INTRODUCTION

1. The National Union of Teachers (NUT) welcomes the opportunity to respond to OECD’s questionnaire on attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers.

2. The NUT’s core purpose is to support teachers. It remains politically unaffiliated in order to focus on needs identified by teachers themselves. As a mark of its independence, the NUT regularly commissions research by leading experts, to inform both national debate on important educational issues and the development of the Union’s own policies, which are evidence-led whenever possible. In addition, the NUT conducts its own research in-house to inform policy, validated by Higher Education institutions.

3. In order, therefore, to provide the OECD with the objective and independent information on the recruitment, development and retention of teachers which its questionnaire seeks, the NUT’s response comprises, almost exclusively, of quotations taken from recent relevant research reports. Each quotation is indicated by the use of inverted commas and a reference is given at the end. Section 2, question 7, however, outlines the NUT’s own policies and principles. The following research reports, which were commissioned by the NUT, have been cited in its response:


4. The NUT has also drawn on a number of other research reports in order to provide up-to-date information in response to some aspects of...
the OECD questionnaire, in particular, those questions relating to teachers returning to the profession after a career break and initial teacher training. Such research reports include:


The use of all quotations or data drawn from such sources has been clearly indicated within the text of this response document.

3. Set out below are the NUT’s comments on specific sections of the OECD’s questionnaire, in the order that they appear in the document.

**Section 1 – National Context**

1. *Describe the key political developments and priorities that effect schools and teachers? What are the main objectives and purposes the government is trying to achieve in schools?*

The independent think-tank Demos provides a useful summary within its report *Classroom Assistance*, commissioned by the NUT:

“Since 1997, when Labour took office, the pace of reform has quickened further. A “standards agenda” designed to drive up levels of attainment across the system, and to create minimum standards below which no school will fall, has been the driving force behind change. Schools have taken on new performance targets, and have been inspected more frequently. Primary education has been subject to highly ambitious – and successful- national literacy and numeracy strategies ….the government has also introduced an ambitious programme to restructure and reform the teaching profession itself. This has put a strong emphasis on rewarding classroom performance; encouraging the individual appraisal of teachers, providing experienced teachers with classroom assistance, and increasing the quality and volume of professional development.

These reforms have been unprecedented in their ambition and intensity but they actually reflect a long-standing historical trend. Every major piece of educational legislation during the 20th century further centralised the direction and management of the school system as a
whole. ....reform has also increased the transparency and public accountability of the system, making schools and teachers subject to society-wide pressure for improvement and “delivery”.

This process reflects how education has become a higher priority and a matter of greater public concern. As with many other public service professions in Britain, this process has placed teachers under continuing pressure to become more productive in their work. Schools have to find ways of doing more with less, as the demands placed on them have increased faster than the level of resources and public spending allocated to them. “

Horne M., Classroom Assistance: Why Teachers Must Transform Teaching, Demos, 2001. Page 20 –1

“Respondents were also asked to say which recent educational reforms had positively or negatively impacted on (a) their working conditions and (b) the quality of their pupils’ educational opportunities. The results are shown in Table 16. The four rating intervals ranged from 4 = strong positive to 1 = strong negative, so that mean scores below the mid point of the scale (2.5) indicate that the initiative has had a detrimental effect overall.

The number in the bracket indicates the rank positions of each initiative. It can be seen that, as might be expected, there is a close correspondence between the two sets of ranking so that those educational reforms that have had the greatest impact on teachers’ workloads are also felt to have had a positive influence on the quality of pupils’ educational opportunity. Generally the National Curriculum and the literacy and numeracy strategies were acknowledged to have had a positive impact on workloads and on the quality of pupils’ educational opportunities.

In contrast, it was felt that inspection, statutory testing and performance management have given rise to the main burdens while at the same time contributing little to the quality of pupils’ educational experiences. This raises a key issue in that the things which take up so much of a teacher’s time are the very things which are seen as contributing only marginally to the quality of pupils’ learning opportunities.

In interviews and responses on the back of the questionnaire, many teachers touched on the frustration caused by having to do activities they think have little educational worth. Some of the paperwork is seen as unnecessary and yet a task that takes up increasingly more teacher time. Many teachers were resentful of this.”

Table 16: Impact of recent initiative on (a) workloads and (b) pupils’ educational opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational reform</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Pupil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>work conditions</th>
<th>opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy Hour</td>
<td>3.48 (1)</td>
<td>3.63 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Curriculum</td>
<td>3.26 (2)</td>
<td>3.28 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Hour</td>
<td>3.08 (3)</td>
<td>3.31 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITT mentoring</td>
<td>2.74 (4)</td>
<td>2.64 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Study</td>
<td>2.72 (5)</td>
<td>2.72 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management</td>
<td>2.19 (6)</td>
<td>2.11 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Testing</td>
<td>2.15 (7)</td>
<td>2.12 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Inspection</td>
<td>1.70 (8)</td>
<td>1.88 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. What are the broad population trends in terms of numbers, age structure and cultural diversity that have implications for schools and teachers?

“The number of school age children will decline after 2004, with projections to 2009 currently available. These would suggest that a reduction of 277,000 pupils within that period. At current staffing levels, this would imply a reduction of approximately 15,400 teachers. The number of births is projected to continue to decline until 2011. Although migration is becoming a large factor in population, and net immigration is likely to provide additional pupils, the numbers are both difficult to predict and still relatively marginal in national terms. In any case, changes in demand as a result of changing pupil numbers are likely to be considerably smaller than those resulting from government expenditure decisions.”


3. Present the main economic trends and labour market trends that have implications for schools and teachers.
“Trends in recruitment to teacher training show that, except in times of economic recession, there have been severe shortfalls, particularly in subjects like mathematics, the physical sciences and modern languages.” Smithers A. and Robinson P., *Coping with Teacher Shortages*, University of Liverpool, 2000. Paragraph 1.1

“The application pattern is remarkably like that for new graduate unemployment shown in Figure 2.5. It appears that teaching can attract applications when opportunities elsewhere are limited, but as soon as the economy picks up teacher training struggles to fill its places.” Smithers A. and Robinson P., *Coping with Teacher Shortages*, University of Liverpool, 2000. Paragraph 2.16

“Teaching is the biggest recruiter of graduates in the UK. It needs to recruit 12 per cent of the graduate population a year in order to maintain numbers, but it is facing increased competition from a booming service sector and from the small-business sector, which is recruiting graduates in an unprecedented scale. To recruit teachers, schools also have to compete with the growing sectors of further and higher education in the UK and other English-speaking countries.

