Teach First, Ask Questions Later:
A summary of research on TF's alternative vision of teaching and teachers

Stephen Parker & Trevor Gale, University of Glasgow, on behalf of the Scottish Teacher Education Committee (STEC)

This paper provides a brief summary of the research on Teach First (TF). It also draws on research about TF's sister organisations (e.g. Teach for America, Teach for Australia) and parent organisation (Teach for All). Also included is research on Schools Direct. (A short description of TF and its activities are provided in Appendix A.) The links between these organisations are both explicit (acknowledged on TF/TFA websites) and implicit: for example, the founder and Chief Executive of Teach First, Brett Wigdortz, previously worked for McKinsey & Company, a major financial supporter of Teach for America.

While several governments and education systems around the world have embraced TF/TFA with little more than political will and ideology for justification, this paper seeks to examine the evidence – to ask the difficult questions about TF – in order to make an informed judgement and before deciding on future action.

The research on TF is extensive. This paper represents a distillation of the main points of criticism of TF and related programmes. A closer reading of the literature beyond the scope of this paper is required to appreciate the nuances of this literature. The bibliography at the end of the paper lists the research identified to date. For a zip file of these research papers, please contact stephen.parker@glasgow.ac.uk. The authors also welcome receiving research not already listed.

The research is of two kinds:

1. Evaluations that tend to find that TF or other 'Teach For' programmes have a positive impact. These evaluations are commissioned by TF, affiliated organisations or the partner universities that deliver aspects of the training and are often concerned with programme improvement rather than broader critique of the programme itself. They are frequently characterised by an excessive endorsement of the programme including the effectiveness of its teachers: often exercises in statistical techniques rather than concerned with social, cultural aspects of teaching.
2. Research that tends to be more critical of TF, conducted by researchers in universities not connected to TF and which has undergone the rigours of expert peer review, as per global norms of academic research assessments utilised in system-level exercises such as the UK's Research Evaluation Framework (REF). The emphasis is on whether TF delivers on its promises and with broader questions about the nature of teaching and education.

The second constitutes the vast majority of research on TF undertaken to date and – given its independence and verification through recognised academic processes – engenders the most confidence.

In summary, this research indicates that:

- It is unclear whether or not TF increases the supply of teachers at a systems level;
- TF teachers have higher rates of attrition than teachers in general;
- Teaching is considered by TF as a temporary proposition and an intermediary step;
- Even though students' contexts are acknowledged rhetorically, the TF strategy to improve student attainment ignores how contextual issues mediate teacher effectiveness;
- The ideal TF student is middle class and from a Russell Group university while their students are from disadvantaged areas and thus attributed with deficits;
- TF teachers tend to engage in restricted pedagogical approaches.

By way of introduction, four points arise from the review and provide context for the summary that follows:

- Teach First is premised on models of teachers, teaching and students that have been disputed, debated and largely discredited by academics and educational experts. TF bypasses this rich research base to make claims about its effectiveness that appeal to populist and common sense ideas of teaching.
- Of note is the lack of rigorous data on Teach First students (such as the number of teachers each year, the types of schools they serve, and retention rates). TF mentions some statistics on its website and in its promotional materials, but these tend to be of a broad, general indicative nature lacking in specific detail and not presented in a consistent or systematic form. There is no available data set of the type published by the Department for Education, for example. This makes comparisons with other public data difficult.
- TF is not simply an alternative route into teaching. It is first and foremost aimed at affecting social change through the development of leadership skills and social entrepreneurs. For TF as an organisation and for TF participants, teaching is a means to this end, an intermediate step towards another goal. TF thus subtly shifts the emphasis of teaching away from serving the educational interests of school students and towards serving the career interests of its trainee teachers.
- Kretchmar et al. (2014) observe that TF is part of the corporate networks of edu-businesses, with links between TFA and other organisations, individuals and donors, including the Gates Foundation. The role of these private organisations in what has traditionally been a state function, subtlety shifts the emphasis from the public good to the private good (Crowley 2016). TF is aligned with a type of politics associated with the privatisation, deregulation and marketization of education. It is also predicated on the view that the existing system of ITE and education has failed and is need of reform (Ellis et al. 2016), although such claims are never substantiated.

It is unclear whether or not TF increases the supply of teachers at a systems level

The precise number of TF teachers teaching in English schools is difficult to ascertain due to the lack of reliable data. However, some trends can be inferred. Teach First's first intake in 2003 was just 186 graduates, growing each year to 1,685 by 2015 (Hill 2012; Teach First 2015). However, the aggregate number of TF teachers in English schools is not readily available as not all of each years' cohort go on to teach, and almost a half do not remain in teaching after the two year programme has concluded.

In England, the number of teachers (presumably including TF teachers) of all levels in publicly funded schools has risen steadily in recent years. Table 1, derived from the Department for Education, England (DfE) data, shows that between November 2010 and November 2014 the number of regular, qualified and unqualified teachers increased modestly (by around 3% or 13,100 teachers). The number of teachers in Academy schools (where TF participants are likely to go, along with public schools) increased by over 600% in the same time. In contrast the number of teachers in Local Authority 'maintained' schools has decreased, reflecting a rise in the number of schools becoming Academies. The total number of schools has decreased slightly. So, overall there's been a modest increase in teacher numbers, accounted for largely by teachers in Academies.

