

**In partnership, Teach First NZ and The University of Auckland will this year launch a new initiative aimed at reducing educational disparities. We respond here to *Fast-track teacher education*, a report commissioned by the Post Primary Teachers' Association.**

*'...the evidence about fast track [Teach For All]-prepared teachers seems positive...there is little evidence to suggest or conclude that [Teach For All] teachers are systematically less effective in fostering or advancing student learning in comparison to their otherwise prepared peers, either novice or experienced. In fact, a clear majority of the available evidence suggests an advantage for [Teach For All] teachers, particularly in the areas of Science and Mathematics.'*  
(McConney et. al, 2012; Murdoch University report commissioned by PPTA, p31.)

In May 2011 the New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association (PPTA) commissioned<sup>1</sup> Murdoch University in Perth to conduct an extensive literature review of overseas programmes affiliated with Teach For All. Teach First NZ and The University of Auckland welcome the completed report that was published last month<sup>2</sup>, and are pleased to be able to offer our response to what we believe is a generally well-balanced literature review. We particularly welcome the PPTA's initiative in taking responsibility for commissioning such a report on behalf of the profession in New Zealand.

The report presents both the positive aspects and some of the criticisms of Teach For All programmes. Positive aspects include the *'selective recruitment of highly able university graduates into teaching and public education more generally, and apparently healthy relationships with prestigious university partners in the UK and Australia. Perhaps most critically, the few well-designed, larger-scale studies that have been conducted to date, on balance, seem to demonstrate that [Teach For All]-prepared teachers are at least as effective in fostering student learning as compared to their traditionally-prepared colleagues, and perhaps more so in subjects like mathematics and science'* (pvii).

The report also points to some of the criticism that 'fast-track teacher education' programmes have received, in relation to recruitment, programme and teacher effectiveness, retention, impact on traditional teacher education, and relationships with philanthropists and teacher unions. Teach First NZ and The University of Auckland wish to comment on each of these areas, and offer some general thoughts for interested readers. Our comments are organised to mirror the sections of the Murdoch report.

## **Recruitment and selection**

The Murdoch report notes that *'[Teach For All] programmes have used innovative marketing and recruitment strategies with a particular emphasis on attracting top students from elite universities – a previously untapped market for [initial teacher education] programmes'*. Teach First (UK), for example, is now the largest recruiter of Oxford and Cambridge graduates and is 7<sup>th</sup> on The Times Top 100 Graduate Employers list, ahead of many of the well-known corporate names. In 2011 the programme received over 5,000 applications for 700 places.

Teach For All programmes also aim to attract diverse groups of graduates. While 12% of all final year students at Ivy League universities applied to Teach For America in 2011, a significant number from

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.ppta.org.nz/index.php/resources/media/1790-teach-first-lit-rev>

<sup>2</sup> 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.  
[http://www.ppta.org.nz/index.php/resources/publications/doc\\_download/1331-fast-track-teacher-education-a-review-of-the-research-literature-on-teach-for-all-schemes](http://www.ppta.org.nz/index.php/resources/publications/doc_download/1331-fast-track-teacher-education-a-review-of-the-research-literature-on-teach-for-all-schemes)

historically black universities applied, including one in four at Spelman College and one in ten at Howard University. In 2011 Teach For America received 48,000 applications for around 5,000 places, with nearly one-third of incoming participants previously receiving Pell Grants<sup>3</sup> and one-third being people of colour<sup>4</sup>.

We believe that in New Zealand, a country with a rapidly changing demographic (particularly in Auckland), there is a real need to broaden and diversify the pool of people from which teachers are recruited. We are also looking to respond to the need for a greater proportion of male, Māori and Pasifika graduates, who are significantly underrepresented in a workforce that is serving an increasingly diverse school student population. Employment/field/school-based teacher education, where participants work in schools during their programme, has been shown to attract top graduates, despite enticements of employment offers from leading businesses, corporations or other agencies.

Teach First NZ has also developed a rigorous selection process. We look for candidates with strong university grades, and screen applicants during a full assessment day for ten competencies including resilience, problem solving, leadership, and self-reflection. Within New Zealand's context we recognise the potential dangers in a 'missionary model' programme (p19), and so at selection candidates must also demonstrate humility, respect, empathy, an understanding of Māori and Pasifika cultures and peoples, and a belief that a child's educational potential is not limited by their socioeconomic background or ethnicity.