At the time of writing in 2001, the graduate labour market seems to be near saturation. Graduates are so confident or finding employment that a majority are opting for travelling, postgraduate study, voluntary or temporary work, instead of carving out a career immediately after university. Only 40 per cent of graduates intend to go direct from degree to work, the lowest rate for ten years, despite record high levels of student debt. “

5. What are the broad public perceptions about the role of schools, the quality of schooling and the status of teachers?

The public’s view of teacher status is much higher than teachers have of themselves. Research by the General Teaching Council for England (GTC (E)), Teacher Training Agency (TTA) and others has confirmed this disjunction.

- 91 per cent of adults in England agree that teaching children is a highly-skilled job
- 90 per cent agree that social problems beyond a teacher’s control make teaching difficult
- 78 per cent think school teachers deserve more public respect than they currently receive
- 54 per cent disagree with the statement “teachers in state schools generally have the resources they need to do their job"
- 78 per cent of non-parents of school-aged children would trust teachers to take good educational decisions in the interests of a child’s education
• 82 per cent of parents of school-aged children would trust teachers to take good educational decisions in the interests of a child's education
• 81 per cent of non-parents think teachers do a good job
• 84 per cent of parents think teachers do a good job at their child’s school.” (GTC (E) survey of public opinion: July 2000)

“The research was commissioned to establish what British people look for in a career and their perceptions of what a career in teaching could offer. The results showed that the benefits most people looked for in a career were matched by what they thought teaching could offer. 62% of respondents felt that teaching would provide a high level of job satisfaction with over half suggesting that teaching would enable them to work with a subject they enjoy.

Job security was also important, with 47% of people viewing a teaching career as offering long-term employment. This was especially attractive to men and chief income earners who had children.

Where teaching really makes an impression is its ability to provide a career which puts something back into society. 61% felt that a key attraction in choosing a career in teaching is that it makes a difference to people's lives - this was an opinion especially shared by people who were already in work. Another key benefit that people expected of a teaching career was the profession's ability to provide a contribution to society. Nearly 45% of people regarded this a top five career benefit for teaching.” (TTA Press Release 16/01/02)

“Teaching is cited by 60% of people in a recent survey as a career which would help them realise improvements in their lifestyle, finances and relationships. This was three times more popular than the next choice, accountancy.....The results from this survey indicate that teaching is regarded as a modern, flexible career and one that can also meet peoples' financial expectations." (TTA Press Release 07/08/02)

“Over half of the respondents (56 per cent) described their exasperation at being under-valued and undermined by negative publicity.

“I'm sick of being bullied by Government and the Press – every time I open a paper, or put on the television, either the Government or the Press is putting down, or misrepresenting teachers. This, in turn, gives parents permission to bully teachers too! Again, this kind of negativity, name calling and misrepresentation, would not be allowed in any classroom.” (Female primary teacher thinking of leaving after four years of teaching)

One telephone interviewee cited public perception of the profession as the main reason for her serious consideration of leaving. She had previously given up her place as a trainee accountant with a top
accountancy firm to become a teacher and was now completely
dishheartened by the general perception by society of teaching as a low
status profession.”

National Union of Teachers. Who’s Leaving and Why? Teachers’
Reasons for Leaving the Profession, 2001. Page 7

There remains a widespread belief amongst teachers that they are
constantly under attack from Government and that the profession has a
poor image with the general public. The growing pressure of
expectations and greater accountability to Government, governing
bodies and the public experienced by teachers has also been identified
regularly as a significant contributing factor to teacher workload and
stress, for example, in the PwC Teacher Workload Study 2001
(Paragraph. 1.20).

Section 2 – The School System and Teaching Workforce

1. **Outline the main structural features of the school system – the types
and numbers of schools, their governance structure,(the levels of
government involved, and the extent of public or private provision) and
the distribution of student numbers by level of school (primary and
secondary), types of programme (e.g. general and vocational
secondary education) and sector (public and private))( drawing special
attention to major recent or proposed changes.

In January 2001 there were 8.4 million pupils in 25,700 maintained and
independent schools in England. (see Annex 1). There were 508
nursery schools (two of which were direct grant), 18,069 primary
schools (of which 147 were deemed middle schools) and 3,481
secondary schools (of which 316 were deemed middle schools)

92 per cent of pupils were taught in maintained nursery, primary and
secondary schools. 7 per cent of pupils attended independent schools
and 1 per cent went to maintained and non-maintained special schools.
In January 2001, there were 18.3 pupils for every teacher (including all
teachers employed by LEAs) in maintained nursery, primary and
secondary schools Pupil: teacher ratios in independent and special
schools in England were 9.7 and 6.4 respectively, in January 2001

See Annex 2 for information on the structural features of the
schools system (from Department for Education and Skills (DfES)

4. **How many teachers are employed by school level, type and sector and
what have been the major trends in teacher numbers over the past 10
years?**

There were 410,000 full-time equivalent teachers employed in
maintained nursery, primary and secondary schools in January 2001
(see Annex 3). Since 1981, the number of primary teachers has
increased slightly, from 181,310 to 185,534 whilst the number of secondary teachers has decreased from 230,928 to 189,026 (see Annex 1) (DfES Statistics of Education 2001).

“Historically, the largest number of primary teachers ever employed was just under 200,000 (full-time equivalents, England only) in 1976, with the peak for secondary teachers being 2332,000 in 1980. After a reduction in numbers by almost 10% in the first half of the eighties, during a period of falling pupil numbers, there was a more gradual decline, which continued until the mid-nineties. In 1998, there was another slight fall. Only in 1999 did rapid and significant increases begin. In January 1998 there were 397,700 teachers in service, but within three years the number had risen to 410,300, the highest since the late eighties. Of these, 206,500 were primary, if the 11,600 occasional teachers are included, so that the employment of primary teachers is at an all-time high.

