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# 1. The research proposal as approved

## The research focus

The title of the project, as approved by ESCalate, was ‘Investigating good practices in the induction of teacher educators into Higher Education’. The project was designed to be investigative in nature, and to draw on a wide range of knowledge and expertise about induction practices within teacher education and the Higher Education (HE) sector.

The rationale for the research was that new teacher educators are an under-researched and poorly understood occupational group whose induction needs have not been fully explored. Recent developments, including initiatives by the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) and the Higher Education Academy (HEA), have recognised the need for further research into induction policies and practices. The project was therefore designed to link previous research and some of these on-going initiatives.

## The aims of the study

The project aimed to investigate what might constitute good practice in the induction of teacher educators new to HE-based Initial Teacher Education (ITE) or pre-service work. This included the aim to produce for ESCalate an up to date account of current practices in the induction of new teacher educators.

The objectives of the study were:

* to collect, analyse and collate examples of the practices used by a representative sample of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in inducting initial teacher educators into HE work.
* to identify and analyse the induction needs of initial teacher educators from the perspectives of professional educators new to this type of HE work.
* to analyse the effectiveness of existing induction practices and procedures by identifying the induction experiences of teacher educators in the early stages of their careers in HE-based ITE.
* to identify and collate previous research findings on induction practices for teacher educators.
* to draw on the findings of the various aspects of this project to establish guidelines for good practices in teacher educator induction.

## Methodology

The methodology was designed to include three perspectives on the research question through three inter-related elements. These were

1. An analysis of relevant research, providing evidence of existing approaches to induction, and where possible an evaluation of their effectiveness. This element of the study was a literature review.
2. An analysis of current HEI practices and principles for induction. This element of the research design aimed to provide evidence of existing support structures across the HE sector. The planned research method was to send questionnaires to a representative sample of 20 old (pre-1992) and new (post-1992) universities and Colleges of Higher Education (CHEs) involved in ITE work.
3. An analysis of new teacher educators’ (NTEs) perspectives of their induction needs and experiences. This element aimed to provide evidence of needs from practitioners’ perspectives, and some opportunities to evaluate the effectiveness of current approaches. The planned research method for this element was to send questionnaires to a sample of 30 new teacher educators working at a range of different types of HEIs. Follow up interviews with 10 teacher educators from this sample were designed to enable issues arising to be pursued in more depth. These interviews were also designed to enable the teacher educators themselves to identify induction practices and principles which they felt were effective.

# Work undertaken

## Research design as implemented

### 2.2.1 Amendments to the original design and negotiating access

Element 1 of the methodology was carried out exactly as planned. Changes were made to both elements 2 and 3 of the original design, but as the account below describes, these resulted overall in a stronger and more informative study.

Two unforeseen factors meant that it was possible to send the questionnaire relating to induction provision (element 2) to a much wider sample of HEIs than originally planned. These factors were firstly, the provision of an email list by the University Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET) which enabled me to contact the Heads of Department (HoDs) of all HEIs in England involved in ITE provision, and secondly, the creation of an on-line questionnaire (see Appendix 1).

These changes to element 2 of the research design meant that it was possible to create a purposive sample of NTEs for aspect 3 of the methodology. The data from element 2 was analysed to indicate the key issues arising and these issues were then used to determine which NTEs should be sent the individual questionnaires. An example of this approach is that element 2 of the study showed that only a small number of HEIs required new recruits with QTS for the school sector to complete a Post Graduate Certificate in Higher Education (PGCE in HE). This was identified as one of the key issues in terms of institutional provision, and therefore individual NTEs within one of these HEIs were sent a questionnaire to explore how useful they found the PGCE HE course in supporting their learning during induction. Contact with the NTEs was made through the HoD in the majority of cases (n=20). In all 30 on-line questionnaires were sent out to individual teacher educators, together with a letter explaining the research (see Appendix 2). The costs planned for in the original bid allowed only four individual and two focus group interviews – each with three NTEs – to take place. The interview schedule is included in Appendix 2.

There was one unexpected addition to the research design. This was the inclusion of an NTE at Brunel University, as a researcher on the project. Drawing on Brunel University funding, this NTE used the framework for aspect 3 of the original research design to send out questionnaires to a subject-specific group of NTEs in Physical Education (PE). She then selected a sample of this group to interview about their subject specific needs in making the transition from teaching PE in secondary schools to teaching on secondary Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) and Under-graduate (UG) PE programmes in HE. This additional aspect of the study, because it is not strictly part of the ESCalate project, will be reported separately once the research is completed in summer 2005.

2.1.2 The questionnaire and interview structures and data analysis

The electronic questionnaires sent to the HoDs were intended to give a brief overview of the probationary requirements set for NTEs, and the provision designed to support induction at university and departmental levels. After each set of questions, there was an opportunity for HoDs to add their comments. The questionnaire was piloted and re-designed with the help of a senior academic and ex-HoD from a new university.

Questionnaires were also sent out by email to individual NTEs who had been working in HEIs for two years or less. These questionnaires were also electronic. They requested some biographical details about previous time in the school sector and current work in HE. The main focuses of the questionnaire were threefold: the probationary requirements the NTEs had been asked to meet; the provision at university level, including long courses such as the PGCE in HE; and the departmental provision for induction into HE. In the latter two sections, individuals were asked to use a Lickert scale to indicate which types of provision they had found most useful in supporting their development. They were also asked to complete comment boxes explaining their answers.

As the interview schedule included in Appendix 2 indicates, the interviews with teacher educators were both planned to have the following characteristics (adapted from Glesne and Peshkin, 1992). They were semi-structured, based on a pre-set but not rigidly ordered schedule of questions, and developed from the literature review. Within this semi-structured format, the schedules were as open as possible, allowing me to pursue any unexpected responses, to follow each interviewee's train of thought, and to probe responses. With the permission of the interviewees, the interviews were taped and the resulting data transcribed. The transcript data was analysed drawing on a systematic coding system, developed in a previous study of teacher educators (see Murray 2002).

## Overview of research into teacher educator induction

2.2.1 Teacher educators as academics

Teacher educators teaching on ITE courses in English HEIs are nearly always qualified school teachers, with considerable experience of teaching and of middle or senior management in the school sector. Entering HE they bring with them a wealth of professional knowledge and expertise accrued in and through school teaching. In the English teacher education system this is often the main reason for their recruitment, and it is frequently a major source of professional credibility during their early years in the university sector (Maguire 1994). In making the career transition to HE they encounter the practices, norms and expectations of academic work, as instantiated in the settings of the teacher education departments of their universities or Colleges of Higher Education (CHEs).

Most new academics enter HE with very high levels of knowledge in their subjects or disciplines – typically gained through study for a PhD - but no experience of teaching. In contrast, NTEs are a unique type of academic for two reasons: firstly, they enter HE with high levels of teaching expertise, albeit expertise gained in a different sector of education; secondly; they often enter HE without doctoral level qualifications in education, or other sustained experience of research and publication processes.

