secondary schools: five in decile 1–3 schools, and nine in decile 4–9 schools. Most are staying in the schools where they were PRT1s/PCT1s in 2015.

Cohort 14 participants will be in their PCT1 year in 2016. As at March 2016, 15 are employed in a New Zealand secondary school. Nine of these are being retained in their host school, and a further four are moving to other decile 1–4 schools. Two others are teaching in decile 7 schools.

Cohort 14

I intend to remain in teaching and education for the rest of my professional life. I’ve got a lot to offer and am excited about the incredible opportunities in the sector. (Cohort 14 participant)

Over the past two years I’ve often wondered whether I should have just done the regular one-year programme. The reality is, however, that I would never have done it. Teach First got me into secondary teaching. (Cohort 14 participant)

Cohort 14 began with 20 participants, but one left early in the programme, in Term 1 of 2014. The remaining 19 are still in the programme, as their second year comes to an end in November 2015. Nine of the 19 participants have been retained by their school as PCTs for 2016, and six of the others have secured teaching jobs, mostly in Auckland. One other will be in full-time study, one will be travelling (but intends to return to teach in New Zealand), one will be relief teaching and one remains on parental leave. Over half of the cohort (13 of the 19) will be teaching in decile 1–4 schools, and two in decile 7 schools.

All Cohort 14 participants responding to the online survey (there were four who did not respond) said that gaining registration and full certification as a teacher was important or very important to them, for teaching in New Zealand and possibly overseas in the future. They plan to stay in teaching to achieve this, and some see a long-term future in education.

Cohort 15

I’m looking forward to this journey going so far, and flying with it. (Cohort 15 participant)

The programme began in 2015 with 20 participants; one left the programme in Term 1, and two left the programme in Term 3. Two of these participants did not therefore participate in the evaluation, but we did speak to others in their schools (co-ordinators and mentors). The remaining 17 participants were still in the programme in November 2015, and

---

24 Data provided by the Ministry of Education, October 2015.
25 Host schools for Cohort 14 included one decile 4 school.
all but one of these responded with an emphatic ‘yes’ to finishing the 2-year programme. Most said they intended to stay in teaching longer than 2 years, and more than half thought they would stay in teaching for more than 5 years. Three of the 17 participants said that they may not stay in teaching beyond the 2 years to gain certification. Cohort 15 participants’ reasons for possibly not continuing to teach were to undertake more study or combine other interests with education.

Destinations after completing the programme

Once participants have completed the 2-year programme, they are free to choose if and where they will teach. The following tables show Cohort 13 destinations in 2015 and 2016, and Cohort 14 destinations in 2016. For easier comparison across the cohorts, the grouping of lower decile schools includes decile 4 schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Cohort 13 destinations in 2015 and 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retained by host school (deciles 1–3)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment at another decile 1 school</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment at another decile 3 school</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment decile 4 school</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total at decile 1–4 schools</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment decile 6 school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment decile 7 school</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total at decile 5–7 schools</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment decile 8 school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment decile 9 school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total at decile 8–10 schools</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living overseas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(inc teaching at International School)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7</th>
<th>Cohort 14 destinations in 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination</td>
<td>Number (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained by host school (deciles 1–4)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment at another decile 1–3 school</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment at another decile 4 school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total at decile 1–4 schools</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment at decile 7 school</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total at decile 5–7 schools</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total at decile 8–10 schools</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living overseas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time study</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental leave</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 Information accurate at March 2016.
Comparing the two cohorts (Cohort 13 and Cohort 14), more Cohort 14 participants have been retained in their host school, and more will be teaching in a school serving a low socio-economic community. In the 2016 evaluation report we will discuss alumni pathways and school staffing decision making in greater detail, when we are able to report on all three cohorts from the pilot programme.
Discussion

In this final chapter of the report we draw together our observations about the Teach First NZ programme in 2015 in relation to the overarching evaluation questions.

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

It’s been hugely positive. It’s been one of the best and hardest things I’ve ever done. Hugely challenging. Hugely rewarding. My political compass has shifted—much more aware of inequality and poverty. It has been really exciting. (Cohort 15 participant)

Now into its third year, the programme continues to be effectively and efficiently implemented. There were two cohorts in 2015 with 38 participants in all—19 from Cohort 14 (two of whom were on long-term leave in the second part of 2015) and 19 from Cohort 15 (two of whom left in September). There have been a few staff additions and changes at Teach First NZ and some schools have new principals or co-ordinators, and there are a number of new mentors. Nine Cohort 15 participants joined Cohort 14 participants in their schools, and 10 were placed in seven schools that were new to the programme in 2015. These changes have been well managed and, for the most part, the programme has been strengthened by them.

The systems and structures that define Teach First NZ have enabled the relationships they have developed with the University of Auckland and with schools in Auckland and Northland. Teach First NZ is very secure in its vision and mission and ways of operating, both within New Zealand, and as part of a global network. Now nearing the end of the third year of the pilot, the Teach First NZ partnership has been able to continue to do the things it has always done well, and add to its strengths.

Co-ordinators and mentors appear to be operating as cohesive groups that have benefited from having a mix of established and new people in those roles. People who have been in these roles for 3 years value their learning and contribute to their school communities and to the Teach First NZ community. There is seen to be reciprocal learning and a growing group of “experts”.

In 2015 we noted a number of different emphases, in part a consequence of the new schools in the programme and in part a response to the fact that the programme is now in its third year. In 2015 some aspects of the programme have bedded in (for example, the co-ordinator and mentor roles and the building of relationships within and between cohorts); and others seem to have opened up areas for further review. In particular we noted with interest:

- Participants not having a mentor in the same department, which is more common in 2015. It is an active choice by leadership teams to appoint the teachers in their schools who will make the best mentors. Schools making this choice provide a double layer of support in that mentors bring different perspectives and additional knowledge and skills to those provided by the department, and by VTS and LAS.
Ongoing challenges for te reo Māori participants some of whom find themselves with little departmental support and in some cases expected to take on HoD responsibilities.