Two trends are worth noting. One is a long-term trend of increasing numbers of part-time teachers, rising from under 36,000 in 1985 to 52,000 in 1990 and almost 69,000 in 2000 (almost 66,000 of whom are in England). The other is the growth of occasional, or supply teachers, who numbered 16,600 in 2000 and 19,000 in 2001. There is a close correspondence between the increase in supply teachers and the increase in vacancies. Nothing is known about the motivations of supply teachers; we need to discover whether this trend indicates a desire for teachers to be more flexible in their working patterns, or to be freed of the non-contact elements of the job which permanent staff undertake.”


“Our census shows that the teaching force of the six boroughs differs significantly in age profile from that of the country as a whole and our survey of those leaving and joining the teaching force in 1998 – 9 suggests that these differences are becoming more acute …. Looking at the socio-demographic features that characterize London’s teachers, the age profile is quite distinct from that of teachers in England and Wales as a whole.

England and Wales have a large aging population, with over 60 per cent of teachers currently in post aged over 40….the subsequent fall in the number of teachers in their thirties is only partly explained by (chiefly) female teachers taking a career break, joining what the DfEE call the PIT (the Pool of Inactive Teachers). Our findings suggest that far more teachers now combine having a family with work, and the PIT contains fewer ex-teachers who are contemplating returning to the profession. There is clearly an incipient national problem here: changes in the early retirement regulations have made it more difficult for teachers to leave in their late fifties but a very large proportion of our teachers will retire over the next 15 to 20 years.
London’s profile is at first sight healthier. It shows a much clearer bimodality, but with a higher proportion of younger teachers, it should be better able to withstand the effects of the period of mass retirements that will occur at the national level. But the situation is more complex: the younger teachers in the London boroughs are, we have found, largely transient workers who will move – either out of London or out of teaching – early in their career.

London’s teachers are also distinctive in that they are more likely than in the rest of the country to be women. Teaching has increasingly become a female profession. Primary teaching has always been dominated by women and in 1998 the DfEE reported that 82.8 per cent of the primary teaching force in England and Wales were female. In the six boroughs surveyed by us, some 85.4 per cent of the force are female. There are 15 per cent fewer men in primary teaching in London: for every twenty male primary teachers in non-London authorities, there are seventeen in these six boroughs. In the secondary sector nationally, 52.2 per cent of secondary teachers are female: in the six boroughs, 62.7 per cent are female.

If we combine the effects of gender and age in age-sex pyramids when comparing London teachers to those of the national teaching force, we see the significant differences. Secondary teachers in England and Wales have a large presence of males in their forties, while in the London boroughs there is a strong female presence in the 25 – 40 year old groups. …..

In primary teaching, we can see at a glance the female domination of the profession and the way in which in England and Wales the males are largely found in the 50 – 55 age range. London, by contrast, has fewer – but younger – men.

In England and Wales. The men are inexorably moving out of education as they move towards retirement: in ten to fifteen years time we will have lost almost half our existing male teachers, replaced at the current rate by a much smaller number recruited. We are already well into this process in London. The apparent larger proportion of thirties men in London include many transient teachers who will leave fairly soon.”


“In addition to the 400,000 plus teachers in maintained schools there are over 40,000 in independent schools. They are largely drawn from the same pool as their state colleagues, the same universities, the same teacher training institutions and, indeed, a number are recruited from state schools. Although the PGCE is not a formal requirement, many independent schools like their staff to have it. Many independent schools play their full part in teacher training. They offer places for
student teachers, they are organised to provide the formal induction programme for newly-qualified teachers, and they have links with various providers so as to be able to offer on-the-job teacher training.

Independent schools tend to have fewer recruitment difficulties than state schools, but that depends to some extent on their standing and requirements. Although the independent sector tends to be thought of as homogenous it, in fact, consists of a great variety of schools. They do, however, fall into a number of broad groupings defined in part by the association to which they belong. Many of the schools usually thought of as independent schools are members of either the Headmasters' and Headmistresses' Conference (HMC) for senior boys' and coeducational schools' or the Girls' Schools Association (GSA) for senior girls’ schools. But, in addition, there are the Society of Headmasters and Headmistresses (SHMIS), mainly for smaller schools with a tradition of boarding, the Incorporated Association of Preparatory Schools (IAPS) and the Independent Schools Association (ISA). Preparatory education is sometimes separated into pre-prep for the 2-7 year-olds and prep for the 7-13 year-olds. ISA includes schools for all ages. The distribution of staff across the schools is shown in Table 10.1.

Teaching in independent schools tends to be less of a female-profession than it is in state schools. Even the equivalent of primary schools have nearly 40 per cent men. …the higher proportion of men also reflects the greater choice available to independent schools when appointing staff.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMC² (242)</td>
<td>10,824 (70.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,620 (29.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBGSA² (213)</td>
<td>1,334 (15.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,398 (84.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHMIS² (90)</td>
<td>1,880 (57.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,390 (42.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAPS² (517)</td>
<td>4,320 (38.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,869 (61.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA² (289)</td>
<td>1,539 (31.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,387 (68.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total¹ (1279)</td>
<td>18,271 (45.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,302 (55.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In January 2000.
2. Headmasters’ and Headmistresses’ Conference – boys’ and co-educational senior schools.
4. Society of Headmasters and Headmistresses – boys’ and co-educational senior schools with tradition of boarding.
5. Incorporated Association of Preparatory Schools – boys’, girls’ and mixed preparatory schools to age 12/13.
6. Independent Schools Association – preparatory and senior schools and schools for children of all ages.
7. Schools totals do not match column totals because some schools belong to more than one association.

Smithers A. and Robinson P., *Coping with Teacher Shortages*, University of Liverpool, 2000. Paragraph. 10.1 – 3

5. **What are the major trends over the past 10 years in the types of personnel other than teachers working in schools?**
In January 2001 there were nearly 189,000 full-time equivalent non-teaching staff maintained nursery, maintained primary, maintained secondary, special schools and pupil referral units. This compares to nearly 129,500 in January 1996 (see Annex 4). Teaching assistants are predominantly deployed in primary schools (see Annex 5).