### 2.2.2 Induction support: making the transition from school to HE

Previous studies of new teacher educators in a number of anglophone countries (see Acker 1996; Ducharme 1993; Sinkinson 1997; Hatt 1997; Nicol 1997) have identified that, while the transition between school teaching and HE work may look like a small shift of occupation and setting to the casual observer of education, individuals often experience the change as challenging and stressful. Many teacher educators have difficulties in adjusting to the academic expectations of HE-based teacher education work (see Ducharme 1993). Uncertainty about the exact nature of their new professional roles (see Wilson 1990), finding it difficult to adjust to the pedagogical skills needed to work with adult learners (see Kremer-Hayon and Zuzovsky 1995; DES 1987), and concerns about the adequacy of their professional and academic knowledge bases necessary for HE work (see Kremer-Hayon and Zuzovsky 1995) have all been identified as areas of tension in previous studies.

In a previous study of teacher educator professionalism (see Murray 2002) all teacher educators with less than three years experience of HE work were found to have similar professional biographies and attributes; these teacher educators were defined as Novices in a typology of teacher educators. This type of tutor constructed a model of professionalism termed *practitioner bond professionalism* in which the experience of school teaching was central. For these teacher educators, professional credibility centred on their identities as ex-school teachers, and they had strong senses of responsibility and commitment to the school sector. Teaching was seen as at the centre of their HE work, with all teacher educators undertaking extended teaching roles, and expressing strong commitment to their students’ development. These new teacher educators had limited engagement in research during their first years in HE, and had ambivalent or negative attitudes to future research activity.

Previous research on NTE induction in England over a period of forty years has identified that HE induction structures for this group of academics have often been very limited (see Taylor 1969; DES 1987; Maguire 1994; Sinkinson 1997). One of the issues identified by these sources is the assumption that knowledge and understanding of teaching acquired in the school sector can be ‘transferred’ to HE with few problems. Some studies have identified that generic institutional induction structures for new academics need to be more consistent, and tailored to the specific needs of teacher education (see, for example, Wilson 1990; Sinkinson 1997).

This inadequacy of induction procedures may be seen as part of the overall devaluation of pedagogical skills in British HE until the publication of the Dearing Report in 1997 (see NCIHE 1997). This report identified the need for more focus on pedagogy across the whole of the HE sector, including better induction procedures for new academics. Since this date, induction provision has become more extensive, often requiring the completion of a PGCE in HE, and with probationary requirements and structures specified through Human Resources and / or Staff Development units.

Recent developments by the Higher Education Academy (HEA) to support academic induction, particularly subject-specific induction, have included the creation of web-based resources by each Learning and Teaching Support Network (the Support for New Academics or SNAS database). For teacher education, extensive SNAS resources are not available at the time of writing.

Initiatives by the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) have recognised the need for further research into existing policies and practices and the development of more extensive support materials for induction. These initiatives have included the commissioning of a national symposium on new teacher educators’ needs (see Murray 2003) and of web-based resources with a strong focus on the subjects of the school curriculum and the needs of ITE tutors preparing students for secondary school teaching. These resources are designed to support NTEs working in schools as mentors, in SCITTs (School Centred Initial Teacher Training) and DRBs (Designated Recommending Bodies for Graduate Teacher Training) as well as in HEIs. These materials have considerable potential value, but do not include focuses on some of the specific needs of HE-based NTEs.

## Findings of the project: perspectives from the Heads of Department

### 2.3.1 Institutional response patterns

The questionnaire relating to induction provision was sent electronically to the heads of departments of all English HEIs offering ITE courses for the school sector in the academic year 2003/2004 (n=75). The overall response rate was 47% (n=35). The response rate, as differentiated by institutional type, is shown in table 1.

**Table 1: Response rate differentiated by institutional type**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Institutional type  | Number of responses | % of responses from each institutional type |
| Old (pre-1992) university  | 12 | 35 |
| New (post-1992) university  | 13 | 37 |
| College of Higher Education (CHE) | 10 | 28 |

### 2.3.2 Probationary requirements

All except one of the HoDs stated that their HEI set probationary requirements, and monitored the progression of NTEs towards meeting these over a probationary period, typically two or three years in length. Monitoring generally took place through regular appraisal meetings (between one and three times over an academic year) with a mentor and / or a member of the senior management team in the department. Most responses emphasised that such requirements were part of their institutional Staff Development or Human Resources structures and procedures.

There were distinct differences, related to institutional type, in the probationary requirements which the NTEs were required to meet. New universities and CHEs set broadly similar probationary requirements for all NTEs, whilst the requirements set in old universities followed different patterns.

All the HoDs from new universities and CHEs mentioned evidence of satisfactory teaching ability as a specific requirement for passing probation. Six new universities and five CHEs stressed the importance of this criterion above all others. One HoD in a CHE, for example, stated ‘We would expect them (the new TEs) to demonstrate outstanding teaching ability appropriate to working in higher education.’ For seven of these HEIs teaching ability was the only probationary criterion mentioned.

Some new universities and CHEs also stressed satisfactory ‘performance’ in wider aspects of NTE work. One HoD in a new university stated, for example, ‘Quality of engagement in school placements would also be considered’; whilst three HoDs from CHEs emphasised that they would expect the new TE to show a ‘reasonable level of professionality in all aspects of their work’, to ‘take on a fair share of academic administration’ or more broadly ‘to show evidence of being a good colleague’. Only three new universities clearly stated that probationary requirements would include evidence of engagement in research, although two others said that this might be set as a requirement if it was thought appropriate for a particular candidate at interview.

Six HoDs in old universities reported differentiated requirements for probation depending on whether the NTE was appointed on a Teaching Only (Teaching Tutor) contract or on a full Lecturer A or B contract. The requirements for those on Teaching Only contracts in these six universities predictably focused on teaching and service to the department. Requirements for Lecturer A and B contracts across all 12 of these institutions mentioned teaching but also stressed the importance of evidence of research engagement, gaining a higher degree, often at doctoral level (n=5) and evidence of application for a research grant (n=3). Part of this emphasis on research was clearly driven by preparations to meet the requirements of the RAE of 2008. One HoD at a prestigious old university stated ‘Evidence of research in the form of publications meeting the RAE criteria, is of great importance for probationers here’. Only one HoD at an old university explicitly mentioned broader professional attributes saying, ‘We would expect the new recruit to be able to relate well to team members and to become fully involved in all aspects of departmental activity.’

The most exacting probationary requirements were found at a ‘research-aspirant’ old university where a number of NTEs were asked to provide evidence of meeting all of the following probationary requirements within three years:

* Good teaching ability in HE
* Completion of a doctorate
* Research engagement in the form of three publications in academic journals
* Application for external research funding
* Satisfactory progress in all other aspects of work

2.3.3. Institutional level provision

The HoDs were asked to describe the induction provision at central university (institutional) level which was used to support NTEs. This provision included PGCE in HE courses, short induction or orientation to the university courses, other university level induction courses and provision of a mentor from outside the education department.

As discussed earlier in this report, it is now the norm for new academics to undertake a PGCE in HE. But the findings of this research show that only 8 HEIs (4 CHEs, 3 new universities and 1 old university) made participating in such a course a ‘recommended’ or ‘required’ part of induction for NTEs. Most NTEs in this study were exempted from the PGCE in HE on the grounds that they already held qualifications as school teachers. This is despite the fact that they may not have prior experience of teaching at HE level. One HoD at a new university, commenting on this issue, said,

The PGCE Higher Ed. is optional for those with QTS. Some people choose to follow it (there’s a day a week deducted from timetables) but the majority of our new entrants feel well enough supported by the team they are placed in. This dispensation only applied *(sic)* to the Faculty of Education

A HoD at an old university commented,

All new entrants have QTS so whilst the option of the PGCE HE is there; no one has actually done it. QTS is seen as sufficient.