Table 1: Number of teachers, schools and Teach First participants, England, 2010-2014

	Teachers – Total Academy Schools (FTE) ('000s)[2]	Teachers – Maintained Schools (FTE) ('000s)	Teachers – Total State Funded Schools (FTE) ('000s)[1,2]	Number of publicly funded primary and secondary schools[3]	Teach First Participants[4]
2010	23.8	429.6	441.8	20,304	560
2011	83.7	366.8	440.0	20,194	772
2012	124.5	331.4	445.4	20,086	996
2013	150.4	309.6	449.7	20,065	1,261
2014	170.1	294.8	454.9	20,117	?

[1] *Academies included in total*
[2] *Includes unqualified teachers*
[3] *Includes: middle/all through schools as deemed; all primary academies, including free schools; city technology colleges and secondary academies, including free schools, university technical colleges and studio schools.*
[4] *Number of graduates recruited to TF in given year; is not necessarily the same as the number of TF teachers in classrooms*

Source: DfE data; Hill 2012; TF 2013

Of these teachers, there has been a notable increase in unqualified teachers in all schools, more marked in Academies than in Maintained Schools (where there has been a decrease). This number might be attributed to TF teachers in their first year of training and who have not yet attained QTS – see Table 2, below.

Table 2: Number of unqualified teachers, England, 2010-2014

	Unqualified Teachers – Maintained Schools (FTE) ('000s)	Unqualified Teachers –Academy Schools (FTE) ('000s)[2]	Unqualified teachers – Total State Funded Schools (FTE) ('000s)[1,2]
2010	14.8	1.9	16.7
2011	11.9	4.2	16.1
2012	10.1	5.9	16.0
2013	9.2	7.4	16.6
2014	10.4	9.9	20.3

Source: DfE data

Teach First claims that it only targets graduates who would not otherwise become teachers rather than seek to poach from universities' existing pool of potential education students (Hutchings et al. 2006). However, because data on TF teachers are not readily available, it is difficult to verify this claim empirically. The figures above indicate a small net increase in teachers over a five-year period, suggesting that TF teachers are absorbed into the teacher workforce as a whole. Also, it is unclear as to whether other providers are obliged to reduce their student intake to accommodate TF teachers in order to fit in with a national quota of new teachers. In other words, do universities have to cut the number of places offered for ITE to avoid an over-supply of teachers?

TF teachers have higher rates of attrition than teachers in general.

TF does not provide publicly available data sets that show the attrition rates of TF teachers beyond the two years for which they are obliged to teach. TF claim that their participants are not expected to teach for more than this two-year period but states that "To date 54% of those who have completed Teach First are still teaching. Over 70% work in education. And nearly all of the rest do something towards the mission."[1] Although the TF organization is proud of this statistic, it is certainly much lower than the proportion of traditionally university-educated teachers who remain in the classroom two years after graduation.

The Department for Education in England found in 2011 that TF teachers were five times more likely to leave the profession than those who moved through a traditional postgraduate teacher education. The DfE also identified having TF training as one of the most significant factors in non-retirement attrition alongside other factors such as part-time teaching, having training from overseas institutions, being aged over 40 for male teachers or over 50 for female teachers (DfE 2011).

[1] https://www.teachfirst.org.uk/blog/how-many-our-teachers-stay-classroom

Recent data published by the UK Parliament (Parliament UK 2015) illustrate the number of TF teachers who enter schools in each of the past five years compared with the number who leave after their two-year teaching commitment concludes – see Table 3 below for a summary. In each of the past five years, approximately 40% of the number of teachers who commence teaching leave the profession (see Table B1 in Appendix B for more complete data).

Table 3: Number of TF teachers who entered and left teaching by year

	2010/11		2011/12		2012/13		2013/14		2014/15	
	Entered	Left	Entered	Left	Entered	Left	Entered	Left	Entered	Left
Total	550	229	754	312	976	401	1201	488	1370	530
Left as % of entered	41.6%		41.4%		41.1%		40.6%		38.7%	

Source: Parliament UK (2015)

An evaluation of the TF pilot in Wales by Estyn (the Inspectorate for Education and Training in Wales; Estyn 2016) found that of the 25 participants in the 2013-14 academic year cohort, only 8 (or 32%) were teaching in Wales at the end of the two-year programme. A further 10 (or 40% of the commencing cohort) were in teaching posts outside of Wales (i.e. England). See Table B2 in Appendix B.

In the similar Teach for America programme, retention of participants in the longer term is widely viewed to be much lower than for teachers who have been educated via more traditional pathways, although the degree to which this occurs varies depending on the location and the study. One study – the results are reproduced in Table B3 in Appendix B – indicates that by their fourth year of teaching, more than half of TFA Corps members had left the profession, with all but a quarter gone by the seventh year (Donaldson & Johnson 2011). The researchers in that study state that these retention rates are significantly lower than the estimated 50% for new teachers from traditional pathways across all schools (Donaldson & Johnson 2011; Smith & Ingersoll 2003). Elsewhere in the US, Henry et al. (2012) found that three-quarters of Teach for America teachers leave the profession before three years in comparison to 80% of in-state prepared teachers (following traditional pathways) stay in teaching three years after commencing.

In Australia, Weldon et al. (2013) report that nearly half (45%) of school principals (i.e. head teachers) in their evaluation of Teach for Australia would reconsider their participation in the scheme if all of the TFA Associates at their school left after the mandatory two years.