### **Effectiveness of Teach For All programmes**

Teach First NZ and The University of Auckland welcome the Murdoch report's findings, which, *'on balance, seem to demonstrate that [Teach For All]-prepared teachers are at least as effective in fostering student learning as compared to their traditionally-prepared colleagues, and perhaps more so in subjects like mathematics and science' (pvii)*. While some evidence is referenced in the Murdoch study, we would like to highlight further findings from three key reports.

Firstly, many of the findings of the most recent and most extensive evaluation of the Teach First (UK) programme, conducted by Ofsted<sup>5</sup> in 2011<sup>6</sup>, were not included. This evaluation of the Teach First programme awarded the highest possible grade of 'Outstanding' in all eleven areas evaluated across all four regions that Teach First has operated in. The report stated that *'Teach First is very successful in meeting its commitment to address educational disadvantage by placing high-quality graduates into schools in challenging circumstances, and, through this, to working closely with the schools to improve student aspirations, experiences and achievement'*. Ofsted found that many participants are already having an impact in their schools, even in their first year, and many are 'well on their way to becoming inspirational teachers and some already are'. The report described how *'participants with strong personal characteristics and who display the required Teach First competencies, including the intellectual capacity and resilience to cope well with the high expectations and demands of the Teach First programme, are recruited. As a result, highly qualified and exceptional participants, many of whom might not otherwise have considered teaching, are given the encouragement and opportunity to enter the profession'*. The training they receive was found to be 'consistently high quality', while the leadership and management of the organisation was 'very strong'. Participants' *'understanding of how to teach a diverse range of students, of the complexities of teaching students with special educational needs and/or disabilities and of the wider role of the teacher is outstanding'*. As a suggested improvement, Ofsted recommends Teach First considers how to provide greater breadth of teaching experience for all participants across all regions.

Secondly, we would like to highlight findings from the University of Manchester report<sup>7</sup>. A key finding from the report was that participation in the Teach First programme by a school correlates positively with student achievement, with a between school variance in pupil performance at GCSE level

<sup>3</sup> Federal grants for university students in financial need

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.teachforamerica.org/sites/default/files/2010-11\\_Press\\_Kit\\_Updated\\_10.5.11.pdf](http://www.teachforamerica.org/sites/default/files/2010-11_Press_Kit_Updated_10.5.11.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> The British education inspectorate, similar to the Education Review Office in New Zealand

<sup>6</sup> Ofsted (2011) Teach First: *Initial Teacher Education Inspection Report*. London: Ofsted.

<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/provider/files/1720861/um/70270.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> Muijs, D., Chapman, C., Collins, A., & Armstrong, P. (2010). *Maximum Impact Evaluation: The Impact of Teach First teachers in schools*. Manchester: University of Manchester.

[http://www.teachfirst.org.uk/web/FILES/TeachFirstMaximumImpactEvaluationReport15980\\_833.pdf](http://www.teachfirst.org.uk/web/FILES/TeachFirstMaximumImpactEvaluationReport15980_833.pdf)

(General Certificate of Secondary Education) of between 20% and 40%. More recent government data show that schools that employ Teach First participants have seen their GCSE results improve at twice the rate of schools nationally (across England), between 2010 and 2011<sup>8</sup>. The Manchester report also presented findings from interviews with principals, and classroom observation data. A content analysis of interviews with principals and middle managers identified the following as the most common descriptors for Year 2 Teach First participants: 'listen and learn', 'enthusiastic', 'creative', 'hardworking', 'resilient', 'energetic' and 'adaptive'. The only negative keyword used by some was 'not creative'. Furthermore, Year 2 Teach First participants were found to have a stronger sense of self-efficacy about classroom management, motivation and increasing student understanding than experienced teachers, and on 32 of 45 classroom observation measures Year 2 Teach First participants out-performed experienced teachers. The study does show that Teach First participants did not perform as well as experienced teachers on four dimensions of effective practice: assisting families to help their children do well in school, the provision of feedback, fostering peer interaction and discussion, and providing learning options for students. On balance, however, no evidence was found to suggest that Teach First teachers harm the learning of the students they teach, and across a range of variables the evidence demonstrated that they add significant value to student learning.