Teach First NZ need to think carefully about where to place te reo participants. They need to be placed in a strong department like [school] where they can be nurtured and then move out into other schools. We can’t afford to lose te reo and Māori teachers from the system. (Cohort 15 co-ordinator)

An enhanced perception that Northland is not Auckland and that different solutions and approaches need to be embedded at all points, including placement, SII, and during the school year. Schools in Northland are different from Auckland schools because of their small size (and accordingly their low staff numbers), their Māori communities, their isolation, and their particular challenges with student progress and achievement.

There has been a little more participant movement than in previous years (resigning and being on parental leave).

The participants

Teach First NZ personnel described Cohort 15 as “cohesive, open, giving, and forgiving” and considered that as a group they had had a very positive impact on the programme. All Cohort 15 participants viewed the Teach First NZ programme positively. Comments typically included some reference to the challenge as well as the rewards, the sense of being involved in a larger and important ‘mission’ or kaupapa, and support provided by the Teach First NZ team and the Faculty, and by most schools. Participants indicated a strong loyalty to the programme.

You want to work hard for them—sign of good leadership. We don’t want to reflect badly on them, because of the personal relationship, and an overarching kaupapa—it’s not just about you and your career, but includes a duty or obligation. (Cohort 15 participant)

It’s a beautiful kaupapa. It’s not for the faint-hearted. Each person who is aligned with Teach First shares the same passion. I know I’m supported—there is so much support. (Cohort 15 participant)

A few participants commented on the difficulties in the beginning, but it seemed that even the worst of those experiences were now just seen as part of the learning process.

In Term 1 I wanted to quit—I’m drowning here! They told me to stick it out … I’m taking it front on. If I can teach here, everywhere else will be skipping daisies. (Cohort 15 participant)

The rigour of the selection process continues to be one of the major strengths of the programme, with nearly everyone involved commenting on the high quality of participants. All Cohort 14 participants were seen to be a great deal more confident, independent, and effective as teachers as they neared the end of their second year.

One of the effects of the very strong selection process has been a high retention rate—only four participants (one from 2014 and three from 2015) have left the programme.27 Retention rates for the completion of the 2-year programme have exceeded the expectation of 90 percent for the first two cohorts. Half-way through the programme, Cohort 15 had a retention rate of 85 percent. The vast majority of participants are teaching in New Zealand secondary schools after they complete the programme. Although we have no hard data about whether principals are choosing to employ Teach First NZ alumni above other applicants, clearly they are employable.

---

27 And one is on parental leave.
In last year’s annual evaluation report we reported that four participants from Cohort 13 had been retained in their host schools, and that just over half were staying in low decile (decile 1–3) schools. This year we report that a lot more Cohort 14 participants are staying in their host schools (nine participants). Host schools for this cohort include one that is decile 4. Many new schools in 2014 were very large secondary schools. It is possible that the higher number of participants’ being employed by their host school is a consequence of more flexible staffing that larger schools enjoy, and also the fact the Cohort 14 participants were not supernumerary in the same way as Cohort 13 were. Overall, of the 29 alumni that we know will be teaching in 2016, nearly two-thirds (19 participants) will be teaching in a decile 1–4 school. We will discuss the pathways of alumni in greater detail in the final evaluation report in 2016, when we have three cohorts to report on, and when many of Cohort 13 will have completed their two years as PCTs.

The programme
Participants in Cohort 15 reported that they felt well prepared by the SII, including in relation to behaviour and classroom management. Positive comments about the programme from Cohort 14 and Cohort 15 participants far outweighed any comments about things that could be improved. On the whole participants found the taught programme and the assignments relevant, and they were positive about the clinics and noho marae held during the year. These provided valuable time with curriculum specialists and an opportunity to reconnect and “reinvigorate” with their peers in both cohorts. A number of Cohort 14 participants and others that they worked with described the positive impact of their inquiry and leadership projects on their learning and on their schools.

The schools
Seven new schools joined the programme in 2015, all of them decile 1 or 2. Almost all decile 1 schools in Auckland are now involved in the programme. Three of the new Auckland schools have very large rolls, including high numbers of Māori and Pasifika students. Two of the new schools are very small. Very small schools may have less ability to support a participant in all aspects of school life although this did not always seem to be a challenge. During 2015 school decile ratings changed and a number of Teach First NZ schools went down a decile rating, so the average decile of schools involved is lower than in previous years. Schools involved are very positive about the programme but not all can or want to host a participant or employ one every year. This may have implications for the proposed expansion of the programme.

However, we are aware that a few Cohort 14 and Cohort 15 participants have been placed in situations where they have had to negotiate better conditions and support for themselves. While this is not typical, it does mean that different arrangements for participants in less supportive environments need to be provided by the Teach First NZ partnership. In our view, assigning participants to schools that are not yet able to provide effective support and mentoring may compromise the quality of the programme. This is likely to affect the extent to which the pilot programme can be expanded as fully as intended, unless creative solutions are found.

Ensuring high-quality mentoring for all participants continues to be an important focus of the programme. A number of schools recognise the dual benefits of the mentoring programme and the ability to develop another teacher and almost all the new 2015 schools have provided very good mentoring for participants. The ongoing development of a community of mentors is one of the major strengths of the programme in 2015.
To what extent has the programme achieved its overall outcomes and objectives?

I love Teach First NZ. It brings fantastically qualified, enthusiastic young people who might not have gone into teaching otherwise. They’re super humans; competent human beings. The school will change when there are enough of these new teachers. (Cohort 15 mentor)

Teach First NZ’s mission is to respond to a longstanding need for quality teachers in schools serving low socioeconomic communities with high Māori and Pasifika enrolments. The pilot is focused on preparing teachers to teach hard-to-staff secondary subjects in Auckland and Northland.