“If teachers are to become “lead learners” in the classroom, then they need to be liberated from many of the non-teaching tasks that take so much time and energy. In our research, teachers saw learning support assistants as crucial to achieving this goal. They also viewed the prospect of managing other adults in the classroom as potentially challenging and rewarding. Teacher assistants increase the appeal of teaching as a career by reducing the level of individual workload and by increasing the level of teamwork in the classroom. However, teachers were adamant that they should not lose ultimate responsibility for pupils’ learning and behaviour. A close working relationship between teacher and assistant should not disguise the need for a clear separation of professional responsibilities....

Nearly all teachers felt strongly that the differing levels of responsibility between teacher and teacher assistant should be clearly reflected in different levels of pay, different career structures and different levels of qualifications. Many also felt that teacher assistants should not become a source of non-graduate qualified teachers, an idea recently floated by the government, because they would undermine the integrity of a graduate profession.”


The following quotation provides a useful overview of how general developments in education have affected the increased use of support staff, although the NUT believes that it is not now budget cuts but teacher shortages which are leading to unqualified teachers being employed in place of teachers.

“A number of developments over the past ten years have led to significant growth in the extent and variety of use of associate staff in schools.

First the 1988 Education Reform Act, and specifically the delegation of budgets, has had a marked effect on staffing patterns in schools. In managing their own school budgets, headteachers and governors have become more aware of the real costs of different kinds of resource. They have also had new and more complex administrative and accounting tasks to undertake and as a result many schools have seen a significant growth in bursarial and clerical staff to manage devolved budgets.

Through local management of their budgets schools have seen the need to maximise the return on their investment in teachers by
ensuring that teachers receive as much support as possible both inside and outside the classroom ...

However many schools have also been forced by downward pressure on budgets to employ fewer teachers and to compensate for this by an increase in the use of associate staff in situations where the school could no longer afford to employ teachers. It is also the case that such staff are often seen as the most easily dispensable by schools needing to reduce expenditure.

The second driver in terms of increased use of associate staff has been the new focus on SEN, following the 1993 Education Act and the publication if the SEN Code of Practice.

Two factors have contributed to a significant rise in the number of Learning Support Assistants (LSAs) deployed in schools –

- A steady increase in the number of children in mainstream schools with formal statements of special educational need
- Delegation of much SEN resourcing to school level and the concurrent reduction in the size and scope of central support for learning and behavioural difficulties.

Third, continuing shortages of skilled teachers in some areas of the curriculum have led to the need for secondary schools to develop alternative strategies for delivering the curriculum and/or to relieving teachers of non-teaching duties. These have involved use of associate staff in a variety of supervisory roles and as associate staff or instructors in areas like modern languages, computer studies, business studies and music.

Fourth, the period since 1988 has seen an unprecedented growth in Government-determined initiatives in schools, bringing with them both administrative and teaching demands but little or no earmarked additional resources. Examples of this include the National Curriculum, SATs, examination league tables, truancy returns, annual parents’ meetings, statutory requirements on reporting pupil progress and so on.

The trend seems set to continue with target setting and the literacy and numeracy initiatives. All these have involved, and will continue to involve, tasks where associate staff can play a key role, not least in protecting the teacher’s ability to teach by taking on some of the administration required. Some schools have realised the potential for use of associate staff to help meet these new demands – many have not, or simply cannot afford to.

Finally, the increased emphasis on ICT in all aspects of school life has placed new demands on schools and teachers in terms of both teaching and technical expertise. This in turn has led to an increased
interest in, and need for, technical support in schools and the realisation that this is an area where associate staff can be particularly valuable.

In combination, these factors have led to a significant increase in the range and numbers of associate staff. That growth has been as a result of the multiplicity of school level decisions taken in response to local factors and external pressures.

There has been very little national recognition of, or guidance about, this growth. Schools have been left largely to their own devices in terms of how associate staff are employed and deployed. As a result it is not surprising that the range and quality of practice is very diverse.”


“With the increasing difficulty in maintaining the supply of teachers (Morris 2001, Smithers & Robinson 2001) the Government aims to increase the workforce in education by recruiting twice as many classroom assistants as new teachers (Morris 2001). Morris suggests that teaching should move away from the historic situation, where the direct education of children was delivered entirely to teachers, to a situation analogous to medicine, where medical roles previously carried out by doctors have been devolved to nurses. Morris considers that this has allowed doctors ‘to concentrate their energies on more difficult matters, to the benefit of those in their care’.

Neill S., *Teaching Assistants*, University of Warwick, 2002 Page 6

“The more general problem of how work in the classroom should be divided between teachers and assistants requires sensitivity to teachers’ concerns and a willingness by policy-makers to take them seriously. There is clearly great goodwill by teachers to their assistants, which should be capitalised on to allow developments which are seen as productive by both parties. However, the Government has expressed its determination to maintain accountability for teachers (Morris 2001) while the recruitment of assistants is currently relatively unregulated (Marr et al. 2001) – which largely explains the concern of many teachers in this survey about the variable quality of assistants.

It is therefore possible that classroom teachers will see themselves as taking the responsibility of accountability for the work delivered by assistants whose work they regard as substandard. In addition, many teachers join the profession largely because they enjoy working with children (Smithers & Robinson 2001); they tolerate the bureaucracy and regulation in return for this satisfying aspect of the job. If teaching becomes a job where more time is spent on planning work, which classroom assistants get the satisfaction of delivering to children, some potential applicants to teaching may consider becoming assistants instead, especially if the improvements in pay and conditions, which many respondents in this survey have called for, are actually delivered.
Indeed it already appears that some teachers, who can afford to do so, have left the stresses of teaching behind, and are now working at the more congenial job of classroom assistant. The Government’s drive to compensate for the teacher shortage by increasing the recruitment of classroom assistants (Morris 2001), could, if not handled carefully, itself increase the teacher shortage. As Morris points out, many other career openings are now available to graduates, with the result that recruitment to teacher training courses sometimes has to draw on applicants with lower qualifications – precisely the group who might be tempted to take up a post as a TA instead.”
Neill S., Teaching Assistants, University of Warwick, 2002. Page 44 – 45

“Less than 10% of teachers now receive no paid assistance in their classrooms, a figure comparable to Neill’s 2001 figure of 13.2%, which, however, also included secondary teachers. This compares with the figure of 43% in the early nineteen nineties. Of those who now receive support 23.5% receive over fifteen hours help each week and 30.2% between six and fifteen hours. In the previous survey, a decade ago, only 12.7% of teachers received more than five hours assistance. It is clear that schools have already gone a considerable way in supporting hard-pressed staff. While further assistance might help to alleviate some problems it may risk depriving teachers of experiences, which they greatly value, such as dealing with displays. The 2.3 hours a week spent supervising pupils at break times and before and after school is an obvious source for redistribution of tasks, while other suggestions, such as preparing materials may actually consume more of the teacher’s time in providing instruction and guidance. It is perhaps a question of examining the ways that existing support is used, rather than looking to increase the numbers of classroom assistants that should be a priority.