Teaching is considered by TF a temporary proposition and an intermediary step

The overarching aim of TF is not simply to produce quality teachers who can work to overcome social and educational inequality. As outlined in Appendix A, TF is marketed as method of developing leadership skills within its trainees. The programme it runs – rather than having reference to schooling, education or teaching – is entitled the Leadership Development Programme, and the second year of its training is focussed on this. The intent is to enable TF participants to move onto other sectors of society after their two-year stint as a teacher so as to pursue a type of social change through social entrepreneurship in the same mould as the TF organisation itself.

The relatively high attrition rate, then, is not simply an unfortunate and unforeseen side effect, but it is a fundamental part of the programme itself. Teach First, as the name suggests, is designed to be a stepping stone to other careers where graduates can apply their 'inspiring leadership' skills to other ventures (Smart et al. 2009). Other than the 2-year minimum teaching commitment, TF participants do not need to be committed to teaching *per se*, and the persuasive rhetoric of the scheme's public face is intended to attract graduates who would not have otherwise become teachers (Ellis et al. 2016; Smart et al. 2009), although that claim is not supported by the available evidence.

Rather than seen as a career, in TF teaching is recast as 'leadership development' for participants who are anticipated to go onto become part of an elite network of alumni and social entrepreneurs (Ellis et al. 2016). In this sense TF and their equivalents in other nations are more directly geared towards the success and advancement of their participants than they are concerned with lessening inequality and the students they teach. This also deprofessionalises teaching to a degree as it is not seen as a worthy end in itself but as a basis for other careers, as a prestigious item on a CV that helps to further career ambitions (Ellis et al. 2016).

Even though students' contexts are acknowledged rhetorically, the TF strategy to improve student attainment ignores how contextual issues mediate teacher effectiveness

The evidence on the overall effectiveness of TF (and its related *Teach for All* programmes) is mixed. While the TF organisation enthusiastically proclaims that its teachers increase student grades by up to 30%, the claims of other research are more measured. For example, while both Muijs et al. (2012) and Estyn (2016) found in separate studies an increase in student achievement in classes taught by TF teachers, they assert that this cannot be definitively attributed to TF. Such research acknowledges that there are many influences on students' performance in school and that correlation between the presence of TF and improved achievement does not demonstrate causality.

Muijs et al. (2012) found that a number of other in-school factors were necessary for TF teachers to be effective. These include 'support' from both the placement school and Teach First itself, and the critical mass of TF teachers at the school. Barriers identified as being detrimental to effective teaching include students' background and behaviour, and the extent of the 'challenging circumstances' of the school. (See Table B4 in Appendix B for more details.)

There is a long history in education research debunking claims of teacher effectiveness that reduce the complex combinations of social influences on student performance (such as the long-abandoned 'process-product' model; e.g. see Garrison & Macmillan 1984). In more recent times, the broader research on teacher effectiveness and school effectiveness also shows that there are a number of other out-of-school ('context') influences on student achievement that are ignored or downplayed in research that attributes a direct causal relationship between what teachers do and student achievement (e.g. Ellis et al. 2016; Priestly et al. 2016; Skourdoumbis 2013; Thrupp & Lupton 2006). This perspective asserts that teacher effectiveness models are not very good at 'controlling for' out-of-school 'factors' such as socioeconomic status or family background (Berliner 2013). Furthermore, there is research that argues that teachers are not the only or largest influence on students *in toto* (including out-of-school influences) but also that classroom dynamics are too complex to attribute to student performance solely to teachers (Berliner 2014). For scholars like David Berliner, the simple linear, causal *Teacher -> Student* relationship that is assumed in much policy and practice (including TF) is reciprocal and more closely resembles *Teacher <-> Student* (Berliner 2014). Student achievement, while school-based, is not necessarily entirety school-caused (Thrupp & Lupton 2006).

In short, the premise that the teacher is capable of making *the* difference to student achievement, rather than simply *a* difference (Skourdoumbis 2014), which is advocated by TF, is a simplistic account of classroom learning in its disregard for external, out-of-school influences. That is, student performance can never be directly or exclusively attributed to teacher performance. Claims made by TF and some evaluations of TF and related programmes (e.g. Muijs et al. 2010; Hutchings et al. 2006; Weldon et al. 2013) that the presence of TF teachers can improve GCSE results by 30% need to be considered in light of the

scholarly literature that questions the presumed causal relationship between effective teaching and student achievement (Priestly et al. 2015).

The ideal TF student is middle class and from a Russell Group university while their students are from disadvantaged areas and thus attributed with deficits

One of TF's selling points is that it can provide teachers to schools in 'challenging circumstances' (i.e. high amounts of deprivation) that would otherwise have difficulty in attracting teachers.[2] Although TF teachers are committed to this task, the vast majority of them do not come from such backgrounds. Around 75% of TF participants are graduates from the elite Russell Group of universities (Hill 2012) and come from middle-class backgrounds (Smart et al. 2009).