Finally, an important study at secondary school level that was not included in the Murdoch report was conducted by The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 2010<sup>9</sup>. It found that Teach For America teachers outperform traditionally prepared teachers in 5 out of 9 subject areas (with no difference in the other 4), and with the strongest effects in mathematics and science. It was also noted that Teach For America teachers outperform UNC's undergraduate prepared teachers, 'in some cases by wide margins'.

## Retention

The Murdoch report notes one of the main criticisms of Teach For All programmes is that they require *'only a two-year teaching commitment, and the majority of [participants] leave at the end of that time' (piv)*, and that the proportion of those who leave the profession is much higher than in traditional teacher education programmes. The report concludes though that *'In recent evaluation studies, indicators of early attrition rates for [Teach For All]-prepared teachers appear similar to those prepared by other routes' (p33)*. The most recent data<sup>10</sup> from Teach First (UK), for example, show that in 2011, 53% of all Teach First (UK) alumni since the programme began in 2003 are still teaching, with a further 12% working in wider education. Over two-thirds of those completing their two year commitment work in schools for a third year. The recent Ofsted (2011) report notes that Teach First's retention is 'exceptionally high' and 'significantly above the national average'. In the United States, the most recent data<sup>11</sup> from Teach For America show that 67% of its entire alumni of 24,000 (since 1991) are working in wider education, with almost half of these as classroom teachers. Moreover, a 2010 study<sup>12</sup> not cited in the Murdoch report found that an estimated 61% of Teach For America participants remain in the teaching profession for more than two years, with 44% remaining in their placement schools beyond their initial two-year commitment.

The report also highlights a criticism that a two-year commitment is seen as too short by some. *'The relatively short duration of this [two-year] commitment means that hiring a [Teach For All] teacher is likely to have both overt and hidden costs for schools and students' (p33)*. While it is true that Teach For All programmes require a two-year teaching commitment, this is actually a longer initial commitment than traditional first-year teachers are required to make to their schools. In addition, for some New Zealand schools a two-year commitment is a significant improvement on transient patterns

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.teachfirst.org.uk/TFNews/TeachFirstpartnerschoolsimproveattwicethenationalrate30530.aspx>

<sup>9</sup> Henry, G. et al (2010). *Impacts of Teacher Preparation and Student Test Scores in North Carolina: Teacher Portals*. Carolina Institute for Public Policy: The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. [http://publicpolicy.unc.edu/research/Teacher Portals Teacher Preparation and Student Test Scores in North Carolina 2.pdf/at\\_download/file](http://publicpolicy.unc.edu/research/Teacher%20Portals%20Teacher%20Preparation%20and%20Student%20Test%20Scores%20in%20North%20Carolina%202.pdf/at_download/file)

<sup>10</sup> Training & Development Agency for Schools data (<http://www.tda.gov.uk>)

<sup>11</sup> [http://www.teachforamerica.org/sites/default/files/2010-11\\_Press\\_Kit\\_Updated\\_10.5.11.pdf](http://www.teachforamerica.org/sites/default/files/2010-11_Press_Kit_Updated_10.5.11.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> 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' in *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 32(2). [http://www.nctq.org/docs/Donaldson\\_Johnson.EEPA.pdf](http://www.nctq.org/docs/Donaldson_Johnson.EEPA.pdf)

that have been observed. Indeed filling a vacancy that might otherwise go unfilled<sup>13</sup> is of high value to both schools and students. It is also important to recognise that Teach For All programmes often aim to attract those graduates who may not have otherwise considered teaching. Many of these graduates, of course, remain in schools as highly successful teachers themselves, ultimately choosing to stay in the profession.

Finally, as graduates are increasingly mobile and seem unlikely to remain in one career for their whole lives, we believe it is an unrealistic expectation for all young teachers to commit their full working lives at the outset to classroom teaching. The Murdoch report identified that *'one of the key attractions for participants selecting Teach First [UK] was that they were able to keep their career options open'* (p16). In other professions such as law and accountancy it is not uncommon to change careers, sometimes frequently. Furthermore, during the consultation phase in the development of the Teach First NZ programme, a number of principals expressed endorsement of future Teach First NZ alumni working in other fields before then returning to a teaching career, bringing valuable and unique work experience. Schools value teachers who can be retained, but they also value those who have real experience beyond just teaching.