Our findings in 2015 are similar to 2013 and 2014 with the programme being strengthened as it continues to develop. The strengths of the programme are in: the selection processes; the quality, resilience and commitment of participants; the responsiveness of Teach First NZ and University of Auckland Faculty to all feedback and their ability to make changes and improvements as required; and the willingness of schools to embrace the programme. Responsiveness is in part due to the small size of the programme, but in no small part due to the quality and commitment of staff and the strong respectful partnership between Teach First NZ and the Faculty.

An important question for the programme and for this evaluation is whether Teach First NZ will deliver or produce effective teacher graduates. All principals, many co-ordinators and most mentors we interviewed in 2015 thought that Teach First NZ would “quite likely” or “very likely” produce quality teachers at the end of 2 years. However, this is dependent on maintaining the calibre of the participants, and the level of support from the Teach First NZ programme and within schools, particularly high quality mentoring afforded by the Ministry funded time allowance.

A minority of school personnel still think it is too early to say from the relatively small numbers so far, and expressed concern about attrition rates and the potential for participants to “burn out”.

It will be interesting to see the development of the alumni and the extent to which Teach First NZ can influence the status of teaching and continue to provide effective teachers for schools serving low socioeconomic communities. Having two cohorts of participants working as PCTs in a range of schools from 2016 is likely to raise the profile of the programme within the secondary school community. Participants are very strong ambassadors for the programme. Almost all participants are performing well, and have supported their students to engage with school and make progress. They intend to stay in teaching at least in the short-term.

Our interview with the Teach First NZ partnership personnel indicated that they were pleased with the pilot and the way they had been able to evolve and expand. They were also clearly looking ahead to new opportunities, including “being more rigorous about understanding what impact we are having in relation to student achievement.” Some ongoing issues remained to be resolved although these were not seen to be insurmountable.

2015 is seen by Teach First NZ to be different from previous years because:

- there is now alumni support in schools and across subjects
- schools are more aware of the programme—staff as a whole know what it means, the programme is more established
- there is deeper understanding of bi-cultural issues and a genuine desire to engage
- there have been small shifts in the status of teaching.

Teach First NZ have many ideas for enhancing the programme but recognise that this is not straightforward.
These are the challenges of being an innovative programme within a conservative legislatively bound environment. We have had to navigate constraints, for example, to add a subject we’d have to go through a whole approval process.

In September 2015 the Education Council conducted a panel review of the Teach First NZ programme and advised that they would be recommending ongoing approval of the programme on condition that participants continue to teach 0.6 FTE and mentors are funded at 0.2 FTE. Their points about the strengths of the programme (as summarised by Teach First NZ at a feedback session with the Education Council) are consistent with our evaluation findings and are as follows:

- Strong conceptual framework that permeates obviously throughout the programme
- Strong guidelines for in-school mentors
- Noho marae
- 0.2 mentor release time
- The quality of participants especially their commitment to excellence
- Selection process
- Independence of learners that the programme produces
- Multiple ways it delivers its curriculum
- Partnership with schools
- Equity in initiative regarding Tai Tokerau and providing for Māori and rural students
- University of Auckland and Teach First NZ partnership.

In October 2015 Teach First NZ co-hosted the Teach For All Global Conference in Auckland with 200 delegates from 40 countries. The conference theme/whakataukī was “Hoea ngātahitia ki kō atu/Paddling together takes us further together”. An international delegate described the impact of “ako” (something to give, something to learn) on his own learning. He embraced the idea of reciprocal teaching/learning captured so elegantly by “ako”. The whakataukī and the practice of ako are truly embedded in the Teach First NZ programme.
Appendix 1: Evaluation approach

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 sub-questions for both questions, which we used as a starting point to confirm the evaluation scope, focus, and design. These are shown in Table 8. Note that these sub-questions were not transferred verbatim into the evaluation plan, but were significant in guiding the approach agreed between NZCER and the Ministry.

Table 8 Ministry of Education indicative evaluation questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key evaluation questions</th>
<th>Indicative sub-questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. How well (effectively and efficiently) has the Teach First NZ pathway been implemented?</strong></td>
<td>To what extent does the programme attract and recruit high-quality applicants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How effective are the Teach First NZ recruitment and selection processes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent does the programme recruit participants who would otherwise be unlikely to enter teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do participants finish the programme? What are retention rates during the 2-year programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How well does the initial summer intensive prepare participants for working in schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent are teaching and coursework loads appropriately challenging for participants? Is it a good balance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How well does the Teach First NZ Trust support participants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How well implemented is the host school recruitment and selection process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How well implemented is the affiliate school recruitment and selection process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent does the programme deliver/produce effective teacher graduates?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what degree do participants support pastoral life within their host schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent does the leadership development strand support, build on, and extend the concept of effective classroom teaching as leadership of learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the programme’s contribution to improving the quality of teaching and learning outcomes in participating schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the value of participating in the programme for host schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent is the programme contributing to improving the status of teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What factors appear to be associated with successful and disappointing outcomes (e.g., enablers, barriers)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How engaged are graduates of the programme in Teach First NZ’s alumni programme?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent 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 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 is the implementation model, including the recruitment process?

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. The second evaluation question concerns impact. Tables 9 and 10 set out the evaluation criteria for each evaluation question.