Some HoDs indicated that additional factors here included the ‘cost’ to the departments of paying the central university for the courses and providing cover for the necessary release time.

All but two HEIs provided some kind of short induction course, usually an orientation and information giving session about institutionally specific procedures, conventions and regulations, taking place in the first few weeks of appointment. Ten HEIs stated that NTEs could also ‘opt in’, according to individual need or choice to the general Staff Development programmes provided by the central university, as an additional form of induction support.

Only two small CHEs reported NTEs being given mentors from outside the education department to support their progress. In all other HEIs mentoring was provided from within the departments. Three of the HoDs from CHEs commented on the difficulty of ensuring systematic induction provision at the institutional level in small CHEs where there was limited, central funding and personnel available.

2.3.4 Departmental provision

The HoDs’ responses indicated that the majority of induction provision occurred within the education departments, often at the micro level of the subject, course or age phase team. The exact setting for induction depended on the way each department was organised and the types of ITE courses it was running. For example, in one HEI all induction for NTEs working on secondary PGCE programmes came from within their subject groups, whilst for primary NTEs it came from age-range related communities (early years, Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2).

Almost all of the HoDs’ responses (n=32) stressed workplace learning within the NTEs’ immediate teams or ‘communities’ of practice, as being of most value. Supporting learning for the NTE was seen as a communal enterprise, and as part of the on-going professional and collaborative development of these communities.

The HoDs were asked to indicate which of the named types of induction activities they routinely provided, to supplement the list by indicating any additional provision, and to add any comments they wished to make. The patterns of provision shown in table 2 were found across all three types of institution, with no marked differentiations by institutional type.

**Table 2: Induction provision at departmental level**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of induction activity** | **Number of HEIs offering induction activity** | **Percentage of HEIs offering induction activity** |
| Monitoring of NTEs progress through target setting and appraisal | 34 | 97% |
| Induction for NTE into academic administration (course procedures, quality assurance etc.) | 33 | 94% |
| Provision of mentor(s) for NTE | 30 | 86% |
| Observation of teaching of NTE | 27 | 77% |
| Opportunities for NTE to assess written work with experienced colleague | 26 | 74% |
| Opportunities for NTE to participate in team planning  | 24 | 68% |
| Opportunities for joint supervision and assessment of students on school placements  | 19 | 54% |
| Opportunities for NTE to observe experienced colleague teaching | 10 | 28% |
| Opportunities for NTE to participate in team teaching  | 9 | 26% |

As the table indicates, the most common induction activity provided was the monitoring and reviewing of the NTE’s progress through target setting and review, against probationary requirements. In many cases these procedures were part of the detailed structures set up by the Human Resources or Staff Development units to monitor and regulate probation.

The feedback from the majority of HoDs indicated that the provision of a mentor and the observations of the new TE’s teaching were often related parts of these structures.

Progress with respect to probationary criteria monitored annually by HoD. Feedback with respect to observed teaching performance provided termly by mentor, and also used to inform the annual review (HoD, old U)

Annual monitoring of quality of performance leads to a Quality Improvement Plan in which specific follow-up actions may be identified for new staff. Observation of teaching by mentor is part of this cycle of review (HoD, new U)

The term mentor was clearly open to very different interpretations. In some HEIs (n=15) the role of mentor became conflated with that of the appraiser with both roles being under-taken by the HoD or by another member of the senior management team. In such cases one individual became responsible for both supporting the on-going professional development of the NTE and for judging her/his performance against the probationary requirements. In other universities the mentor appeared to take on responsibility for day to day support and informal monitoring of the NTE’s work, whilst the HoD or a senior manager took on all aspects of the formal review process. In some HEIs mentoring roles were split in other ways, with different people taking on responsibility for mentoring different aspects of work. Five universities, for example, specifically mentioned providing ‘research mentors’ or ‘research buddies’ for NTEs, as well as different mentor(s) to support teaching and academic administration work.

As table 2 shows, some collaborative teaching activities offering NTEs opportunities to work alongside more experienced colleagues were less likely to be included in induction programmes. These collaborative activities included participation in team teaching, joint supervision in schools, and observation of an experienced colleague teaching. Time and other practical constraints, such as the number of staff, were sometimes identified as factors in the omission of such activities from induction programmes. One HoD in an old university, for example, commented that, ‘Team teaching depends on the size of the subject group. Difficult to provide for this in one person PGCE courses.’

For some HEIs (n=11) the omission of such activities was related to staffing cuts or other funding pressures. One HoD in a new university, commented, for example, ‘These used to be provided routinely. Regretfully, recent staff cuts mean that this is no longer possible.’

Working from the data provided, it seemed that in a number of HEIs (n=13) induction activities took place within the on-going routines of the departments rather than as a planned programme for NTEs.

We don’t have a departmental induction programme as such. All of the above *[the activities specified in the questionnaire]* happen but they are not formally part of any induction programme. They are part of how we always work together (HoD, old U)

No formal induction programme within the department. All new members of staff join a subject team. Informal support is always available from these teams (HoD, new U)

Other HEIs (n=10) provided a formal, organised programme of induction activities devised by the HoD or the mentor, and sometimes also the NTE. In some cases this provision was clearly individualised. One HoD in a CHE commented, for example,

(There is) dedicated documentation on induction which facilitates the mentor in devising the induction programme with the mentee *(the NTE)*… The individual programme is sent to the Staff Development Office for monitoring and evaluation ….The mentoring programme is also evaluated through a meeting between mentees and mentors at the end of the year.

In other cases it was not clear from the responses given whether induction provision was formally planned or not. This lack of clarity may be attributed in part to the limitations imposed by the use of email questionnaires as a research tool[[1]](#endnote-1).

### Perspectives from new teacher educators

*Responses from the questionnaires*

Thirty questionnaires were sent out by email to a purposive sample group of individual teacher educators, using either HoDs or a subject group network list as first points of contact. Approach letters for both HoDs and the individual teacher educators are included in Appendix 2. Seventeen NTEs returned the questionnaire, giving a response rate of 57%. The questionnaire, included in Appendix 2, asked NTEs to describe the probationary requirements set for them, to indicate what sort of induction provision they received and to rate how useful they found this in supporting their professional development.

The study made no attempt to correlate the responses from the NTEs with the responses from the HoDs, even when data was collected from HoDs and NTEs within the same HEI. The themes identified from the questionnaire responses were pursued during the individual and focus group interviews.

*NTEs’ perspectives on probationary requirements*

* Where targets set for probation related to teaching performance, most NTEs saw these as reasonable. But some NTEs, particularly those in old universities, expressed reservations about how realistic some of the research related targets set for them were.
* Overall, the probationary targets set were seen as related more to the university’s agenda and to meeting bureaucratic requirements than to the professional development of the individual. Because of this the probationary processes involved in induction were generally seen as limited in promoting learning. This point is reported in more detail in the section below.