The literature suggests that TF as an organisation and its teachers are not from the same social backgrounds as the pupils whose lives they hope to improve. They are "other people's children" (Ellis et al. 2016). The TF's website and marketing material employs a deficit rhetoric, portraying schools from disadvantaged backgrounds as suffering a significant and long-standing problem that only the sort of motivated and high-calibre teachers that TF produces are able to fix. TF is represented as the saviour coming to the rescue of deprived children. As Ellis et al. observe, the TF conception of the student in working-class schools:

> is built on want, need and ultimately deficit. There is no detail of what these sorts of schools and students have to offer; they are positioned as a long-standing problem in need of 'high calibre, passionate individuals to support schools in delivering the best education for pupils'! (Ellis et al. 2016, p. 68)

Indeed, one of the stated aims of TF is to 'raise' aspirations and support 'high' aspirations among students of disadvantaged backgrounds. The critical literature on this matter is clear in at least four respects: 1) many young people from deprived backgrounds *do* aspire to go to higher education (e.g. Bowen & Doughney 2010); 2) maintaining that such students have low or no aspirations is based on a deficit understanding of these communities, that they have nothing to contribute to society; 3) a framework of 'low' and 'high' aspirations marginalises some preferred futures and emphasises others; 4) aspirations are shaped in the context of social life and are not purely individual traits that can be changed by teachers (Appadurai 2004).

Research in Australia has also shown that when new and student-teachers are from middle-class and higher socioeconomic backgrounds they often hold deficit views of pupils in disadvantaged schools (e.g. Mills 2009, 2013). Teachers who have little experience of disadvantage and deprivation often do not view their students as capable or bringing anything of value of their own to the classroom. While such criticism can be levelled at many teachers, Estyn (2016) has shown that TF teachers are particularly weak in this respect. In contrast, US researchers argue the need to incorporate these students' own values, experiences and knowledge into school work and show that this is an effective way of overcoming disadvantage in the longer term (e.g. Moll et al. 1992; Gonzáles 2005).

[2] This has less purchase in Scotland, which has difficulty in recruiting particular kinds of teachers but not typically those who are willing to work in areas of multiple deprivation.

TF teachers tend to engage in restricted pedagogical approaches

Research into Teach First and School Direct has found that these programmes tend to result in certain pedagogic approaches. For example, Muijs et al. (2012) note that TF teachers tend to teach in the most common teaching styles in England, namely whole-of-class lessons and Direct Instruction models. Muijs et al. (2012) similarly note that these restricted pedagogical approaches may result in a lack of due attention to metacognitive instruction and higher order thinking skills.

Similarly Brown et al. (2016) found that School Direct places a strong emphasis on the practical dimensions of teaching, while downplaying the academic and theoretical contributions of universities. This is part of a "turn to the practical" (Furlong & Lawn 2011, p. 6) observed in English teacher education in which teaching is considered to be a craft rather than an intellectual endeavour; and teacher education becomes teacher *training* taking on a technicist form akin to an apprenticeship where much is learned on the job (Brown et al. 2016). This is in marked contrast with Graham Donaldson's 2011 warning that existing undergraduate TE programs in Scotland have become "too narrowly vocational", leading to "an over emphasis on technical and craft skills at the expense of broader and more academically challenging areas of study" (Donaldson 2011, p. 88). Brown et al. (2016) have also found that pedagogical and theoretical knowledge tends to be squeezed out in School Direct in favour of practical teaching experience.

Such approaches also constrain teacher agency and limit the role of teachers in the co-construction of curriculum (Donaldson 2010; Priestly et al. 2015). Importantly, this is counter to the aims of Scotland's *Curriculum for Excellence,* which intends to be inclusive of teachers and their professional judgement (Scottish Executive 2006).

Bibliography of international research on Teach First and its sister/parent organisations

Australia

Bowden, M. P., & Doughney, J. (2010). Socio-economic status, cultural diversity and the aspirations of secondary students in the Western Suburbs of Melbourne, Australia. *Higher Education, 59*(1), 115-129.

Hattie, J. (2005). *What is the Nature of Evidence that Makes a Difference to Learning?* Australian Council for Educational Research, viewed 4 May 2015, http://research.acer.edu.au/research_conference_2005/7/

Mills, C. (2009). Making sense of pre-service teachers' dispositions towards social justice: can teacher education make a difference? *Critical Studies in Education, 50*(3), 277-288.

Mills, C. (2013). Developing pedagogies in pre-service teachers to cater for diversity: Challenges and ways forward in initial teacher education. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning, 8*(3), 219-228.

Scott, C., Weldon, P., & Dinham, S. (2010). *Teach for Australia Pathway: Evaluation Report Phase 1 of 3 (April-July 2010)*. Camberwell, Victoria: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Skourdoumbis, A. (2012). Teach for Australia (TFA): can it overcome educational disadvantage? *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 32*(3), 305-315.

Skourdoumbis, A. (2013). The (mis)identification of ineffective classroom teaching practice: critical interrogations of classroom teacher effectiveness research. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(4), 350-362.

Skourdoumbis, A. (2014). Teacher Effectiveness: Making *The* Difference to Student Achievement? *British Journal of Educational Studies, 62*(2), 111-126.

Skourdoumbis, A. & Gale, T. (2013) Classroom teacher effectiveness research: A conceptual critique. *British Educational Research Journal*, *39*(5), 892-906.

Weldon, P., McKenzie, P., Kleinhenz, E., & Reid, K. (2012). *Teach for Australia Pathway: Evaluation Report Phase 2 of 3*. Camberwell, Victoria: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Weldon, P., McKenzie, P., Kleinhenz, E., & Reid, K. (2013). *Teach for Australia Pathway: Evaluation Report Phase 3 of 3*. Camberwell, Victoria: Australian Council for Educational Research.