### **Impact on traditional teacher education**

Teach First NZ and The University of Auckland welcome the report's findings that Teach For All programmes in Australia and the UK have *'seemingly strong relationships with schools of education in leading universities and with school leaders where its teachers are placed'* (piv). Through a close working partnership model, Teach First NZ and The University of Auckland welcome opportunities to learn from each other and, as the Murdoch report notes, see such a partnership as a crucial element and an important strength to the programme.

The report also concluded that Teach For All programmes *'generally are not in direct competition for students with traditional university-based teacher education; if there is such an impact, it may be best characterised as "subtle"'* (p36). One additional study<sup>14</sup> from the United States showed that only 8% of Teach For America students had applied to a traditional programme – evidence that other programmes have the potential to create a different path and attract a different applicant.

To be clear, we support multiple pathways into teaching and we aim to attract into teaching those top graduates who may not otherwise have considered the profession. We want to make teaching a top graduate choice, and therefore make no apologies for striving to establish Teach First NZ as a prestigious programme – other teacher education programmes and the wider profession share similar goals. But we do not believe the Teach First NZ programme is the 'best' pathway, and we do not believe it should be the only pathway. Indeed just as children need to be taught differently in the classroom according to their own background, experiences and learning preferences, so should we be willing to prepare graduates in different and innovative ways to teach in the classroom. The University of Auckland's traditional secondary teaching programme will remain the University's predominant pathway into secondary teaching. That programme produces many fine graduates and it will continue to do so. This new and smaller pathway will enable the University to expand and diversify its provision to better meet the needs of the full range of New Zealand schools. We believe, therefore, the assertion of critics that Teach For All 'undermines, and could ultimately result in the demise of, traditional teacher education' (p36) greatly overstates the case. Teach First NZ does not claim to hold any specific expertise in teacher education and does not seek to 'educate' or 'train' teachers itself; rather through a carefully formed partnership with a highly regarded university it offers critical value in other areas under a wider remit that reaches beyond the preparation of effective teachers.

---

<sup>13</sup> At the start of the 2011 school year, there were over 100 unfilled secondary school vacancies and more than half of these had been re-advertised ('Monitoring Teacher Supply' <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/series/2519>)

<sup>14</sup> Hammerness, K. & Reininger, M. (2008). 'Who Goes into Early-Entry Programs?' In P. Grossman & S. Loeb (eds.) *Alternative Routes to Teaching: Mapping the New Landscape of Teacher Education*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Education Press, pp31-63 (see p55).

## Political philosophies and related relationships with philanthropic supporters

The Murdoch report highlights claims that Teach For All programmes encourage private interests to interfere with core 'public education'. It is important to note that in New Zealand's case, all teacher salaries and the core teacher education costs for the Teach First NZ programme are proposed to be funded by the Ministry of Education and the Tertiary Education Commission – there is no direct funding from the private sector. In fact, business and philanthropic support of the Teach First NZ Trust is supplementary, but necessary for the wider partnership and programme. This support helps fund recruitment, the selection and school placement process, complementary leadership development modules and an alumni programme. Furthermore, while public education is largely the responsibility of the state in New Zealand, this is not completely the case in teacher education. At present, both public and private institutions are responsible for preparing new teachers (universities and other private establishments) so the Teach First NZ programme does not change the status quo.

The Murdoch report also draws attention to claims that Teach For All programmes are affiliated with 'neoliberal'<sup>15</sup> agendas. While we cannot comment on behalf of other programmes, this is not the case with Teach First NZ and The University of Auckland. Teach First NZ is a non-partisan independent charitable trust, and is not attached to any political party nor does it hold political views. It has been initiated and is run out of the community sector, and is a not-for-profit organisation. As an aside, it is interesting to note that both Teach First (UK) and Teach For Australia were both founded under Labour governments.

The motives, too, of philanthropists and businesses that support Teach First NZ are unlikely to be affiliated with 'neoliberal' agendas. Businesses and philanthropists have supported public education for many years, and will continue to do so. Businesses look for highly-educated school-leavers as their future employees, and welcome the opportunity to support schools, as appropriate, in achieving this outcome.