*NTEs’ perspectives on induction provision and its contribution to professional development*

* It was clear from the responses that NTEs saw a great deal of their learning as taking place informally within their day to day work experiences. Nevertheless, learning to become a teacher educator was constructed predominantly as a solitary endeavour.
* Where NTEs had not taken a PGCE in HE qualification, the induction provided for them by the central university was limited to brief ‘acclimatisation’ courses. These were seen as offering little support, beyond giving an initial overview of university procedures. Only two NTEs had undertaken other courses organised centrally by their universities.
* The small number of respondents who had taken the PGCE HE course saw it as a valuable source of professional learning overall, although there were some reservations about how appropriate the emphases on basic teaching skills, early in the course, were for NTEs with QTS.
* The NTEs felt that the most significant micro level for learning was their course, subject or age phase teaching ‘team’. But support at this level was seen as variable. Key factors defined by the NTEs for successful learning were: the existence of a supportive learning community; the planned provision of certain induction activities (see below); and on-going support from an empathetic mentor. Where learning was less successful, a number of recurring factors were identified. These included: working within a ‘team’ with ‘no sense of community’; being a solo teacher educator within a subject group (this was a particular factor for some PGCE secondary tutors); having no planned or implemented programme of induction provision; having an unsupportive or over-burdened mentor and / or ‘team’, with no time to devote to the NTE; and having a mentor who was also the appraiser for probationary requirements. For some NTEs such factors meant that learning during induction became unfocused, self-directed or haphazard.
* The most valuable learning experiences in induction were defined as supported and collaborative endeavours. The following activities were all seen as very useful for professional development: participating in team planning; collaborative assessment of students’ written work; observing colleagues teaching; team teaching with experienced colleagues; and joint supervision in schools.
* The procedures and processes used by the departments for monitoring individual progress during probation, including target setting and being observed teaching, were given low ratings for promoting learning. More than one NTE defined such procedures as ‘jumping through hoops’.
* Over half of the NTEs (n=9) felt that their induction could have been more closely crafted to their individual needs. Some of these comments related to dissatisfaction with the provision made for supporting research development, but there was an overall feeling that many NTEs were put through the same induction processes, regardless of previous experience or existing expertise.
* Overall induction into teaching and academic administration was felt to be much better supported than induction into research and scholarship.

*Interview focus group 1: Taking a PGCE in HE as an NTE.*

All of the NTEs in this group came from one new university where the PGCE in HE qualification was compulsory for all new academics. The interview with these three NTEs, all of whom had QTS and had taught in the school sector for a minimum of six years, explored their perceptions of the relevance of the course in supporting their induction. One relevant contextual detail reported by the interviewees was that this PGCE in HE started with the basic skills of teaching, assuming that no one in the group had ever taught before.

* Differentiated starting points to take previous teaching experience into account would have been a better policy. This would not only have recognised the relevant experience of the NTEs, but also that of other new academics with experience of teaching or training in other work contexts.
* Some of the first sessions on basic teaching skills were inappropriate for NTEs who already had these skills. The group agreed that they could have contributed effectively to some of these sessions rather than ‘sitting in the audience’. They felt that at this stage of the course everyone was treated as a novice teacher without any differentiation for individual starting points.
* The course became more relevant later in year 1. A number of useful sessions were mentioned including: including interactive teaching in large group lectures; managing discussion sessions in seminars; e-learning structures within the university (the Blackboard VLE in this case); group dynamics; adult learning patterns; supporting first year under-graduates; differing ways of assessing adult learners; and supporting students from non-traditional backgrounds in HE.
* The assignments attached to the PGCE HE course added to the NTEs workload, but, in retrospect, were useful. This was because their structure enabled the NTEs to take a discipline specific focus on their teaching, and to explore their developing practice in teaching teachers.
* The requirements of the PGCE in HE were not well articulated with the requirements for probation and with induction provision at departmental level. The departmental mentors for two of the NTEs, for example, were not aware of the pattern of teaching and assessment on the PGCE.
* The course focused on developing teaching skills rather than on giving support with developing research and scholarship. The assumption was felt to be that all new academics already possessed research-related skills.
* Networking with other new academics was useful and gave a sense of belonging to a broader university community of academics.
* Overall, the PGCE offered valuable insights into teaching adults learners in HE, and was seen as an important source of support during induction. But crafting the course more carefully to meet the learning needs of particular groups of new academics would have improved provision still further.

*Interview focus group 2 and individual interviews: experiences of induction*

The main focuses of these interviews, following up the questionnaire responses, were how effective the interviewees thought provision at university and departmental level for their induction had been. Three NTEs from one old HEI were involved in the group interview; four individual interviews with NTEs from three HEIs (1 old, 1 new and 1 CHE) were also conducted.

* None of the seven interviewees had taken a PGCE in HE qualification. The induction provided for them by the central university was therefore limited to brief ‘acclimatisation’ courses. Perhaps unsurprisingly, all found these courses inadequate as support in the day to day learning about how the university structures and procedures worked. Only one NTE in this sample had taken up other courses offered by the central university Staff Development unit.
* The probationary processes involved in induction were generally seen as inappropriate and unsupportive. The targets set were seen as related more to the university’s agenda than to the developmental needs of the individual. Some targets were seen as unrealistic, with interviewees in old universities expressing particular reservations and anxieties about research related targets for publications and research grants. Where induction centred predominantly around the probationary processes, NTEs found this approach unhelpful.
* Most NTEs characterised the majority of their learning as experiential, stating variously that it occurred ‘through practice’, ‘by doing’ or ‘by apprenticeship’. It was clear that most learning took place across and within the workplaces of the HEIs and the partnership schools. NTEs stressed the individual and often haphazard nature of their learning, using a variety of terms including ‘ad hoc’, ‘crisis driven’, ‘reactive rather than proactive’, ‘trial and error’ ‘trial and improvement’, ‘reflecting on practice’, and ‘learning by my mistakes’.
* For most NTEs the most significant micro level(s) for learning was the course, subject or age phase team(s) within which the majority of their teaching took place. Some of these teams were defined as having strong collaborative cultures which supported learning well. In such teams, planning, teaching and evaluating courses communally provided regular learning opportunities for NTEs. But this informal and on-going provision was felt to be enhanced if there was also a clear, planned and implemented programme for induction.
* Other NTEs stated that they did not have a supportive learning community at the micro level of subject or course. In some cases this was because they were the only teacher educator in their subject group (this was a particular factor for PGCE secondary tutors), In other cases the NTEs felt that there was, as one interviewee expressed it, ‘no sense of community’ at the level of course or subject, and that this reflected senses of fragmentation in the department as a whole. Other NTEs felt overlooked in the fast pace of daily life in their departments. For these NTEs induction took place largely by ‘immersion’. This was seen as a direct result of the time pressures on more experienced teacher educators, and the consequently restricted opportunities for collaboration and professional development. This approach, termed here *induction by immersion* was seen as generally inadequate.
* When individuals within such teams took on responsibilities for inducting NTEs, either as formal or self-appointed mentors, then they often provided invaluable guidance in learning both the explicit and tacit requirements of the job. But many of the interviewees stressed that they felt this responsibility added to the already heavy workloads of their mentors, and was not fully recognised within the department.
* The most valuable support did not always come from the formally designated mentor. This was a particular factor in cases where both mentoring and appraisal roles were carried out by one senior member of staff. Where it occurred, this conflation of roles was felt by all interviewees to be unhelpful. Trust and empathy between the NTE and the supporting colleague were consistently mentioned as essential criteria for learning. Other criteria mentioned here which enabled mentors to provide strong induction support were: the levels of the mentor’s motivation to take on the role; his or her on-going knowledge and experience of ITE practice; and a shared background between mentor and NTE in experience of school teaching.
* Accessing discipline-specific research and scholarship about teaching on ITE courses was difficult. NTEs often did not know where to look for relevant books and papers, and felt that mentors often did not have the time available to talk through the scholarship and tacit knowledge underpinning their teaching and practices. Some NTEs felt that their daily work raised issues, questions and challenges for them, which often went unexamined because of pressure of time and lack of other support structures.
* Overall, induction into teaching and academic administration was felt to be much better supported than induction into research and scholarship. In the latter area NTEs felt that it was either presumed that they already had relevant knowledge and understanding of research, or that induction would be provided through the gradual learning processes involved in doctoral work. One interviewee commented that the latter approach was often inappropriately slow in HEIs where probationary requirements specified rapid achievement of research publications and / or funding.
* Where induction support for research and scholarship existed, it often came from outside the micro level context which provided the teaching support. Support for research often came from key individuals, including HoDs, doctoral or Masters degree dissertation supervisors, and research mentors who were more experienced colleagues, often taking on this role informally. Communal support for induction into research was mentioned by only one interviewee who worked within a research cluster. He clearly felt that this context provided him with a strong, collaborative and supportive learning environment.