This view is borne out by the priorities that teachers placed on the use of additional support. First they wanted time out of the class to carry out joint planning with colleagues. Second they wanted to engage in more small group teaching so that they could maximise time with slower-learning and high-achieving children instead of pitching lessons at the middle of the class. Both activities require additional professional assistance, for example a SENCO or a subject specialist, because use of less well qualified support staff would require the teacher to devote considerable time to preparing materials and training the classroom assistant in their use.”


6. What indicators are used to identify shortages of teachers in schools? What types of teachers appear to be in greatest shortage, or for whom shortages are projected?
Indicators used by Government simply list outstanding teaching vacancies. The work done by Alan Smithers and Pamela Robinson has revealed that such methods do not give a true picture of shortages of teachers in schools:

“Vacancies are difficult to pin down for at least two reasons. First, they are transient. A post becomes available, it is advertised, applicants are seen, and an appointment is made or not made. Recording vacancies on a fixed date as the Department seeks to do can only be a snapshot of a moving scene. But, secondly, seeking to count unfilled vacancies, as many of the newspaper surveys do, is flawed because rarely is a post left unfilled, even where it is not possible to make a satisfactory appointment. To do so could mean children having to be sent home. Our report last year, *Coping with Teacher Shortages* (Smithers and Robinson, 2000), explored in detail the many ways in which schools seek to ensure that all classes have a teacher.”


“We thus appear to have, on the one hand, a crisis in recruitment to training and, on the other, schools seemingly able to fill the posts that become vacant. It could be that the targets are inaccurate in overstating the requirement. But more likely the vacancy figures do not reflect the actual situation in schools. This could be for both conceptual and technical reasons. First, the construct of ‘unfilled vacancy’ is a composite of a post falling vacant, a decision to re-establish that post and the ease of making an appointment. Secondly, at any one time a school may have a number of vacancies and fill them by a variety of means. The dynamics of the situation are not easily captured in a questionnaire and while it may appear that all the vacancies have been satisfactorily filled schools may, in fact, be merely making do. Headteachers may also be reluctant to admit to making unsatisfactory appointments in case it affects the reputation of their schools.”

Smithers A. and Robinson P., *Coping with Teacher Shortages*, University of Liverpool, 2000 Paragraph. 1.2

“The official view seems to be that the shortfalls in recruitment to teacher training are having relatively little impact on schools. Last year in its evidence to the School Teachers’ Review Body, the DfEE (STRB, 1999b) asserted that “despite suggestions to the contrary in the media, figures on teacher vacancies suggest that there is no substantial shortage of teachers across England and Wales as a whole”. This could, of course, be more of a bargaining counter in pay negotiations than something that is seriously held, but it is nevertheless odd since it could only mean that the targets for teacher training are grossly inaccurate. The case for the DfEE’s contentious position rests on vacancy figures.

Each January the Department conducts a survey of unfilled vacancies in schools, and regularly relatively few are found. In January 1999, for
example, only 2,400 vacancies (0.7 per cent) were reported out of a workforce of 366,000 regular full-time appointments. Although there was some variation with region and subject the vacancy rates were uniformly very low. The highest for a region was 1.9 per cent in London and the highest for a subject 0.9 per cent in information technology. Moreover, 1999 continues the trend of many years.

The deeply puzzling nature of the discrepancy between the chronic under-recruitment to teacher training and DfEE’s vacancy figures led the School Teachers’ Review Body to commission its own surveys of vacancies. They arrived at much the same result as the DfEE. In January 1999, the STRB (1999a) reported that of the 41,700 vacancies advertised for September 1998, 38,600 (92.6 per cent) had been filled. Of the others, about half were covered by supply teachers, and most of the rest by short-term contracts, with-in school moves, and other arrangements. Only 155 (3.7 per cent of the vacancies or 0.4 per cent of posts) had not been be filled. The headteachers rated 79 per cent of the permanent appointments as having skills well suited to the post. The STRB (2000a) repeated the survey for September 1999 and found that overall nine per cent of posts were advertised of which about one in 20 was not filled.

We are therefore left with the conundrum – not enough teachers being trained, but posts being filled – which prompted this inquiry”

Smithers A. and Robinson P., *Coping with Teacher Shortages*, University of Liverpool, 2000. Paragraph. 3.1 – 3.4

“The present survey provides us with some of the key pieces in the picture we are trying to put together. Yes, schools are filling the posts they advertise, but only with difficulty. There were differences with subject, post and region which we shall be taking up in Chapters 7 and 8, but the general experience was that in about half the cases appointments could be made only with ‘some difficulty’, and in about a fifth only with ‘great difficulty’. This is what you would expect if not enough teachers were being trained and taking posts in schools to meet the schools’ requirements.

Schools are driven by an imperative to have a full complement of staff. Sending children home is an option of last resort. They will therefore go to great lengths to fill their posts. If one looks only at whether posts are eventually covered one might – as the DfEE has done – chose to conclude there is no problem. But if one looks at what schools have to do in order to get someone in place then it might look very different.”


“Table 8.1 shows that secondary vacancies most frequently occurred in English, maths, science, modern foreign languages, PE and D&T. The ease of filling these posts, however, varied greatly. Whereas PE seemed to cause little difficulty, 71 per cent of those in D&T and two-
thirds of those in maths and foreign languages were declared difficult to fill. Of the other subjects, posts in the physical sciences, home economics and RE seemed difficult to fill, and those in history, geography, biology, art and English less so.