England

Allen, R., & Allnutt, J. (2013). *Matched panel data estimates of the impact of Teach First on school and departmental performance*. DoQSS Working Paper No. 13-11. London: Institute of Education.

Bassey, M. (2016). Guest post: School-led teacher training compared to university teacher education. *Schools Improvement*, 3 March 2016. Accessed 24 March 2015, http://schoolsimprovement.net/guest-post-school-led-teacher-training-compared-to-university-teacher-education/

Brown, T., Rowley, H., & Smith, K. (2015). Sliding subject positions: knowledge and teacher educators. *British Educational Research Journal*. doi:10.1002/berj.3203

Brown, T., Rowley, H., & Smith, K. (2016). *The beginnings of school led teacher training: New challenges for university teacher education: School Direct Research Project Final Report*. Manchester: Manchester Metropolitan University. http://www.esri.mmu.ac.uk/resgroups/schooldirect.pdf

Charity Commission (2016). *Charity overview: 1098294 – Teach First*. Accessed 17 March 2016, from http://apps.charitycommission.gov.uk/Showcharity/RegisterOfCharities/CharityWithPartB.aspx?RegisteredCharityNumber=1098294&SubsidiaryNumber=0

Department for Education (England) [DfE]. (2010). *The Importance of Teaching: The Schools White Paper, 2010*. London: The Stationery Office.

Department for Education [DfE] (2011). *A profile of teachers in England from the 2010 School Workforce Census*. Department for Education.

Department for Education [DfE] (2012). *Teach first to recruit more top graduates*. Accessed 17 March 2016, https://www.gov.uk/government/news/teach-first-to-recruit-more-top-graduates

Exley, S. (2014). Think tanks and policy networks in English education. In M. Hill (Ed.), *Studying Public Policy: An International Approach* (pp. 180-190). Bristol: Policy Press.

Hill, R. (2012). *Teach First: Ten Years of Impact*. London: Teach First.

Hutchings, M., Maylor, U., Mendick, H., Menter, I., & Smart, S. (2006). *An evaluation of innovative approaches to teacher training on the Teach First programme: Final report to the Training and Development Agency for Schools*. London: Institute for Policy Studies in Education.

Lupton, R. (2005). Social justice and school improvement: improving the quality of schooling in the poorest neighbourhoods. *British Educational Research Journal, 31*(5), 589-604.

Parliament UK. (2015). *Teachers: Labour Turnover: Written question – 853*. Access 24 March 2014, http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2015-06-02/853/

Muijs, D., Chapman, C., & Armstrong, P. (2012). Teach First: Pedagogy and outcomes. The impact of an alternative certification programme. *Journal for Educational Research Online, 4*(2), 29-64.

Muijs, D., Chapman, C., Collins, A., & Armstrong, P. (2010). *Maximum Impact Evaluation: The Impact of Teach First teachers in schools.* Manchester: The University of Manchester.

Ofsted. (2008). *Rising to the challenge: a review of Teach First initial teacher training programme*. London: Ofsted.

Smart, S., Hutchings, M., Maylor, U., Mendick, H., & Menter, I. (2009). Processes of middle-class reproduction in a graduate employment scheme. *Journal of Education and Work, 22*(1), 35-53

Sutton Trust. (2015). *Developing Teachers. Improving Professional Development for Teachers*. Accessed 18 March 2016. http://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/DEVELOPING_TEACHERS-FINAL.pdf

Teach First [TF] (date?). *Our impact.* http://www.teachfirst.org.uk/sites/default/files/press/pdf/impact%20doc%20WEB.pdf

Teach First. (2015). *2012/13 Annual Review*. London: Teach First.

Teach First. (2015). *Trustees' annual report & accounts for the year ended 31 August 2015*. London: Teach First.

Thrupp, M., & Lupton, R. (2006). Taking School Contexts More Seriously: The Social Justice Challenge. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 54*(3), 308-328.

International &/or comparative

Appadurai, A. (2004). The Capacity to Aspire: Culture and the Terms of Recognition. In V. Rao & M. Walton (Eds.), *Culture and Public Action* (pp. 59-84). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Beauchamp, G., Clarke, L., Hulme, M., & Murray, J. (2015). Teacher education in the United Kingdom post devolution: convergences and divergences. *Oxford Review of Education, 41*(2), 154-170.

Crowley, C. B. (2016). Teach For/Future China and the politics of alternative teacher certification programs in China. In L. Lim & M. W. Apple (eds.), *The Strong State and Curricular Reform: Assessing the Politics and Possibilities of Educational Change in Asia* (pp. 131-147). New York: Routledge.

Ellis, V., Maguire, M., Trippestad, T. A., Liu, Y., Yang, X., & Zeichner, K. (2016). Teaching other people's children, elsewhere, for a while: the rhetoric of a travelling educational reform. *Journal of Education Policy, 31*(1), 60-80.

Dupriez, V., Delvaux, B., & Lothaire, S. (2016). Teacher shortage and attrition: Why do they leave? *British*

Educational Research Journal, 42(1), 21-39.

McConney, A., Price, A., & Woods-McConney, A. (2012). *Fast track teacher education: A review of the research literature on Teach For All schemes.* Perth: Murdoch University, Centre for Learning, Change and Development.