# Conclusions

## Overview of main findings from the study

* Probation requirements for NTEs differ across institutions, with the majority of new universities and CHEs setting requirements only for high quality teaching and contributions to academic administration. Old universities, however, added research related targets (for publications, funding or achievement of a doctorate) for NTEs appointed on full lecturer contracts.
* Most NTEs see probationary requirements as driven by the university’s agenda, rather than by their individual needs. For some NTEs in old universities, research related targets were seen as unrealistic.
* Procedures and targets for probation were planned, implemented and monitored in most HEIs. These procedures, and related processes such as the observation of the NTEs’ teaching, were routinely included in departmental induction ‘curricula’ in most HEIs.
* Most NTEs are exempted from the PGCE HE qualification, largely because they already hold QTS for the school sector.
* The small number of NTEs in this study who had taken the PGCE HE qualification defined it as a valuable learning experience overall, although it was generally agreed that starting points needed to be differentiated in order to acknowledge the existing levels of teaching expertise of NTEs.
* Because most NTEs did not take the PGCE HE and were unlikely to opt in to other centrally provided courses, the induction provided for them at the level of the university was limited to short, initial orientation courses.
* Most induction provision for NTEs was situated within education departments, at the micro level of teaching or subject ‘team’.
* The HoDs’ responses showed that the content of induction ‘curricula’ at this micro level varied, with activities which supported probationary processes – such as target setting and observation of the NTEs’ teaching - most likely to be planned and implemented. This approach is termed *induction by monitoring* here. Some potentially valuable collaborative learning opportunities – such as team teaching and observing experienced colleagues teaching - were less likely to be routinely included in induction programmes.
* Approaches to induction varied between HEIs, with some institutions formally planning, implementing and monitoring detailed micro level programmes, whilst others followed a less formal approach, relying on induction taking place through the inclusion of the NTE in the daily work of the relevant team(s).
* From the perspectives of the NTEs, the quality of micro level provision was variable. Whilst some NTEs participated in a varied range of induction activities and felt well supported, formal provision for others was limited to meeting the requirements of the university’s probationary schemes. This latter approach was felt to have limitations, and to be for the benefit of the university rather than the individual. For other NTEs learning was haphazard and often felt unsupported and solitary.
* The degree of formal planning for induction activities also varied. Some NTEs followed planned programmes; others had programmes planned but not implemented, often due to time pressures. A third group experienced *induction by immersion,* a term used here to indicate induction taking place informally as part of the normal, on-going routines of the department.
* Generally, NTEs felt that some degree of planned and well implemented provision was important during induction.
* The quality of mentoring was an important factor in the overall quality of NTE learning. NTEs defined empathy and trust between mentor and NTE as key qualities.
* In some HEIs, HoDs reported that the roles of mentor and probationary appraiser were conflated and undertaken by one individual, often the HoD or a senior manager. Some NTEs found this conflation of roles unhelpful.
* Induction at the micro level centred around academic administration and teaching. There was less emphasis on induction into research. But where this occurred, it was likely to come from different sources of support, either individual or team.

## Induction into the community of teacher educators

This study found that most induction provision for NTEs was situated within departments at the micro level of the teaching ‘team’, and that for some new recruits this provided a good induction into HE. Framing NTE induction as occurring predominantly and most effectively within the micro levels – or specific communities of practice (Wenger 1998) - of teacher education departments would seem then to have considerable potential for developing effective induction provision.

This emphasis on the effectiveness of induction at the micro level is reiterated in previous research. Drawing on Wenger’s work, Trowler and Knight (2004) argue, for example, that this micro level is the most important context for induction to HE. In their view it is the university which provides the structural context for work, but the community of practice (variously defined as the department, the research group or the teaching team) which develops the day-to-day behavioural and discursive practices for the new academic (p.159). Induction to HE is in their view essentially ‘departmental or team business’ (p.144).

Gilpin’s work (2003:2) supports Trowler and Knight’s arguments in identifying this type of induction as often ‘contextually well aligned, *(and able to)* provide rich insights into variations in local procedures and culture … (*because it*) is people, rather than institutionally purposed’. But whilst the idea of learning through participation in the micro level of the community of practice offers a popular way of understanding induction, the concept is very broad, has a number of limitations (Hodkinson and Hodkinson 2004), including the fact that understanding of how participatory learning might occur is limited (Edwards and Protheroe 2003:229). Without such understanding of NTE induction – and the acquisition of the expertise in teaching and researching as a teacher educator which it involves – induction at this level risks being mis-understood or dismissed as ‘merely’ apprenticeship learning or ‘sitting by Nelly’.

The findings of this ESCalate study indicate that induction at the micro level can vary both in terms of the types of provision made and of NTEs’ perceptions of its value in promoting learning. Useful features of this type of induction from the NQTs’ perspectives were strong and established communal ways of working, some degree of planned provision for collaborative learning activities, and an empathetic mentor with time to guide the NTE. Features of less helpful approaches included -

* *induction by immersion,* in which there was little or no explicit planning of induction activities for the NTE, and learning was assumed to take place as part of the normal collaborative work of the community. This approach was seen as inadequate by NTEs because it often led to inconsistent support, particularly where mentors and other team members were too pressured to provide relevant learning experiences to meet the NTEs’ learning needs.
* *induction by monitoring* in which programmes were devised around the procedures necessary for meeting probationary requirements (such as target setting and observation of the NTE’s teaching) and ‘outcomes’ were judged through the individual production of effective performances of teaching (and research, where relevant), often against those requirements. This approach was seen as limited because it tended to focus more on the surveillance, monitoring and regulation of the NTE’s performance through the auditing processes involved in academic probation, than on her/his long term professional development[[2]](#endnote-2).

The existence of the induction by monitoring approach in a number of HEIs in this study indicates some of the problems in devising professional induction programmes within the current accountability-led system of HE. The emphasis placed on the production and judgement of individual performance during induction certainly raises questions as to who or what some of these structures might benefit, and about whether or not such programmes offer sufficient time and space for NTEs to learn.