---

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.
Table 9  Evaluation question 1, evaluation criteria and possible data sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key evaluation questions</th>
<th>Specific areas for investigation</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Possible data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well (effectively and efficiently) has the programme been implemented?</td>
<td>Who the programme attracts</td>
<td>Programme attracts high-calibre* participants, some of whom may not otherwise have undertaken teaching (particularly in schools serving lower decile communities) at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*High calibre as defined by Teach First NZ</td>
<td>Document analysis (i.e. candidate applications (with permission); candidate academic records; interviews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention rates</td>
<td>Retention rate for the 2 years is 90%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Programme records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Initial Intensive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Initial Intensive (SOAR) prepared participants well for their Summer Initial Intensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Initial Intensive (SII) strengthened participants’ motivation to teach in schools serving low income communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SII strengthened participants’ understandings of the cultures of their students and how to incorporate this understanding into their teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants felt well prepared to begin teaching</td>
<td>Data collected by providers during and after the intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intensive built a sense of “connectedness” within the cohort</td>
<td>Participant interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programme personnel interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme factors</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a common clear vision of effective teaching</td>
<td>Document analysis (for example, U of A programme resources and documents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vision permeates course work and practice in schools</td>
<td>Interviews with participants, programme and school personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong core curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of case methods and teacher research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants confront and rethink assumptions about learners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key evaluation questions</td>
<td>Specific areas for investigation</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria</td>
<td>Possible data sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants judge the course work to be intellectually challenging and practically relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to participants</td>
<td>Participants feel that their wellbeing has been important to Teach First NZ</td>
<td>Interviews with participants, Surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Teach First NZ</td>
<td>Participants feel that they are part of the Teach First NZ community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>Document analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support to participant from host school</td>
<td>Document analysis (participant, school staff records, minutes, resources etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Host schools are well prepared for, and supported in their roles</td>
<td>Document analysis (participant, school staff records, minutes, resources etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Host schools rate their preparation and support for their roles as high quality</td>
<td>Document analysis (participant, school staff records, minutes, resources etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Host schools feel well supported by the partnership</td>
<td>Document analysis (participant, school staff records, minutes, resources etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selection of affiliate schools</td>
<td>Document analysis</td>
<td>Document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affiliate schools provide useful learning experiences for participants</td>
<td>Document analysis (for example, programme resources and documents)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document analysis</td>
<td>Interviews with programme personnel, relevant staff in schools, participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to affiliate</td>
<td>Affiliate schools are aware of their responsibilities to the participants</td>
<td>Document analysis (for example, programme resources and documents)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools</td>
<td>Affiliate schools feel well supported by the partnership</td>
<td>Document analysis (for example, programme resources and documents)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The exchange is judged to be useful by the affiliate school</td>
<td>Document analysis (for example, programme resources and documents)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor teachers</td>
<td>Mentor teachers provide regular high-quality observation, mentoring and feedback to participants</td>
<td>Document analysis</td>
<td>Document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key evaluation questions</td>
<td>Specific areas for investigation</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria</td>
<td>Possible data sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentor teachers are well supported by the partnership</td>
<td>Mentors help participants to become part of the wider school community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit Curriculum Specialists (now called learning area specialists (LAS) and visiting teacher specialists (VTS))</td>
<td>LAS and VTS provide regular high-quality observation, mentoring, and feedback to participants</td>
<td>There are explicit links between the curriculum papers in the qualification and the feedback provided by the specialists in schools</td>
<td>Document analysis (for example, programme resources and documents; participant records)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme responsiveness</td>
<td>The programme has evidence of its responsiveness to feedback from participants and participating schools</td>
<td>Document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viability</td>
<td>The Teach First NZ model can successfully adjust to larger numbers of participants within agreed funding arrangements Host schools are able to support the programme when they self-fund participants’ salaries from 2014</td>
<td>Interviews with stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second high-level evaluation question calls for a summative focus. Table 10 sets out the evaluation criteria for evaluation question 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key evaluation questions</th>
<th>Specific areas for investigation</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Possible data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the Teach First NZ programme achieved its overall outcomes and objectives?</td>
<td>Effectiveness of participants’ teaching</td>
<td>High engagement of students, especially Māori and Pasifika Teaching aligns with Teach First NZ model</td>
<td>Student engagement surveys (Year 2 for each cohort) Student attendance data Document analysis (from mentor feedback to participants (from, for example, mentor teachers, visiting specialists) Classroom observations (not in budget, but highly desirable) Interviews with mentors, curriculum specialists, other teachers in same department as the participant and principals Student achievement data if appropriate and available Further exploration is required to determine the feasibility of using student achievement data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student achievement in classes taught by the participants is as good as or better than the achievement of other students in the same demographic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support by participants for pastoral life of school</td>
<td>Participants contribute positively to wider school activities</td>
<td>Interviews with school personnel Interviews with participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development Strand</td>
<td></td>
<td>In first year participants demonstrate effective leadership of students In second year participants successfully lead a professional practice project within the school From year three, participants build on the leadership experience of the first 2 years</td>
<td>Document analysis (feedback from lesson observations) Examination of the participants’ projects Interviews with Teach First NZ, school personnel Survey (end of Year 2 for each cohort) Alumni survey (2015, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing involvement and/or retention of participants</td>
<td>Alumni stay in teaching or wider education after the programme, or continue to contribute to reducing educational inequalities through other pathways Programme graduates can articulate their key learnings from the 2 years as they begin their</td>
<td>Retention data Survey of alumni (2015, 2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key evaluation questions</td>
<td>Specific areas for investigation</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria</td>
<td>Possible data sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programme has helped shaped their future</td>
<td>journey as alumni, and can describe how the 2-</td>
<td>Interviews with school personnel from participating schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme impact on quality of teaching and</td>
<td>participating schools</td>
<td>Survey of teachers from participating schools (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning in participating schools</td>
<td>Participating schools can describe how (if) the programme has contributed to improving the quality of teaching and learning in their schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of teaching</td>
<td>Growing numbers of high-calibre Māori, Pasifika and male applicants for the programme</td>
<td>Programme data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enablers and barriers to success</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant survey at end of 2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni engagement</td>
<td>Graduates continue to participate in alumni programme</td>
<td>Programme records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni surveys in 2015, 2016 (two cohorts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2:  *Me and My Class* item-level differences between Cohort 14 and Cohort 15

Students in Cohort 14 Year 9 classes were more likely than students in Cohort 15 Year 9 classes to strongly agree with the following items from *Me and My Class* (see Table 11).