This pattern corresponds closely with the success in meeting the training targets discussed in Chapter 2. The latest figures shown in Table 2.2 (Page 6) continue the trend of recent years. PE has been recruiting over-target, but there have been large shortfalls in technology, modern languages and mathematics. Of the other top six subjects for vacancies, the 40 per cent of posts found difficult to fill in English reflect the recent below-target recruitment to the subject. The position in science, however, is masked by the grouping together of biology, physics and chemistry. While it looks as if, after many years, the incentive payments may be bringing science recruitment closer to target, schools are still expressing considerable difficulty in filling posts particularly in physics and chemistry. This is consistent with the progressive ‘biologicalisation’ of science revealed in Table 2.4 (Page 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Vacancy N</th>
<th>%(^1)</th>
<th>Experiencing Difficulty N</th>
<th>%(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFL</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;T</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Studies</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the subjects generating fewer vacancies, those in history were the easiest to fill and this is consistent with history always having been able to meet its targets with well-qualified graduates. Even though not many vacancies arose in RE these proved difficult to fill, again consistent with the failure of the teacher training institutions to meet their targets. Although it may appear obvious that shortfalls to teacher training would lead to recruitment difficulties in schools it is satisfying to be able to
demonstrate it in this way. It not only gives confidence in the validity of the survey and interview data, but also the lie to the DfEE’s (STRB, 1999b) surprising claim that teacher shortages have not been impacting on schools.”

Smithers A. and Robinson P., *Coping with Teacher Shortages*, University of Liverpool, 2000. Paragraph 8.2 – 8.4

“As with subject, there were variations with level of responsibility. This is particularly the case in primary schools. Table 8.2 shows that in this phase it was the special needs co-ordinators and deputy heads posts that were the most difficult to fill. This accords with the findings of the School Teachers’ Review Body’s (2000a) latest survey. In secondary schools, as we have seen, major problems can arise in recruiting to classroom posts in some subjects. The filling of senior posts, however, seemed less difficult.

The difference in the attractiveness of deputy headships in primary and secondary schools is probably not unconnected with salary. In 1999 over three-quarters (76.8 per cent) of primary deputies were earning less than £30,000, a sum which 96.3 per cent of the secondary deputies exceeded, and often considerably. But it will also have been due to the nature of the job. Whereas in secondary schools deputy headships are specialist roles, in primary schools senior staff may find themselves as little more than classroom teachers having to carry a substantial administrative load. Primary schools are often fully stretched with little or no non-contact time. Any staff shortages due to recruitment difficulties or staff absences are likely to fall disproportionately on the senior staff.

The School Teachers’ Review Body has recognised the problem and in 1999 aimed through improving minimum salaries to make it financially attractive for classroom teachers to take up more senior posts. But the view at the time of our survey was the salary differential was not sufficient to compensate for all the extra hassle.

The difficulties of appointing to senior posts in primary schools also need to be acknowledged. They partly explain why there are still recruitment problems in this phase even though the overall training target is being met. The requirement for subject specialists as co-ordinators is a further factor.

In secondary schools there can be difficulties with more senior posts but they are often a reflection of subject shortages.
Looking at difficulties in making appointments by subject and post, just as by region, location and school, reveals what happens when there are not enough teachers to go round. Setting the training targets so as to get a reasonable balance between having enough slack in the system and unemployment must be difficult enough since local circumstances can vary so much. But, as we have seen, recruitment has been persistently under target for the secondary phase. Too often this means that schools receive hardly any applications for the posts they advertise. When there is a possible clutch and interviews are quickly arranged, it is not uncommon to find that most of those on the short list have been snapped up elsewhere before they can take place.

This is essence of the recruitment crisis as headteachers see it. Not being able to advertise a vacancy and get a reasonable response from which a new member of staff can be confidently chosen. Having to compete so vigorously for the staff who are available and cope when a suitable appointment cannot be made inevitably takes its toll on the senior staff and there are knock-on effects to the classroom teachers.”

Smithers A. and Robinson P., Coping with Teacher Shortages, University of Liverpool, 2000. Paragraph. 8.8 – 8.14

“The DfES defines a vacancy as “ a full-time permanent appointment (or an appointment of at least one term’s duration) that was advertised but not filled”. It is often suggested that this definition does not give a valid picture of staffing difficulty. For example, a school might not advertise a post if it considers there is little chance of attracting a suitable candidate. It may deploy into a post a member of staff who is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.2: Vacancies by Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Key Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second in Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Dept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second in Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headteacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
not well-equipped for it. It may appoint a candidate whose quality is in doubt in lieu of any alternative.

With the possible exception of the very smallest, schools do not have a standard staffing establishment. On the whole, they employ as many teachers as they can afford. Hence, a more valid definition of vacancy is not possible. For example, given available funds, a decision on whether to create a new post and advertise it might be affected by a view on the likelihood of filling it.

The vacancy figures certainly do not tell the whole story about staffing difficulty, particularly in relation to quality issues, but there are two ways in which they are valuable. Firstly, the definition provides a good indicator of the excess of demand over supply, in the sense that no suitable teacher is both willing and able to take up that number of posts. The work is being done by people who are not prepared to undertake the whole responsibility of the job on a permanent basis. While the number of vacancies increased by 2,020 between January 2000 and January 2001, the number of supply teachers increased by 2,400."


7. What organisations are involved in the development of teacher policies? Are there effective frameworks to promote dialogue and common action among the main stakeholders? How many teacher unions exist and how are they structured? What is the level of unionisation of teachers by school type and sector? What were the key issues at stake during the latest round of teacher employers – teacher union negotiations? What were the outcomes of those negotiations?

There are currently six nationally recognised teacher organisations in England; the National Union of Teachers (NUT), the National Association of Schoolmasters/Union of Women Teachers (NASUWT), the Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL), the Professional Association of Teachers (PAT), the National Association of Head Teachers (NAHT) and the Secondary Heads Association (SHA), with a seventh, Undeb Cenedlaethol Athrawon Cymru (UCAC) in Wales. The NUT is the largest teacher organisation in England and Wales. ATL, NASUWT, NUT and UCAC are affiliated to the Trades Union Congress (TUC).