Rice, S., Volkoff, V., & Dulfer, N. (2015). *Teach For/Teach First* Candidates: What Conclusions Do They Draw from Their Time in Teaching? *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 21*(5), 497-513.

Sim, C. (2010). *A Review of Research on the 'Teach for' Programs Based in the USA, UK, and Other Countries (Teach for All) Completed for the Queensland College of Teachers*. Mount Gravatt, Queensland: Griffith University. Accessed 24 March 2016 https://www.qct.edu.au/PDF/Publications/Research/Teach_For.pdf

Scotland

Donaldson, G. (2011). *Teaching Scotland's Future: Report of a review of teacher education in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Menter, I., & Hulme, M. (2011). Teacher education reform in Scotland: national and global influences. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 37*(4), 387-397.

Menter, I., Hulme, M., Elliot, D., Lewin, J., with, Baumfield, V., Britton, A., Carroll M., Livingston, K., McCulloch, M., McQueen, I., Patrick, F., and Townsend, T. (2010). *Literature Review on Teacher Education in the 21st Century*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Priestley, M., Biesta, G. J. J., & Robinson, S. (2015). *Teacher Agency: An Ecological Approach*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Scottish Executive. (2006). *A curriculum for excellence: progress and proposals*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Government. (2011). *Continuing to build excellence in teaching – The Scottish Government's response to Teaching Scotland's Future*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government. http://www.gov.scot/Resource/Doc/920/0114570.pdf

United States

Berliner, D. C. (2013). Problems with Value-Added Evaluations of Teachers? Let Me Count the Ways! *The Teacher Educator*, *48*(4), 235-243.

Berliner, D. C. (2014). Exogenous Variables and Value-Added Assessments: A Fatal Flaw. *Teachers College Record, 116*(1), 1-31.

Blandford, S. (2008). Teach First: From McKinsey to the Classroom. *Perspectives in Education, 26*(2), 95-104.

Blumenreich, M., & Gupta, A. (2015). The globalization of Teach for America: An analysis of the institutional discourses of Teach for America and Teach for India within local contexts. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 48*(May), 87-96.

Brewer, T. J. (2014). Accelerated Burnout: How Teach For America's Academic Impact Model and Theoretical Culture of Accountability Can Foster Disillusionment Among its Corps Members. *Educational Studies, 50*(3), 246-263.

Cann, C. N. (2015). What School Movies and *TFA* Teach Us About Who Should Teach Urban Youth: Dominant Narratives as Public Pedagogy. *Urban Education, 50*(3), 288-315.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Villegas, A. M. (2015). Framing Teacher Preparation Research: An Overview of the Field, Part 1. *Journal of Teacher Education, 66*(1), 7-20.

Darling-Hammond, L., Holtzman, D. J., Gatlin, S. J., & Vasquez Heilig, J. (2005). Does Teacher Preparation Matter? Evidence about Teacher Certification, Teach for America, and Teacher Effectiveness. *Education Policy*

Analysis Archives, 13(42), 1-48.

Donaldson, M. L., & Johnson, S. M. (2010). The Price of Misassignment: The Role of Teaching Assignments in Teach For America Teachers' Exit From Low-Income Schools and the Teaching Profession. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 32*(2), 299-323.

Donaldson, M. L., & Johnson, S. M. (2011). Teach for America Teachers: *How Long do They Teach? Why do They Leave? Phi Delta Kappan, 93*(2), 47-51.

Enterline, S., Cochran-Smith, M., Ludlow, L. H., & Mitescu, E. (2008). Learning to Teach for Social Justice: Measuring Change in the Beliefs of Teacher Candidates. *The New Educator, 4*(4), 267-290.

Garrison, J. W., & Macmillan, C. J. B. (1984). A Philosophical Critique of Process-Product Research on Teaching. *Educational Theory, 34*(3), 255-274.

Gonzáles, N. (2005). Beyond culture: the hybridity of funds of knowledge. In N. Gonzáles, L. C. Moll & C. Amanti (Eds.), *Funds of knowledge: theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms* (pp. 29-46). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gottfried, M. A., & Straubhaar, R. (2015). The perceived role of the Teach For America program on teachers' long-term career aspirations. *Educational Studies, 41*(5), 481-498.

Hansen, M., Backes, B., & Brady, V. (2016). Teacher Attrition and Mobility During the Teach for America Clustering Strategy in Miami-Dade County Public Schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. doi:10.3102/0162373716638441

Heineke, A. J., Mazza, B. S., & Tichnor-Wagner, A. (2014). After the Two-Year Commitment: A Quantitative and Qualitative Inquiry of Teach For America Teacher Retention and Attrition. *Urban Education, 49*(7), 750-782.

Hellig, J. V., & Jez, S. J. (2010). *Teach for America: A Review of the Evidence*. Boulder, CO and Tempe, AZ: Education and the Public Interest Center and Education Policy Research Unit.

Henry, G. T., Bastian, K. C., & Smith, A. A. (2012). Scholarships to Recruit the "Best and Brightest" Into Teaching: Who Is Recruited, Where Do They Teach, How Effective Are They, and How Long Do They Stay? *Educational Researcher, 41*(3), 83-92.

Hramiak, A. (2015). Applying the framework for culturally responsive teaching to explore the adaptations that teach first beginning teachers use to meet the needs of their pupils in school. *Cogent Education, 2*(1), 1108950.