Table 11  Larger differences between Cohort 14 and 15 Year 9 classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cohort 14 percentages (n = 71)</th>
<th>Cohort 15 percentages (n = 170)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students and the teacher respect and help each other</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher likes it when I ask questions and try out new things</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher encourages us to keep trying especially when we get stuck</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher encourages us to try new things, even if they feel a bit hard at first.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Year 10 data tells the opposite story although both sets of classes are less likely than Year 9 classes to choose “strongly agree” as their response. Note that student numbers are very different for each cohort: there are only 37 students from Cohort 14 and 205 from Cohort 15.

Students in Cohort 15 Year 10 classes were more likely than students in Cohort 14 Year 10 classes to strongly agree with the following items from *Me and My Class* (see Table 12).
### Table 12: Larger differences between Cohort 14 and 15 Year 10 classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cohort 14 percentages (n = 37)</th>
<th>Cohort 15 percentages (n = 205)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students and the teacher respect and help each other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher helps me understand how other people might be feeling or thinking</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We help each other to think about how to make our work better</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We talk about how we are learning and different ways of learning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher encourages us to keep trying especially when we get stuck</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We use our learning to design or make new things</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Cohort 14 survey questions

Participants: Survey questions phase 3 (Cohort 14)

This survey asks about you to reflect on your initial impressions and expectations of the Teach First programme and whether these have changed (as a result of your experiences) since beginning the programme.
Teach First C14 Participant 2015

About you

1. Your name

2. Name of your school

3. To what extent does the range of classes you are teaching this year challenge you to build on your teaching experience?
   - High extent
   - Some extent
   - No extent

Please briefly explain.
Teach First C14 Participant 2015

4. Are you intending to remain in teaching next year and beyond?
   - Yes – likely to remain next year and beyond
   - Yes – likely to remain just next year
   - No – not likely to stay in teaching

5. How important is becoming fully registered as a teacher to you?
   - Very important
   - Important
   - Not important

6. Briefly explain why this is, or isn't, important to you.
Teach First C14 Participant 2015

These questions ask you to reflect on your teaching now and on changes since...

7. How enjoyable / rewarding do you find teaching?
   - Very enjoyable / rewarding
   - Enjoyable / rewarding
   - Not enjoyable / rewarding

8. How well do you feel you are functioning as a teacher at this stage in your development?
   - Very well
   - Moderately well
   - Not very well

9. To what extent has your confidence as a teacher changed since last year?
   - Increased a lot
   - Increased somewhat
   - Stayed the same
   - Decreased

10. What are the main rewards you have found in the process of becoming a teacher?

11. What are the main challenges you have found in the process of becoming a teacher?

12. How effective do you feel you are as a teacher in terms of helping raise student achievement?
   - Very effective
   - Effective
   - Not effective

13. Are you pleased with the progress your students have made this year?
   - Very pleased
   - Moderately pleased
   - Not very pleased

14. How confident are you that you are culturally responsive to the Māori and Pasifika students in your classes?
   - Very confident
   - Confident
   - Not confident
15. What aspects of classroom teaching are the *most challenging*? Please tick all that apply:

- [ ] lesson planning
- [ ] classroom management
- [ ] pedagogical knowledge
- [ ] specialist subject knowledge
- [ ] relating to all students
- [ ] relating to colleagues
- [ ] administrative tasks
- [ ] other aspect (please specify)


16. What aspects of classroom teaching are the least challenging? Please tick all that apply

- lesson planning
- classroom management
- pedagogical knowledge
- specialist subject knowledge
- relating to all students
- relating to colleagues
- administrative tasks
- other aspect (please specify)
### Teach First C14 Participant 2015

#### About the Programme

17. **How useful (to your development as a teacher) do you find each of the following programme activities?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Not useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer school paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach First NZ subject meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits from Visiting Teacher Specialists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits from Learning Area Specialists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional inquiry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social events organised by Teach First NZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. **How well supported do you feel by the Teach First NZ / University of Auckland partnership team this year?**

- Very supported
- Supported
- Not supported

19. **How well supported do you feel by the Learning Area Curriculum Specialist this year?**

- Very supported
- Supported
- Not supported

20. **How well supported do you feel by the Visiting Teaching Specialist this year?**

- Very supported
- Supported
- Not supported

21. **How connected do you feel with other Teach First NZ participants?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Very connected</th>
<th>Connected</th>
<th>Not connected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In your cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the 2013 cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the 2015 cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. How challenging is your teaching workload this year?
   - Too challenging
   - About right
   - Not challenging enough

23. How does your teaching workload compare with last year?
   - Greater
   - About the same
   - Reduced

24. Do you have any additional comments about your teaching workload and how this has changed, if at all?

25. How challenging is your course workload this year?
   - Too challenging
   - About right
   - Not challenging enough

26. How does your course workload compare with last year?
   - Greater
   - About the same
   - Reduced

27. Do you have any additional comments about your course workload and how this has changed, if at all?

28. To what extent is your course work useful this year?
   - High extent
   - Some extent
   - No extent

29. How does your course work compare with last year?
   - More useful
   - About the same
   - Less useful

30. Do you have any additional comments about your course work and how this has changed, if at all?
Teach First C14 Participant 2015

31. What impact do you think you have had on how other people perceive teaching as a profession?
   - Very positive impact
   - Somewhat positive impact
   - No impact
   - Somewhat negative impact
   - Very negative impact

32. How important is belonging to the Teach First NZ alumni community to you?
   - Very important
   - Important
   - Not important

33. How important is belonging to the Teach for All global community to you?
   - Very important
   - Important
   - Not important

34. How has the programme responded to your feedback over time and have any changes been made?

35. Are there any changes that would improve your experience of the programme now (at this 2nd year stage) and are there any changes that you think would improve the programme for future participants?
### Teach First C14 Participant 2015

#### About your school and community

36. To what extent do you feel part of the school community?
- [ ] Fully accepted as a staff member
- [ ] Treated somewhat differently to regular staff
- [ ] Not at all

37. How helpful do you find different aspects of your mentor's support?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Not helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on lesson planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback after classroom observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets me to observe their lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets me to observe other teachers' lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on classroom management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist subject knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other aspect (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. How helpful have you found support from staff other than your mentor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Not helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on lesson planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback after classroom observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets me to observe mentor's lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets me to observe other teachers' lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on classroom management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist subject knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other aspect (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
39. What other aspects of school life outside classroom teaching are you involved with this year?