In this study the induction by monitoring approach also seemed to narrow the range of learning opportunities on offer to the NTE during induction, with collaborative learning opportunities – such as team teaching and observing experienced colleagues teaching - less likely to be routinely included in induction programmes. There are parallels here with Edwards and Protheroe’s (2003) identification of the lack of extended learning opportunities offered to student teachers by mentors on school placements. In that study student teachers had limited opportunities for learning through participation in and interpretation of teaching processes. Edwards and Protheroe argue that this was in part because understanding of how participatory learning might occur was undeveloped. I would argue that a similar statement could equally well be made for induction into teacher education communities in instances where valuable collaborative learning opportunities are not routinely provided for NTEs. Part of the reason for such omissions may be that, to draw on the words of Edwards and Protheroe (p.229) what we lack at the present time is ‘a worked-out view of participatory learning that might draw on mentors’ strengths and enrich the learning experiences’ of NTEs.

In previous work (Murray 2005), I have argued that, equipped with their personal knowledge and understanding of teaching and scholarship in schools, new teacher educators require support in ‘shifting the lens’ of their existing knowledge to meet the demands of HE-based ITE. Good quality induction support for NTEs needs to focus on analysing previous practices and their implications *within* the new setting in order to begin to build new pedagogical and research-based knowledge and understanding for teacher education work. Induction support in interpreting and understanding both the HE setting and the nature of ITE work therefore becomes essential. This induction into the specific setting(s) of teacher education, to the wider world of the university, and to the HE sector in general needs to go far beyond the conventional and limited induction models which were reportedly on offer to some of the participants in this study. It needs to be tailored to the specific contexts of each education department and its missions, as well as attending to the *issues from practice* which arise for each new educator as part of daily work. The challenge for ITE induction then is not to devise set induction programmes which will equip NTEs with a ‘bag of tricks’ full of generic pedagogical and research skills for HE work, but rather to give them the time, space and opportunities to reflect on and analyse their emerging practice as teacher educators and the questions, issues and dilemmas it raises.

In the article cited above I have also posed some questions about centring induction only around one specific teacher education community of practice, identifying that this may lead to ‘insularity’, and fragmented and fractured provision which loses sight of teacher educators’ commitments to broader social goals and to other discourses and practices found within the broader teacher education community. I would suggest then that, whilst acknowledging the power and importance of coherent and well planned induction into the immediate community of practice, care also needs to be taken to ensure that such provision does not become parochial, communally anecdotal, and limited in understanding of the broader social and moral purposes of HE-based teacher education. Induction provision clearly has to meet the needs of individual NTEs and of the departments within which they work, but it also needs to reflect the accepted discourses and practices of teacher education as a professional discipline in the university sector.

This study found that most NTEs are exempted from PGCE HE courses because they already have QTS for the school sector. This recognition of existing expertise may seem superficially beneficial, but could also be considered unhelpful in a number of ways. Firstly, it lends credence to the assumption that teaching skills acquired in the school sector can be ‘transferred’ to teaching in HE in straightforward ways. This is an assumption which this study, and previous research (Trowler and Knight 2004; Ducharme 1993) question. Secondly, equating the skills of teaching in school with those for teaching teachers in HE fails to recognise the skills involved in teaching adults, the uniqueness of teacher educators’ pedagogy, and the consequent need for NTEs to develop their existing teaching and research skills and knowledge. Most NTEs in this study did not have access to the PGCE in HE as one type of institutional structure which, if properly designed, could have assisted them in developing this new pedagogical and scholarly knowledge. Finally, lack of access to a PGCE in HE, together with limited engagement in other university wide learning opportunities, means that most of these NTEs had restricted early career stage opportunities for networking with new academics from other disciplines and with their wider university communities. The findings of this study would suggest that, if the practice of exempting NTEs from PGCE in HE qualifications is routinely followed, then alternatives ways of ensuring high quality induction provision for NTEs into their wider university communities need to be given enhanced consideration

## Questions towards guidelines for good practice in the induction of NTEs

This was a small-scale study, with some methodological limitations, hence using its findings to draw up definitive guidelines for good practice in the induction of NTEs would not be appropriate. But the following questions about induction provision emerge as pointers from the study, and could be used by HoDs, other senior managers, mentors and NTEs in drawing up, implementing and evaluating induction programmes. Feedback from colleagues involved in NTE induction on the usefulness of these questions would be very welcome.

* Has the NTE been involved in a ‘needs analysis’ as s/he enters HE, identifying previous knowledge and understanding, existing strengths and areas for future development?
* Are probationary requirements challenging but achievable? Do they take account of individual starting points? Do they reflect the individual’s aspirations for career development as well as the departmental and institutional priorities? Do they relate to teaching, research / scholarship and service to the university as the three commonly accepted elements of academic work?
* Is induction provision tailored to assist new teacher educators in meeting the requirements set for their probationary period? Does the provision aim to match individual aspirations?
* Does the programme provide a good basis for further professional development, beyond induction?
* Does the PGCE HE provide differentiated starting points for NTEs who already hold QTS qualifications? Does it acknowledge the existing pedagogical knowledge and expertise of NTEs? Does it support the changes in the processes of teaching, research and scholarship during the transition from the school sector to HE? Does it include opportunities for structured personal reflection on personal pedagogical and scholarly practices within the particular learning and teaching contexts in which teacher educators’ work?
* If NTEs are exempted from the PGCE HE, does the induction programme identify alternative ways identified in which they can acquire the skills of teaching teachers in HE settings? Are there alternative ways in which they can become familiar with the broad HEI setting in which they now work? Are networking opportunities with academics in other disciplines provided?
* Is there a planned programme of induction activities within the department? Does it clearly relate to overall provision, to the probationary requirements and to the initial needs analysis? Is it clear within which specific micro level(s) of the department the various induction activities will take place? Is the implementation of the programme monitored and reviewed regularly? Is the programme flexible enough to take into account developing needs which the NTEs, the mentor or appraiser may identify as arising during the induction period?
* Does this programme support the development of all three elements of academic work (research or scholarship, teaching and service)?
* Does the programme include a broad spectrum of activities to support professional development, as well as to monitor and regulate performance against probationary targets?
* Within the programme is there articulation between different ‘levels’ of induction (for example, between the requirements of a PGCE HE course and the departmental / micro level induction programme)?
* Does the programme include opportunities for the NTEs to gain experience of how other teacher education communities of practice work, beyond their own micro level context(s), and departments?
* Is the NTE encouraged to access research and scholarship of teaching on ITE courses, and to use relevant sources to inform her/his practices?
* Does the NTE have a mentor who is not directly involved in the formal probationary processes set by the university and the department?

## Future research

This study, as implemented, had a number of methodological limitations. For example, the size of the sample groups for element 3 of the study – the questionnaires and interviews with NTEs – was small, and the use of questionnaires as a research tool to gather details of induction provision from both the NTEs and the HoDs may have resulted in tendencies to give normative responses (Becker 1997) or ‘thin stories’ about induction (Leonard et al 2005). To address these limitations, further research could include larger sample sizes and a wider variety of research tools, particularly the more extensive use of focus group interviews. A more in-depth and detailed survey of departmental provision, for example, could include case studies investigating what provision is planned and implemented for NTEs’ learning when, how and by whom across a range of institutional contexts.