Teach First NZ freely discloses the names of all its supporters on its website, and would like to point out that The Tindall Foundation is not one of its financial supporters, as suggested in the Murdoch report.

## Relationships with teacher associations and unions

The Murdoch report notes that in most cases, teacher unions in various countries support alternative teacher education programmes. However the authors also note that unions tend to consider some 'fast-track' programmes an 'assault on the professional status and standards of teaching' and oppose a '*minimalist and highly technicist approach to teacher education and the inherent assumptions that anyone who is bright and enthusiastic can teach*' (p41). The report also notes the views of the National Education Association (NEA), the largest labour union in the United States: '*The NEA recognises that there are and should be multiple pathways for entrance into the teaching profession and for attaining full licensure. The NEA believes, however, that alternative pathways must be equal to in rigour to traditional programmes and that every teacher must meet identical standards to receive professional teaching licence*' (p41). Teach First NZ and The University of Auckland acknowledge the potential for such programmes to be 'minimalist'. However, our proposed programme's duration is two-years and two-months in length, and is grounded in extensive local and international research, and contextualised to local circumstances and legislation. It aims to strengthen the status of the profession, not to demean, de-professionalise or de-skill. We do not believe that anyone who is 'bright and enthusiastic' can automatically teach, and have designed a rigorous selection process that demands much more than these traits alone. The programme must also go through the same approval and quality control processes as any other teacher education programme in New Zealand, and its graduates must meet exactly the same standards (Graduating Teacher Standards) as in all programmes.

Secondly, despite the comment that Teach For All participants may '*go on to drive neoliberal educational reform agendas, potentially including anti-union stances*' (p48), we are fully committed to

---

<sup>15</sup> Defined in the Murdoch report as a conservative, market-driven approach to social and economic policy

engaging with the PPTA union throughout the development and ongoing implementation of this programme. During the past year, we have met regularly with PPTA executive members and staff, to keep them informed about the Teach First NZ programme. Our discussions with the PPTA have been constructive; we have identified areas of clear common ground (for example, making teaching a top graduate choice), acknowledge our differences, support PPTA concerns about sufficient provision for mentoring and release time, and look forward to an ongoing and productive relationship. We have invited the PPTA to present membership opportunities to participants, during the summer Initial Intensive. It is interesting to note here that almost all Teach First (UK) participants take up these opportunities and are union members themselves.

Thirdly, we would like to highlight references about teacher perceptions of Teach For All participants, particularly in relation to any initial doubts. In the first evaluation<sup>16</sup> of the Teach For Australia programme, for example, it was found that *'All school personnel reported that initial scepticism tended to dissipate when staff met and worked with the [participants], the majority of whom had become accepted and respected in their schools' (p10)*.

Finally, we would like to note that the Teach First NZ programme has full endorsement and support from the Secondary Principals Association of New Zealand (SPANZ), the New Zealand School Trustees Association (NZSTA), many individual principals from a wide range of secondary schools, and Auckland education groups such as COMET. It is also important to note that Teach First NZ is a demand driven programme, and will only be made available to those principals who wish to participate.

## General remarks

Teach First NZ and The University of Auckland note that PPTA and Murdoch University have chosen to use the term 'fast-track teacher education' to frame their review. While we understand why the authors have used 'fast-track', we note that the term may carry connotations that are inconsistent with the programme we have developed. Firstly, it is important to point out that the six-week Initial Intensive residential is simply the initial part of the programme, designed to prepare participants to enter the classroom. During the following two years there is extensive ongoing support and education provided by both In-school mentors and University visiting lecturers, who regularly meet and observe participants in schools. Furthermore, participants return to university campus for mid-year and end-year intensives, and coursework continues throughout as participants work towards their Postgraduate Diploma in Teaching. The entire programme is therefore approximately two years and two months in length, more than double the length of traditional 10-month programmes. Secondly, it is important to note that face-to-face contact time with university staff before participants actually take up their teaching roles is similar to the face-to-face time delivered over traditional 10-month programmes. In other words, it may not be appropriate to compare 'fast-track' and 'traditional' programmes in terms of duration of weeks or months, but rather in terms of actual contact time with staff and the quality of that contact time. As Zeichner and Hutchinson (2008)<sup>17</sup> note, *'the choice between a traditional programme and an alternative route is not a choice between some professional preparation and no such preparation, but rather a decision about the timing and institutional context for teacher preparation and the mix of professional knowledge and skills to be acquired'*. The distribution of the *timing* of professional preparation in the Teach First NZ programme is front-loaded during the Initial Intensive and then maintained over a period of two-years, with an emphasis on selection, initial preparation, and ongoing support. The *institutional context* for the two years of the programme is provided largely within schools, rather than on a university campus.