- Sports coaching
- EOTC
- Kapa haka
- Cultural events / groups
- Arts / drama
- Homework centre
- Revision or NCEA / scholarship classes
- Other aspect (please specify)

40. How has this involvement impacted on your teaching?

41. To what extent have you been able to take on leadership roles within the school this year?

- High extent
- Some extent
- No extent

42. What has enabled your contribution to leadership?
Teach First C14 Participant 2015

General

43. In your view, what impact has Teach First NZ had on the perceived status of teaching as a competitive profession attracting top graduates and talented individuals?

- Very positive impact
- Somewhat positive
- No impact
- Somewhat negative
- Very negative impact

Do you have any comment on this?

44. Is there anything else you would like to comment on about your experience of the Teach First programme in general?

Thanks very much for your time.
Host school mentors: Survey questions phase 3 (Cohort 14)

Teach First C14 Mentor 2015

This survey asks you about your role as a mentor for a Teach First participant and about your observations of how the participant is functioning within the programme and the school.

If you are mentoring more than one participant, please fill in a different survey for each participant.

Please leave blank any questions that do not apply.
**Teach First C14 Mentor 2015**

**About you and your mentor role**

1. Your name

2. Name of your school

3. Name of participant you are mentoring

4. Were you the mentor for this participant last year?
   - Yes
   - No

5. Are you and the participant in the same department / subject area as each other?
   - Yes
   - No
6. How often do you observe the participant’s lessons this year (2015)?
- Once a week
- Once every two weeks
- Once a month
- Twice a term

7. How well do you feel you are able to support the participant?
- Very well
- Moderately well
- Not very well

8. What are the main challenges for you in supporting the participant this year?

9. How are these different from the challenges of the previous year, if at all?

10. Do you have any other comments you’d like to make about your role as a mentor?
11. To what extent do you think the participant’s confidence as a teacher has increased since 2014?

- High extent
- Some extent
- No extent
- Not applicable

12. What aspect(s) of classroom teaching does the participant find most challenging?

Please tick all that apply

- Lesson planning
- Classroom management
- Pedagogical knowledge
- Specialist subject knowledge
- Relating to all students
- Relating to colleagues
- Administrative tasks
- Other aspect (please specify)

13. How effective is the participant as a teacher in terms of helping raise student achievement?

- Very effective
- Effective
- Not effective

14. How confident are you that they are culturally responsive to the Māori and Pasifika students in their classes?

- Very confident
- Confident
- Not confident
15. To what extent has the participant been able to show leadership within the school this year?

- High extent
- Some extent
- No extent

16. What do you think has enabled their contribution to leadership?


17. In your view, how challenging is the participant’s *teaching* workload this year?

- Too challenging
- About right
- Not challenging enough

18. How does this *teaching* workload compare with last year?

- Greater
- About the same
- Reduced

19. In your view, how challenging is the participant’s *course* workload this year?

- Too challenging
- About right
- Not challenging enough

20. How does this *course* workload compare with last year?

- Greater
- About the same
- Reduced
Teach First C14 Mentor 2015

About your role in the programme

21. How well supported do you feel by the Teach First NZ / University of Auckland partnership team this year?
   - Very supported
   - Supported
   - Not supported

22. Are you happy with the amount of mentor PLD you have had from Teach First NZ / University of Auckland partnership this year?
   - Very happy
   - Happy
   - Not happy

23. Are you happy with the nature of mentor PLD you have had from Teach First NZ / University of Auckland partnership this year?
   - Very happy
   - Happy
   - Not happy

24. Briefly describe any changes you are aware of that have been made to the Teach First NZ programme (since last year) as a result of feedback from participants or school staff, if any.
25. Are there any changes that would improve your experience as a mentor?

26. What have you learned (if anything) that has contributed to your own development as a teacher / school leader?

27. Would you be a mentor again?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Not sure
   - Why or why not?
28. How well do you feel your role as a Teach First NZ mentor is valued in the school by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly valued</th>
<th>Valued</th>
<th>Not valued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior management?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other teachers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme participants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Do you have any other comments you'd like to make about the school's role in the Teach First programme?
Teach First C14 Mentor 2015

General

30. In your view, what impact has Teach First NZ had on the status of teaching as a competitive profession attracting top graduates and talented individuals?

- Very positive impact
- Somewhat positive
- No impact
- Somewhat negative
- Very negative impact

Do you have any comment on this?


31. Is there anything else you would like to comment on about your experience of the Teach First programme in general?


Thanks very much for your time.
Host school co-ordinators: Survey questions phase 3 (Cohort 14)

Teach First C14 Coordinator 2015

This survey asks you about your role as a Coordinator for the Teach First NZ programme and the school. The survey relates to Cohort 14 participants. Please leave blank any questions that do not apply.

The questions we asked you during the site visits related to Cohort 15 participants.
1. Your name

2. Name of your school

3. Number of 2014 participants
   - 0
   - 1
   - 2

4. Number of 2015 participants
   - 0
   - 1
   - 2

5. If the answer to Q4 is '0', please give reasons for why there are no participants this year.


Teach First C14 Coordinator 2015

About the participants

6. To what extent do you think the participants’ confidence as teachers has increased since 2014?
   - High extent
   - Some extent
   - No extent
   - Not applicable

7. What evidence suggests this?

8. How much impact do you think the participants have made in the school?
   - High impact
   - Some impact
   - No impact

Do you have any comment on this?