Research could also track the early stage career trajectories of individual NTEs to see how, when, and where learning occurs over time and across different work settings (for example, HEI seminar rooms and school classrooms). An additional element to such research would be to consider the part which individual professional biographies and habitus play in professional learning in the HE workplace (see Hodkinson and Hodkinson 2004).

## Implications of the project for other professional groups in HE

Although the project was specifically focused on initial teacher educators, it also has implications for the induction of all staff involved in educating professionals in HE contexts. The project provides wider insights for the Higher Education Academy and the Learning and Teaching Subject Networks within it about the possible induction needs of new lecturers in other disciplines, particularly professional educators in professional education areas such as health, social work, law, medicine, nursing and management work. It also has implications for the induction of Further Education (FE) staff, transferring to work in HE. In each of these instances individuals entering HE are not likely to conform to the conventional picture of the young academic entering HEIs as her/his first career in her/his mid to late twenties, and after completing PhD studies or a major research project. Professional educators and those moving into HE work from FE colleges tend to enter the university sector later in their working lives, with considerable professional experience, and often from senior posts in their original fields (see Lyons 1999; Murray 2002; Royal College of Nursing 2001). They are also likely to enter HE without a PhD or sustained research experience.
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Appendices

Appendix 1

1. Approach letter to Heads of Department

21st May 2004

Dear

Re. ESCalate Research project: Investigating good practices in the induction of teacher educators into Higher Education

I am currently undertaking a research study for ESCalate – the Learning and Teaching Support Network for Education – analysing induction procedures used to support new teacher educators entering Higher Education. The first part of the project aims to collate examples of the practices used by various HEIs. I am sending out questionnaires to all English HEIs currently offering Initial Teacher Education courses. The research process follows ethical guidelines, and guarantees institutional anonymity in the research process and the final report. Full details of the project can be found on the ESCalate website. The findings will also be made available on this website.

Your institution comes within my sample group, and I am therefore attaching to this email a brief on-line questionnaire which asks you to outline the induction procedures used with new teacher educators in your institution. I would be grateful if you, or a nominated representative, could complete this questionnaire and return it to me as soon as possible. I can supply you with a hard copy of the questionnaire should you require it.

If you have any queries about this research, please contact me either by email (jean.murray@brunel.ac.uk) or by fax or phone (details above).

With thanks,

Dr. Jean Murray

Phone: 0777 3697189; 020 88910121

Fax: 020 8744 2960

2. Questionnaire sent to Heads of Department

**ESCalate project on the Induction of Teacher Educators into HE**

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this project. I would be grateful if you could supply the following information. Please complete the form and send as an email attachment to jean.murray@brunel.ac.uk together with any other relevant information or comments you might wish to send.

**Identification**

Name of institution:

Name of Head of Department or contact person:

Email (in case of queries):

Please cross the boxes to indicate the provision for the induction of new teacher educators at your Higher Education Institution.

**Provision at University level**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Enrolment on Post Graduate Certificate in HE course or similar  | **[ ]**  |
| Participation in an orientation to the university course  | **[ ]**  |
| Participation in other institutional level course | **[ ]**  |
| Provision of a mentor (from outside the department) | **[ ]**  |
| Other (e.g. any other University level provision):      |  |
| Comments (optional):      |  |

**Provision at departmental level**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Participation in short courses organised within the department | **[ ]**  |
| Provision of a mentor (from inside the department) | **[ ]**  |
| Induction by mentor into departmental structures and awards  | **[ ]**  |
| Regular monitoring of new tutor’s progress by mentor | **[ ]**  |
| Observation of new tutor’s teaching by mentor / peer | **[ ]**  |
| Opportunities to observe experienced staff teaching  | **[ ]**  |
| Opportunities to team teach with experienced staff | **[ ]**  |
| Opportunities to moderate / assess students’ work with experienced staff | **[ ]**  |
| Opportunities to undertake joint supervision of students in schools | **[ ]**  |
| Other (please state)      |  |
| Comments      |  |

**General requirements for new teacher educators to pass their probationary period**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Satisfactory teaching ability | **[ ]**  |
| Completion of relevant qualification | **[ ]**  |
| Evidence of research engagement | **[ ]**  |
| Evidence of external research funding | **[ ]**  |
| Other (please state)      |  |
| Comments      |  |

**With thanks for your participation in this project.**

**Dr. Jean Murray, Brunel University, 300 St Margarets Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW 1 1PT**

Appendix 2

1. Approach letter sent to Heads of Department

16th January 2004

Dear Head of Department

Re. ESCalate Research project: Investigating good practices in the induction of teacher educators into Higher Education

I am currently undertaking a research study for ESCalate – the Learning and Teaching Support Network for Education – analysing induction procedures used to support new teacher educators entering Higher Education. The research process follows ethical guidelines, and guarantees institutional anonymity in the research process and the final report. Full details of the project can be found on the ESCalate website. The findings will also be made available on this website.

One part of the project aims to identify and analyse the induction needs of teacher educators from the perspectives of the new educators themselves. The designated sample group includes teachereducators in their first three years of HE-based work. The approach letter to individuals and the questionnaire are attached for your reference.

I am writing to you to ask if you would give your permission for teacher educators within your department who come into the above category to participate in the research. If you give your permission, please do the following

1. forward this message to relevant individuals, adding your endorsement
2. forward the attachments to each individual

Thank you in anticipation for your participation in this research. If you have any queries about the project, please contact me either by email (jean.murray@brunel.ac.uk) or by fax or phone (details below).

With thanks,

Dr. Jean Murray

Phone: 0777 3697189; 020 88910121

Fax: 020 8744 2960

1. Letter to individual NTEs

1st November 2004

Dear Colleague

Re. ESCalate Research project: Investigating good practices in the induction of teacher educators into Higher Education

I am currently undertaking a research study for ESCalate – the Learning and Teaching Support Network for Education – analysing induction procedures used to support new teacher educators entering Higher Education. Full details of the project can be found on the ESCalate website.

One part of the project aims to identify and analyse the induction needs of teacher educators from the perspectives of the new educators themselves. The research process follows ethical guidelines, and guarantees individual anonymity in the research process and the final report. The findings of the project will be made available on the ESCalate website.

I am writing to you to ask if you would participate in this research. In the first instance, participation would consist of completing the brief questionnaire attached to this email. The questionnaire asks you to outline the induction procedures you have experienced and to comment on which procedures / practices have been most effective in supporting your professional development. I would be grateful if you could complete this on-line questionnaire and return it to me as soon as possible. I can supply you with a hard copy of the questionnaire should you prefer it.

It would also be useful to know if you would be prepared to be interviewed at a future date. The interview would be based around the questionnaire and would focus on exploring your perceptions of the induction processes you have experienced in more depth. The interview would take approximately one hour and can be arranged at a time and place to suit you.

If you have any queries about this research, please contact me either by email (jean.murray@brunel.ac.uk) or by fax or phone (details above).

With thanks,

Dr. Jean Murray

Phone: 0777 3697189; 020 88910121

Fax: 020 8744 2960

1. Questionnaire sent to individuals

**ESCalate project on the Induction of Teacher Educators to HE**

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this project. I would be grateful if you could supply the following information. Please complete the form and send as an email attachment to jean.murray@brunel.ac.uk together with any other relevant information or comments you might wish to send. Anonymity for individuals and institutions is guaranteed in the research process and final reporting.