Irizarry, J., & Donaldson, M. L. (2012). Teach for América: The Latinization of U.S. Schools and the Critical Shortage of Latina/o Teachers. *American Educational Research Journal, 49*(1), 155-194.

Kretchmar, K., Sondel, B., & Ferrare, J. J. (2014). Mapping the terrain: Teach For America, charter school reform, and corporate sponsorship. *Journal of Education Policy, 29*(6), 742-759.

Kretchmar, K., Sondel, B., & Ferrare, J. J. (2016). The Power of the Network: Teach For America's Impact on the Deregulation of Teacher Education. *Educational Policy*. doi:10.1177/0895904816637687

Labaree, D. (2010). Teach for America and teacher ed: heads they win, tails we lose. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*, 48-55.

Lincove, J. A., Osborne, C., Mills, N., & Bellows, L. (2015). Teacher Preparation for Profit or Prestige: Analysis of a Diverse Market for Teacher Preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education, 66*(5), 415-434.

Little, J. W., & Bartlett, L. (2010). The Teacher Workforce and Problems of Educational Equity. *Review of Research in Education, 34*(1), 285-328.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice, 31*(2), 132-141.

Pallas, A. M., & Buckley, C. K. (2012). *Thoughts on Leaving: An Exploration of Why New York City Middle School Teachers Consider Leaving Their Classrooms*. New York: Research Alliance for New York City Schools.

Parsons, S. A., Malloy, J. A., Vaughn, M., & La Croix, L. (2014). A Longitudinal Study of Literacy Teacher Visioning: Traditional Program Graduates and Teach For America Corps Members. *Literacy Research and Instruction,*

53(2), 134-161.

Schneider, J. (2014). Rhetoric and practice in pre-service teacher education: the case of Teach For America. *Journal of Education Policy, 29*(4), 425-442.

Smith, T., & Ingersoll, R. (2004). Reducing teacher turnover: What are the components of effective induction? *American Educational Research Journal*, *41*(3), 681–714.

Sondel, B. (2015). Raising Citizens or Raising Test Scores? Teach For America, "No Excuses" Charters, and the Development of the Neoliberal Citizen. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 43*(3), 289-313.

Sondel, B., Kretchmar, K., & Ferrare, J. F. (2015). Mapping the Education Entrepreneurial Network: Teach for America, Charter School Reform, and Corporate Sponsorship. In W. Au & J. F. Ferrare (Eds.), *Mapping Corporate Education Reform: Power and Policy Networks in the Neoliberal State* (pp. 65-85). New York and London: Routledge.

Stanfield, J., & Cremin, H. (2013). Importing control in Initial Teacher Training: theorizing the construction of specific habitus in recent proposals for induction into teaching. *Journal of Education Policy, 28*(1), 21-37.

Straubhaar, R., & Gottfried, M. (2014). Who Joins Teach For America and Why? Insights Into the "Typical" Recruit in an Urban School District. *Education and Urban Society*.

Tatel, E. S. (1999). Teaching in under-resourced schools: The teach for America example. *Theory Into Practice, 38*(1), 37-45. doi:10.1080/00405849909543829

Wales

Arad Research. (2015). *An Evaluation of the delivery of the Teach First Leadership Development Programme Cymru (Wales)*. Cardiff: Arad Research.

Estyn (2016). *The impact of the Additional Training Graduate Programme (Teach First) in Wales*. Cardiff: Estyn.

Appendix A: What is *Teach First*?

Overview

Teach First (TF) is a graduate recruiter that provides an alternative pathway to a teaching degree to those who may not have otherwise considered teacher. TF is a registered charity and social philanthropic organisation established in 2002 by entrepreneur Brett Wigdortz. It has an annual income to August 2015 of £60.6m, and employs 490 staff with almost 1,100 volunteers (Charity Commission 2016). TF's stated mission is to reduce educational inequality in particular addressing achievement gaps between schools of high and low socioeconomic background. It has a focus on both primary and secondary schooling as well as post-school employment and training, and university graduation rates. TF outlines 5 broad aspirations[3]:

1. Narrow the gap in literacy and numeracy at primary school
2. Narrow the gap in GCSE attainment at secondary school
3. Ensure young people develop key strengths, including resilience and wellbeing, to support high aspirations
4. Narrow the gap in the proportion of young people taking part in further education or employment-based training after finishing their GCSEs
5. Narrow the gap in university graduation, including from the 25% most selective universities, by 8%

What training is offered by Teach First?

Training of TF participants consists of a two-year Leadership Development Programme (LDP) which is comprised of:

- *An initial Summer Institute* – an intensive 6-week period of immersion into the theory and practice of teaching, as well as curriculum knowledge and classroom management. This is provided by partner universities that have teacher training. The summer intensive also involves spending time with local schools (teachers and pupils) and communities to come to grips with local contexts and to observe classroom teaching. All participants are allocated a mentor. The Summer Institute is touted as providing participants with the skills needed to enter classrooms as beginning teachers.[4]
- *A School Placement* at a school in 'challenging circumstances'. This occurs after the completion of the Summer Institute. Schools are in partnership with TF and located all across England and Wales.[5] Participants are monitored and supported by their school, the Regional Training Provider and Teach First. Participants begin as unqualified teachers attaining Qualified Teacher Status by year's end.[6] In the second year, participants are qualified teachers with a PGCE and/or working towards a Masters Degree. While on placement, participants have an 80% teachers load while studying towards their teaching qualification on a part-time basis. They are employed teachers and paid accordingly.[7]
- *A teaching qualification*, normally a *Postgraduate Certificate of Education (PGCE)* – this is attained after the end of the first year. Participants are given written assignments and are required to complete a weekly journal of written reflections. There is a final external assessment that, along with a file of evidence of achievement, progress and reflection made up of assignments, count