“Teacher trade union membership has soared to its highest level in more than 20 years, official figures will reveal next month.

The number of people officially registered with the six associations covering England increased by 32,889 - or 4 per cent - last year to 837,769.
The statistics from the Certification Office for Trade Unions and Employers' Associations come against the background of a 9,400 rise in the number of teachers in English schools last year.

The totals provide particularly good news for the biggest union, the National Union of Teachers, which saw its membership climb by 28,000 to 314,174.

The Association of Teachers and Lecturers also recorded an increase, its membership rising more than 8,000 from 178,697 to 186,774.

Both these totals are the highest since union records began in their current form in the 1970s.

But the National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers lost more than 2,000 members, from 255,768 to 253,584, while the Professional Association of Teachers shrank from 34,787 to 33,081.

2001 was a better year for the Secondary Heads' Association than the National Association of Head Teachers. SHA gained 621 members, while the NAHT lost 152.

*Times Educational Supplement, 21/06/2002*

The NUT has taken the view that the issues of excessive teacher workload and the “remodelling” of the profession are central to the work of the teacher organisations in England currently, in particular, the unnecessary workload generated by Government initiatives which have been uncosted in terms of the teacher time required for their implementation. The NUT believes that this has arisen due to a failure on the part of the Government both to engage the teaching profession as partners in the development of new initiatives and to follow up the introduction of such initiatives with effective evaluation strategies.

The current governmental policy emphasis on tackling excessive teacher workload and remodelling the profession can be linked directly to the joint NUT – NASUWT “Cover to Contract” action in 2001. The NUT and the NASUWT shared the common objectives of reducing workload, stopping the "cover up" of teacher shortages and ending the coping strategies used by schools which were not fully staffed. Both organisations believed that progress could be made towards a new contract for teachers which would protect non-teaching time to mark and prepare; a contract which protected teachers and supported teaching.

This action secured from the then Secretary of State, David Blunkett, agreement to the Union's demand for a review of teachers' workload which would take account of all aspects of teachers deployment, the resulting workload and their effects on the recruitment and retention of
teachers and the status of the profession. The Government commissioned a large-scale study of teacher workload by PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) and, under pressure from the NUT, it established a review group of the six teachers’ organisations, the employers and the Government. The role of the review group was to produce a costed plan to remove teachers’ excessive workload.

It was agreed that the findings of the PwC teacher workload study would provide a basis for the review group to make recommendations on ways to reduce workload and that these recommendations would be forwarded to the School Teachers’ Review Body (STRB). Fieldworkers involved in the PwC study, which was conducted in 100 schools in England and Wales from May – November 2001, included an NUT representative.

The PwC survey showed an increase in most teachers’ workload compared to the STRB survey. Primary teachers averaged 54.5 hours and secondary teachers averaged 55.3 hours. Comparing these figures to those for other professionals/managers, PwC stated that teachers’ annual hours were at similar levels overall but that teachers and headteachers worked more intensively during the school term, both in terms of hours which were longer than average than other managers and professionals and in terms of the “performance” that teaching requires them to give.

The study also confirmed that approximately 25 per cent of teachers’ work was done outside “normal” hours and that approximately 95 per cent of all teachers undertook some sort of holiday working – on average, 116 hours for primary teachers and 121 hours for secondary teachers.

The survey found that teachers believed the increase in their workload was mainly a result of new Government initiatives. Most frequently cited external influences on workload were inspection related activities, ICT initiatives, revisions to the National Curriculum and the Literacy and Numeracy Strategies.

The failure of DfES initiatives to reduce workload was clearly shown. Awareness of the DfES “Reducing Bureaucratic Burdens” guidance and website was low (approximately 30 per cent and 10 per cent respectively), whilst 60 per cent of those who were aware of these felt that they had made no difference to them or their school.

It was never intended that the PwC report would determine solutions but the evidence in the report strengthened the Union’s case for changes in teachers’ contracts, as various elements identified in the report provided the basis for such changes, in particular, the PwC proposal for a maximum number of teaching hours together with guaranteed time for preparation and marking. The report underlined the number of hours spent by teachers undertaking work which should be
done by others, information which supported the NUT’s view that there should be a list of activities teachers should undertake and a list which specifies work they should not.

The NUT sought agreement with the other teachers' organisations on proposals to put to the employers and the Government with a view to an agreed package being sent to the School Teachers' Review Body early in 2002. The joint submission by the four TUC-affiliated teacher unions and the Professional Association of Teachers (PAT) was supported by joint oral evidence and set out a 13 point package for changes to conditions of service and working arrangements:

- An overall limit to working hours;
- A maximum limit on teaching time;
- A maximum limit on hours within directed time for other duties, including meetings;
- Guaranteed times for marking and preparation in direct proportion to teaching time, with one hour of such support time for every two hours teaching;
- Half of the support time should be within directed time with no more than 50 per cent being outside directed time;
- Statutory guidance on working time arrangements;
- New limits on obligations to undertake cover with compensatory time off for cover undertaken beyond those limits;
- Increased administrative support with each classroom teacher being entitled to at least three hours per week clerical support;
- A clearly defined list of tasks that should not be expected of teachers routinely;
- An entitlement to decide where work should be undertaken when not teaching or reasonably required for school duties;
- Removal of the open-ended requirement to work in excess of the 1265 hours directed time in section 59.8 of the School Teachers’ Pay and Conditions Document;
- Limits to class size; and
- No increase in the working year but better use of the five non-pupil days for collaborative planning and professional development.

In addition, a joint submission by the national employers and teacher organisations included acceptance by all parties that dealing with workload should be the top priority for the DfES, that the open-ended commitment should be capped, that maximum class contact limits should be introduced and that changes should start to be introduced from September 2002.