The Murdoch report also seems to suggest that Teach For All 'runs' the programmes affiliated with it. For example, the second line of the report refers to 'schemes run by the organisation Teach For All', and it is stated that *'Teach For All teacher training schemes across the world have common marketing strategies and standardised recruitment and selection processes' (p14)*. It is important to point out that all Teach For All programmes are completely independent of each other and adapted to each

---

<sup>16</sup> Scott, C., Weldon, P. and Dinham, S. (2011). *Teach for Australia Pathway: Evaluation Report Phase 1 of 3 (April-July 2010)*, Report submitted to DEEWR, ACER, Melbourne. <http://www.deewr.gov.au/Schooling/Documents/EvaluationReport.pdf>

<sup>17</sup> Zeichner, K. & Hutchinson, E. (2008). 'The Development of Alternative Certification Policies and Programs in the United States'. In P. Grossman & S. Loeb (eds.) *Alternative Routes to Teaching: Mapping the New Landscape of Teacher Education*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Education Press, pp15-30 (see p 19).

country's local educational context, including recruitment and selection processes. Teach For All is also not a franchise programme, and each programme is independently governed, managed, and financed. Programmes within the Teach For All network, however, do share certain core similarities, and Teach For All was created to enable these programmes to share best practice, learn from each other, and thus have a greater impact sooner.

Finally, the report largely avoids discussion around the wider goals of Teach For All programmes, which involve tackling educational inequality both in the short term (through classroom teaching) and over the long term (through leadership both within and beyond schools). If we are actually going to make an impact on educational inequality in New Zealand, we believe that we need to do more than just build networks of highly effective teachers within schools. We also need much wider networks of alumni, who have taught in schools that serve low-income communities themselves and therefore have an empathetic and stronger sense of personal responsibility to work to help close the education gap over the long-term. We plan to support these individuals to do this – whatever field they ultimately end up working in – through an alumni programme that will create and foster such networks. The alumni programme will include options to remain in schools beyond the two years, and perhaps progression to middle-leadership positions, for example. It will also include options for alumni who may choose to leave the classroom, including for example working in wider education, business, policy development, forming partnerships with schools, mentoring students, or becoming school trustees. A recent study<sup>18</sup> by the National Bureau of Economic Research and Harvard University, for example, provides the first causal estimate of the impact of Teach For America participants following their two years on the programme. The study found that participating in Teach For America increases ethnic tolerance, makes individuals more optimistic about the life chances of children from low socioeconomic backgrounds, and makes them more likely to work in education.

### **Concluding remarks**

The Murdoch authors summarise their findings by concluding that *'at present, the story of [Teach For All] is neither black nor white, but rather a "shades of grey" story' (vii)*. Indeed Teach First NZ and The University of Auckland believe that like almost every innovation in education, this initiative's impacts are best described in 'shades of grey'. Yet we do need to innovate, and in doing so are committed to capitalising on the strengths of similar programmes as revealed by the Murdoch report. This initiative will present new challenges and risks both for us internally and to the sector more widely, but if these are well-managed the programme will provide significant opportunities. Without claiming the programme as a silver bullet, most notable of these opportunities is a chance to not only work in a new way to close the worrying education gap in New Zealand, but also to support the status of the teaching profession and make teaching a much stronger first choice for talented graduates.

*Shaun Sutton*  
*Chief Executive*  
*Teach First NZ*

*Associate Professor Graeme Aitken*  
*Dean of Education*  
*The University of Auckland*

---

<sup>18</sup> Dobbie, H. & R.G. Fryer (Jnr.) (2011) 'The Impact of Voluntary Youth Service on Future Outcomes: Evidence from Teach For America', NBER Working Paper No. 17402 <http://www.nber.org/papers/w17402>