**Identification**

Name:

Name of institution:

Discipline or subject:

Age phase in Initial Teacher Education (Pri? Sec? FE?):

Time in Higher Education to date:

Main teaching duties at present:

Years of teaching in school prior to entering HE:

Post in school sector prior to entering HE:

Level of academic qualification on entry to HE:

Email:

Phone:

**Type of contract (e.g. lecturer A/B? senior lecturer? teaching only?)**

**Length of contract (e.g permanent? 1 year?...)**

**Requirements for passing probation**

Please check the boxes to indicate the conditions you were given for passing your probationary period.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Satisfactory teaching ability | [ ]  |
| Completion of relevant qualification | [ ]  |
| Evidence of research engagement | [ ]  |
| Evidence of external research funding | [ ]  |
| Other (please state)      |  |
| Comments      |  |

Please check the boxes below to indicate the types of provision made for your induction by your HEI. If you were offered this type of provision, please then use the numbered boxes to comment on how useful you feel each component has been in your overall induction.

**Provision at University level**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Enrolment on Post Graduate Certificate in HE course very useful 1 [ ]  2 [ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  not at all useful | [ ]  |
| Participation in orientation to the university course very useful 1 [ ]  2 [ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  not at all useful | [ ]  |
| Participation in orientation to the university course very useful 1 [ ]  2 [ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  not at all useful  | [ ]  |
| Participation in other institutional level coursevery useful 1 [ ]  2 [ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  not at all useful | [ ]  |
| Provision of a mentor (from outside the department)very useful 1 [ ]  2 [ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  not at all useful | [ ]  |
| Other (please specify)      |  |
| Comments      |  |

**Provision at departmental level**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Participation in short courses within the departmentvery useful 1 [ ]  2 [ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  not at all useful | [ ]  |
| Provision of a mentor (from inside the department)very useful 1 [ ]  2 [ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  not at all useful | [ ]  |
| Induction by mentor into course structuresvery useful 1 [ ]  2 [ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  not at all useful | [ ]  |
| Regular monitoring of new tutor’s progress by mentorvery useful 1 [ ]  2 [ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  not at all useful | [ ]  |
| Observation of new tutor’s teaching by mentor / peervery useful 1 [ ]  2 [ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  not at all useful | [ ]  |
| Opportunities to observe experienced staff teaching very useful 1 [ ]  2 [ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  not at all useful | [ ]  |
| Opportunities to team teach with experienced staff very useful 1 [ ]  2 [ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  not at all useful | [ ]  |
| Opportunities to moderate students’ work with experienced staffvery useful 1 [ ]  2 [ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  not at all useful | [ ]  |
| Opportunities to undertake joint supervision of students in schoolsvery useful 1 [ ]  2 [ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[ ]  not at all useful | [ ]  |
| Other (please specify)      |  |
| Comments      |  |

**Would you be willing to be interviewed about your responses on the questionnaire?**

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

**With thanks for your participation in this project.**

**Dr. Jean Murray, Brunel University, 300 St Margarets Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW 1 1PT**

1. Interview schedule for individual and focus group interviews.

**ESCalate study on induction into Higher Education**

**Individual and focus group interview schedule** (to be used in conjunction with questionnaire responses)

1. **Outline project and ethical stance** (re-cap from questionnaire and access letter). Dissemination.
2. **Check biographical details**, as recorded on questionnaire. Clarify where necessary, especially in terms of main teaching duties in Higher Education (HE).
3. **Entry to HE**
* Motivation – why did you want to become a teacher educator? (TE)
* How did you make the transition from school teaching / Local Authority work as an advisor to pre-service teacher education (ITE)?
* Looking back, what did you see as your main strengths on starting HE work? What did you see as the main challenges you faced at this time?
* In retrospect, were these perceptions accurate? If not, why not?
* What advice would you give to another TE about to start her/his first year of HE work?
1. **The experience of the first year**

Two possible approaches here –

* Interviewee to describe/ draw her/his trajectory of learning over their first year as a whole. Where were the high points? Where were the low points? Why did these occur? What were the main points of learning? Which areas of your previous professional knowledge and understanding were relevant? Why do you think this was?
* Interviewee to talk through the major events of their first year term by term, including the questions above as the interview progresses.

Ask the interviewee to re-cap the main areas of learning during the first year and why s/he thinks these occurred. Also what were the major tensions encountered on entering HE.

1. **For interviewees in their second or third years of HE.**
* Have your experiences of HE in your second / third year been different from those of your first year? If so, why has this been?
* Where have the major areas of learning been for you in year 2/3? Why do you think these areas remained or became important at this point?
* What advice would you give to another TE about to start her/his second year of HE work?
* How do you want to develop your own practice in your next year of TE work?
1. **Probationary requirements and Support structures**.
* **Probationary period?** Requirements for passing probation? Induction procedures / practices in place to support you in meeting these? Usefulness of these procedures?
* **Institutional level?** Are you required to complete a Post Graduate Certificate in Teaching in HE? If yes, how useful do you feel this course has been in your overall induction? Please provide a brief explanation of your answer. What other support have you been offered at University level? (E.g. short induction / orientation courses; other types of courses; network meetings with other new academics). Please indicate how effective you feel such courses have been for you, and indicate briefly why this is so.
* **Induction at departmental level** – Mentoring. Have you been given a formal mentor within your department? How many meetings have you had with this mentor per year? What has been the focus of these meetings? How useful have you found your mentor’s support? Why is this? What, in your view, would be the ideal mentoring system for inducting new teacher educators into HE?
* **Short courses**. Have you been attended any short courses within your department? What has been the focus of these? How useful have you found these? Why is this? In your view what kind of kind of courses, specifically tailored to teacher education, do you feel would have be useful for new teacher educators?
* **Working with colleagues**. As part of your induction, have you had structured opportunities to work collaboratively with colleagues in your course / subject team? These might include joint teaching, peer observation of your teaching, joint observation and assessment of students in schools, moderation of assessed work? Cross reference to checklist in questionnaire. How useful did you find these opportunities? Why was this? Please give a specific example of particular opportunities which you found most valuable. Ideally, what structured opportunities for working with colleagues would you have liked during induction?
* **Self development.** Which approaches to self-development have supported your induction into HE? Checklist. Which have been particularly useful? Please give a specific example. Are these any ways in which you would have liked your department to support your self-development activities?
* **Integration.** Did you feel that these different types of induction support were well integrated? Please give examples to support your answer. How could the integration of the various types of induction support be improved?
* What kind of support and professional development activities do you feel were most useful during your **first year**? What specific advice would you give about induction support in the first year?
* What kind of support and professional development activities do you feel were most useful during your **second / third year**? What specific advice would you give about support for Early Professional Development?
1. **Self-identification.** Which of the following words do you think describe you? Which do not describe you? Please explain why / why not.

Teacher / teacher educator / teacher trainer / academic / lecturer / tutor / researcher / discipline specific term (as appropriate) e.g. mathematician, linguist, sociologist / generalist / curriculum developer.

**Thanks for time. Dissemination of findings. Ownership issues.**

**JM 7.04**

1. Some types of questionnaires are acknowledge to produce normative responses (Becker 1997) and restricted responses, or what Leonard et al (2005) refer to as ‘thin stories’ [↑](#endnote-ref-1)
2. It is acknowledged that professional development and auditing processes are not necessarily mutually exclusive. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)