9. To what extent have the participants been able to show leadership within the school this year?
   - More than last year
   - Same as last year
   - Less than last year

10. In what ways do you think these participants differ from other beginning teachers, if at all?

Teach First C14 Coordinator 2015

About your role in the programme

11. How well are you supported by the Teach First NZ / University of Auckland partnership team this year?
   - Very supported
   - Supported
   - Not supported

12. Has this changed since last year?
   - More support
   - About the same
   - Less support

13. Briefly describe any changes you are aware of that have been made to the Teach First NZ programme (since last year) as a result of feedback from participants or school staff, if any.
### Teach First C14 Coordinator 2015

#### About your school

14. How well do you feel your role as a coordinator is valued in the school by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly valued</th>
<th>Valued</th>
<th>Not valued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior management?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other teachers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor(s)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Do you have any other comments you’d like to make about the school’s role in the Teach First programme?

[Blank space for comments]
16. In your view, what impact has Teach First NZ had on the status of teaching as a competitive profession attracting top graduates and talented individuals?

- Very positive impact
- Somewhat positive
- No impact
- Somewhat negative
- Very negative impact

Do you have any comment on this?

17. Is there anything else you would like to comment on about your experience of the Teach First programme in general?

Thanks very much for your time.
Appendix 4: Cohort 15 interview questions

Participants: Interview questions phase 3 (Cohort 15)

1.0 Recruitment

1.1 What was your degree and what teaching subject areas did you study in your TFNZ programme?
   1.1.1 Degree: undergraduate postgraduate (Masters) postgraduate (PhD)
   1.1.2 Teaching subjects in Post Grad Diploma of Teaching

1.2 How did you hear about Teach First NZ?
   1.2.1 Print advertisement
   1.2.2 Other media (specify)
   1.2.3 Seminar/presentation by Teach First NZ
   1.2.4 From others/word of mouth (specify e.g. friends, family, university lecturer)
   1.2.5 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 “mission” of Teach First NZ (low decile, disparities in Māori/Pasifika achievement, opportunity to ‘make a difference’)
   1.3.3 The financial incentive (being paid a salary/no fees)
   1.3.4 Good reputation (compared to the traditional pathways to becoming a teacher)
   1.3.5 Liked being part of a new approach to becoming a teacher (specify)
   1.3.6 Leadership development opportunities?
   1.3.7 Postgrad level study opportunities?

1.4 Would you have applied to other teacher training at this point in time were it not for Teach First NZ?
   1.4.1 Yes
   1.4.2 No

1.5 What would you have done if you had not been accepted for this programme?
   1.5.1 Applied for the traditional pathway to becoming a teacher
   1.5.2 Further university study
   1.5.3 Travel
   1.5.4 Another job
   1.5.5 Other (specify)

2.0 Programme factors
2.1 How well do you think the Summer intensive prepared you to begin teaching? Are there any areas where you needed more preparation? (What are they?) In what areas did you feel well-prepared?

2.2 Are there any areas where the ongoing coursework/taught programme could be improved? (What are they?)

2.3 What are the strengths and weaknesses of the programme? (possible probes: responsiveness to feedback, vision, core aspects, teaching and learning approaches, amount of challenge, relevance of assignments, timing)

2.4 To what extent do the LAS and the VTS help you to develop your expertise as a teacher? In what ways? (Ask them to be as specific as possible, giving examples)

2.5 To what extent do you feel part of the Teach First community? (Check: with participants in the cohort, with participants/alumni from other cohorts and others involved in NZ/with the global Teach First community)

2.6 How important is this connection to you? (And why?)

3.0 Your host school

3.1 What classes are you teaching? (subjects and levels)

3.2 How do you think the school community responded to you and the other Teach First NZ participant?

4.0 Teaching and involvement

4.1 What were the main challenges for you in your first term of teaching?

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

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

4.4 How do you think your students are doing? How do you know?

4.5 How do you and your mentor work together?

4.6 What are the most useful aspects of your mentor’s support?

4.7 Are there any ways in which your relationship or the way you work with your mentor could be strengthened or improved?

5.0 General

5.1 What is your overall perception of the Teach First NZ pilot programme so far?

5.2 Do you expect to complete the 2 year programme?

5.3 Do you expect to stay in teaching after the two years?

5.3.1 If YES, for how long?

5.3.2 If NO what are the reasons for leaving?

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

Host school mentors: Interview questions phase 3 (Cohort 15)

1.0 Background

1.1 How did you get to be a mentor for this programme? (for new mentors)
1.2 What did you see yourself gaining from being a mentor? (Are you able to use/adapt mentoring approaches in other things that you do?) (for new mentors)

2.0 Participants’ placement and support

2.1 Are you and the participant you mentor in the same subject area? How is this working for you?
2.2 How effective was the liaison between the programme personnel at Teach First NZ and you in terms of your respective roles and expectations e.g. visiting teacher specialists?
2.3 What were the most useful aspects of university PLD meetings for mentors (mentor training)? (Any ways this could be improved or strengthened?)
2.4 What is your view of Teach First NZ’s approach to mentoring of participants? Are you finding that you are able to use the learning you have had from Teach First NZ in your work with your participant?
2.5 How supportive is the school of your role as mentor? (Any ways this could be improved or strengthened?)

3.0 The mentor role

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 observe the participant teaching in the classroom? What is your approach to doing observations (regular/formal/focus or informal)?
3.3 Have you been able to model your teaching approach to your participant? How often?
3.4 Has the participant been able to observe other teachers teaching?
3.5 Other than classroom teaching, in what other aspects or areas of teachers’ work have you been able to help your participant? (e.g., school policies/procedures, parent and whānau relationships, etc.)

4.0 Participant teaching and impact

4.1 How have students responded to the participant/s so far?
4.2 Have the participant/s had a noticeable impact in any way that you’re aware of? (Prompt: student engagement & achievement; other teachers in the school; activities outside the classroom)
5.0 General

5.1 What is your overall perception (so far) of the Teach First NZ initiative? Have there been any barriers to effective participation in the programme? (Summing up the positives/negatives)

5.2 From what you have seen so far, how likely is it (in your view) that the Teach First NZ model will produce quality teachers at the end of 2 years?