[3] https://www.teachfirst.org.uk/why-we-exist/what-were-calling
[4] https://graduates.teachfirst.org.uk/leadership-development-programme/training/summer-institute
[5] https://graduates.teachfirst.org.uk/leadership-development-programme/where-you-could-work
[6] https://graduates.teachfirst.org.uk/leadership-development-programme/training/teaching-qualification
[7] https://graduates.teachfirst.org.uk/faqs

towards the PGCE.[8] Participants also have the option of doing further study and completing a *Masters in Education*, *Educational Leadership*, or *Educational Practice*. Five universities across England currently offer these degrees which are identified by the suffix 'Teach First' or 'Teach First Leadership'. Masters degrees are an additional two years of study, and begin in the second year of the TF programme.[9]

- *Leadership Development* – the Teach First programme as a whole is branded as a Leadership Development Programme. In the second year of TF, participants are instructed in how to develop their leadership skills in the classroom and beyond. Leadership in this context means inspiring, motivating and engaging students, and helping them to 'raise' their aspirations, achievement and expand their opportunities. These are skills that TF see as part and parcel of quality teaching. Leadership skills are also promoted by TF as being crucial to participants' careers after they complete their 2 years of TF.[10] Leadership skills and experience are the central goal here with teaching in disadvantaged schools being one of the vehicles to foster skills among participants with a view to employing them in other sectors later on.

All participants of TF become Teach First Ambassadors when they finish their two year commitment. Many stay in teaching, but close to half of TF alumni go onto other ventures, sometimes attaining leadership positions within teaching, while others go onto social entrepreneurial projects. TF boasts about their large and growing network of Ambassadors who are well positioned to achieve social change.

[8] https://graduates.teachfirst.org.uk/leadership-development-programme/training/teaching-qualification, https://www.teachfirst.org.uk/what-we-do/developing-leaders-schools-0/training-and-supporting-new-teachers
[9] https://graduates.teachfirst.org.uk/leadership-development-programme/training/masters
[10] https://graduates.teachfirst.org.uk/leadership-development-programme/training/leadership-development and https://graduates.teachfirst.org.uk/faqs

Appendix B: Detailed statistics

Table B1: Number of TF teachers who entered and left teaching by year and subject area

	2010/11		2011/12		2012/13		2013/14		2014/15	
	Entered	Left	Entered	Left	Entered	Left	Entered	Left	Entered	Left
Art	3	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	1
Business Studies	24	10	21	9	12	7	14	14	14	7
Citizenship	25	18	9	9	6	16	10	11	0	8
Design and Technology	3	1	10	4	5	3	6	6	8	3
English	160	49	194	69	222	99	255	103	302	120
Geography	19	9	15	8	26	14	44	13	46	13
History	23	12	33	16	39	13	47	20	53	22
ICT	12	8	15	7	18	8	15	10	10	9
Maths	125	40	172	66	187	88	262	115	217	107
MFL	33	14	45	12	76	22	81	32	86	43
Music	7	8	14	3	13	4	13	8	12	4
Primary	18	5	81	28	170	26	226	67	344	94
Primary EYFS	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	39	3
RE	14	9	18	12	15	14	18	5	18	9
Science	84	40	127	64	187	84	194	84	221	87
Unknown	0	4	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0
Total	**550**	**229**	**754**	**312**	**976**	**401**	**1201**	**488**	**1370**	**530**
Left as % of entered	**41.6%**		**41.4%**		**41.1%**		**40.6%**		**38.7%**	

Source: Parliament UK (2015)

Table B2: TF Cymru teacher destinations, 2013-14 academic year intake

	Number	%
Participants who achieved QTS	25	100%
Participants who completed Year 2 of the programme	22	88%
Participants teaching in Wales in September 2015	8	32%
Participants in teaching posts outside Wales in September 2015	10	40%
Participants seeking teaching posts in September 2015	<5	-
Participants in employment other than teaching in September 2015	<5	-

Source: Estyn 2016, p. 9

Table B3: Retention Rates of Teach for America Teachers in their Schools and in Teaching

Year	Continued teaching in initial school	Continued teaching in initial school or any other public school
2	90.1%	94.8%
3	43.6%	60.5%
4	22.5%	44.6%
5	14.8%	35.5%
6	8.6%	27.8%
7	5.2%	23.9%

Source: Donaldson & Johnson 2011, p. 49

Table B4: Facilitators and barriers to TF effectiveness (% of coding of interviews with TF teachers)

Facilitators	%	Barriers	%
Critical mass of Teach First teachers in school	25.7	**Adaptation period**	21.8
In-school support	16.5	**Lack of in-school support**	21.4
Support from Teach First	9.8	**Challenging circumstances of school**	18.6
Clear and consistent school policies	9.0	**Pupils' social background**	10.3
Freedom to take initiatives	8.3	**Poor pupil behaviour**	9.5
Two-year term	7.6		
Good relationships in school	6.6		

Source: Muijs et al. 2012, p. 63