5.3 Is there anything else you can tell me about your experience to date?
Host school co-ordinators: Interview questions phase 3 (Cohort 15)

1.0 School involvement

1.1 Why did your school become involved in the Teach First NZ approach to teacher preparation? (*not required for previously interviewed co-ordinators)

1.2 What appear to be the particular strengths of this way of preparing teachers? (*not required for previously interviewed co-ordinators)

1.3 In your view are there any particular weaknesses and/or challenges to this way of preparing teachers? (*not required for previously interviewed co-ordinators)

1.4 How well prepared do you think you were for your role as co-ordinator? (How could your preparation be strengthened?) (*not required for previously interviewed co-ordinators)

1.5 (ask all) How well supported do you feel by the Teach First NZ / University of Auckland partnership team this year? (response options from survey – very supported, supported, not supported)

2.0 Participant placement

2.1 How did you select mentors for participants?

2.2 How effective was the liaison between the programme and the school in terms of your respective roles and expectations? (Or what sorts of change have there been – if previously interviewed)

3.0 Participant teaching and involvement

1.1. What information do you have about how well the participants are teaching? (Probe for sources of this information. Has the co-ordinator observed any participants teaching?)

1.2. Have the participants had a noticeable impact in any way that you’re aware of? ) Prompts: student engagement and achievement; other teachers in the school; the school culture; activities outside the classroom)

1.3. How have students responded to the participants so far?

1.4. From what you have seen so far, how likely do you think it is that the Teach First NZ model will produce quality teachers at the end of 2 years?

4.0 General (*asking for an update for those previously interviewed)

1.5. What is your overall perception (so far) of the Teach First NZ initiative? Have there been any barriers to effective participation in the programme? (Summing up the positives/negatives)

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

1.7. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your experience to date?

Host school principals: interview questions phase 3 (schools new to the programme only)

1.0 School involvement
1.1 Why did you choose to involve your school in Teach First NZ approach to teacher preparation?

1.2 What appear to be the particular strengths of this way of preparing teachers?

1.3 In your view are there any particular weaknesses and/or challenges to this way of preparing teachers?

1.4 Do you think Teach First NZ participants are different from other beginning teachers? In what ways?

1.5 In your view, from what you have seen so far, how likely is it that the Teach First NZ model will produce quality teachers at the end of 2 years?

2.0 General

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

2.2 In your view, what has the school gained from its participation in the programme?

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

2.4 From what you have experienced so far, do you intend to continue a relationship with the Teach First NZ programme in the future?

2.5 Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your experience to date?
Teach First NZ partnership staff: Interview questions phase 3

1. What is your overall perception (so far) of the Teach First NZ programme in 2015? Is this different from 2013 and 2014? If yes, in what ways?

2. What are the main changes you have made to the programme between 2014 and 2015?

3. What do you see the schools as having gained from participation in the programme? Is it different for 2013 and 2014 schools?

4. What do you see the participants as having gained from participation in the programme? Was it different for 2013 and 2014 participants?

5. What are the strengths of the Teach First NZ approach? Have you changed your perceptions of these strengths over time?

6. In what ways might the programme be strengthened?

7. Are there things you will change (or would like to change) for 2016?

8. What have been the main challenges for you in 2015?

9. What have the highlights been for you in 2015?

10. Is there anything else you want to tell me about your experience to date?
Appendix 5: 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
   - Slightly disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly agree
   - Strongly agree

2. I am always on time and organised.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Slightly disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly agree
   - Strongly agree

3. I’m really interested in what we learn.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Slightly disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly agree
   - Strongly agree

4. I have surprised myself with what I can achieve.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Slightly disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly agree
   - Strongly agree

5. I always want to go to this class.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Slightly disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly agree
   - Strongly agree

6. I learn things I can use outside of school.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Slightly disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly agree
   - Strongly agree

7. My culture is respected and valued.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Slightly disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly agree
   - Strongly agree

8. I want to tell other people about what I’m learning in this class.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Slightly disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly agree
   - Strongly agree

9. I have fun.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Slightly disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly agree
   - Strongly agree

10. I work well with others.
    - Strongly disagree
    - Slightly disagree
    - Neutral
    - Slightly agree
    - Strongly agree

Me and My Class

About Me

Gender:
- Male
- Female

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

Ethnic group:
- NZ
- European
- Maori
- 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
   - Slightly disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly agree
   - 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
   - Slightly disagree
   - Neutral
   - Slightly agree
   - Strongly agree

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

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.
# 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Students and the teacher respect and help each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I can make mistakes and learn from them without getting told off.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The teacher uses my ideas and things I know about to help me learn new things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My teacher helps me understand how other people might be feeling or thinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My teacher likes it when I ask questions and try out new things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>We work with people from outside school (like students from other schools, scientists, writers, etc).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>We help each other to think about how to make our work better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>We talk about how we are learning and different ways of learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>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).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>We learn good ways to co-operate while we learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I get to explain my thinking – how I worked something out.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My teacher encourages us to keep trying, especially when we get stuck.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>My teacher encourages us to try new things, even if they feel a bit hard at first.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We learn how things like words, pictures, symbols, sounds and movements can show the same ideas in different ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>We work on real life projects that make our school or community a better place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I get to do things that are about my family and culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>We are allowed to disagree with others, and to change our minds if someone has a better idea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>We learn about things that are important to different cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>We learn ways to work out problems or challenges together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>We use our learning to design or make new things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>We think about how our new learning changes what we already know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>We learn good ways to say what we are thinking in different situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>We learn that things we read or see can have more than one meaning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>We talk about how we could use our learning in new situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>We work with people from outside school (like students from other schools, scientists, writers, etc).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>