The STRB report on workload was published in May 2002. Its recommendations included:

- Guaranteed in-school time for paperwork and planning;
- No overall limit on hours;
- Fewer Government initiatives and better management of them, to avoid constant changes;
- Additional support staff to be employed as a matter of urgency;
• Teachers’ term time hours should be reduced from the current average of 52 to 48 within two years, and to 45 by 2006;
• Headteachers and governors should be contractually required to ensure that workloads are managed so that teachers can maintain a work-life balance;
• Teachers’ contracts should be altered as soon as possible to include a personal annual limit on cover; and
• An entitlement to professional development equivalent to five working days, for which course fees and travel costs should be paid.

A joint response to the STRB report was agreed by the four TUC teacher affiliates and subsequently endorsed by the other teacher organisations, PAT, NAHT and SHA and by the employers’ organisation NEOST, which emphasised that, unless immediate Government action was taken to introduce the improvements identified by the STRB, the existing serious problems of teacher shortages would worsen.

The response acknowledged that the recommendations contained within the STRB’s report could have a significant impact on reducing teachers’ excessive workload, but that the success of any measures put in place would depend on Government providing substantial funding to meet the cost incurred by schools and local education authorities.

The joint response stressed that the timetable for change would be crucial in gaining the confidence and support of teachers and that it was essential for certain measures, including the deployment of extra support staff and the prioritisation by school management of tasks currently undertaken by teachers; the early amendment to the School Teachers’ Pay and Conditions Document to place a duty on governors and heads to have regard to work/life balance; and the provision of additional resources to schools to be introduced by September 2002:

The teacher organisations recognised that the STRB report placed a high priority on reducing teachers’ working hours from the current level of over 50 per week but urged that a target for a reduction in overall weekly working hours to 35 hours should be phased in from September 2003.

The joint response fully endorsed the recommendations that, as a matter of urgency, all teachers should be entitled to a minimum allocation of time for planning, preparation, marking and recording of children’s work and a clear limit should be set on the amount of cover each individual teacher could be required to undertake.

The joint response concluded that the next stage in the consultation process should include an opportunity for consideration of the issues between the Government, employers and teacher associations. The
Secretary of State, however, has so far refused to meet to discuss conditions of service issues to date and has stated that standards rather than improved working conditions are the Government’s main priority:

“It is true that a well-motivated, better-prepared teaching profession is crucial to raising standards even further than we have done. But I do not want people to believe this process is just about workload. The bottom line will always be standards.” Times Educational Supplement, 10/05/02

In tandem with these developments, there was an increased emphasis by Government on the use of support staff in a variety of roles, as outlined in question 2.5 above, which has come to be known as the “remodelling agenda”. The remodelling agenda is being developed in a complex framework and it is essential for Government to understand clearly the context in which it is operating.

Teachers expect that the remodelling agenda will contribute to tackling the problem of excessive workload, provide improvements in working conditions in all schools and enable them to concentrate more effectively on the task of classroom teaching. Support staff have equal expectations. They wish to see improvements in their terms and conditions of service. Through a national framework, they want to regularize the current, highly unsatisfactory position where an ad hoc approach is taken by employers and managers to their roles, which often results in a requirement to take on new responsibilities without appropriate recognition in terms of pay, conditions and training.

At the heart of the debate between the Government, the employers and the teacher organisations has been the definition of core responsibilities of teachers. It seems likely that there will be three types of responsibilities: tasks which must be carried out by qualified teachers; tasks which teachers might do or could supervise other staff; and tasks which teachers currently do but which could be transferred to other staff.

The teacher organisations are now seeking final agreement with the Government on measures to tackle workload. The NUT is particularly concerned by the Government’s continuing reluctance to provide statutory guidance on the tasks that only qualified teachers can do, which it believes would leave the Government open to accusations that lower-paid support staff could be employed effectively as teachers.

SECTION 3: ATTRACTING ABLE PEOPLE INTO THE TEACHING PROFESSION

3.1 Are there major concerns about attracting people to enter the teaching profession? In what respects?
"The scale of the recruitment challenge is apparent from the proportion of graduates from even the greatly expanded higher education system. The overall total teacher training target for England and Wales in 1999 of about 31,000 (that is, including both the B.Ed and PGCE for primary and secondary) amounts to nearly 12 per cent of the graduate output of 263,671 for that year (for the whole of the UK including Scotland and Northern Ireland). In individual subjects even taking only the PGCE targets and a broad view of eligible degrees the proportion required is daunting.

Table 2.5 shows that to meet the PGCE targets in modern foreign languages and religious education over 40 per cent of the graduate output for the UK in those subjects is required each year. In maths the proportion is almost as great. In English it is over 30 per cent. The science target of 2,355 can be compared with the total physics output of 2,320 and the total chemistry output of 3,624. But in biology it was 11,636, which in part explains why the subject has come to dominate science teacher training applications.

Table 2.5: Teacher Training Targets in Relation to Graduate Output, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>PGCE Target¹</th>
<th>Graduate Output</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>6275</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>4250 ²</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2355</td>
<td>24119 ³</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>4932 ⁴</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>5862 ⁵</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>4536</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹. Personal communications from TTA and Higher Education Funding Council for Wales.
². Mathematical Sciences Subject Group.
³. Includes Biological Sciences Subject Group without psychology, Physical Sciences Subject Group without geography, and combined or general science subjects. For chemistry N = 3624, and physics N = 2320.
⁴. French, German, Spanish and balanced combinations within languages.
⁵. History, and Economic and Social history.

It is evident that over a number of years that the teacher training institutions have been struggling to meet the secondary teacher training targets, particularly in certain subjects. If the number of places allocated truly reflects schools’ needs then we would expect there to be consequences for schools.

It is not only the overall targets that are important, however, but also how they are met. Teaching’s lack of success in tapping the widest pool of potential applicants may mean the profile of those accepted on training courses for the secondary age range does not adequately reflect the needs of schools in terms of gender, age, ethnic background and location’. Smithers A. and Robinson P., Coping with Teacher Shortages, University of Liverpool, 2000. Paragraph 2.20 - 23
Key negative factors identified by undergraduates as barriers to entering the teaching profession include salary levels, teacher workload, pupil behaviour and lack of intellectual challenge.


3.2(a) **What are the main pathways by which people can become teachers or former teachers can return to teaching? Are there any major trends in terms of the proportions of people entering via different pathways? Have there been any major changes in these pathways in recent years or are any planned? If so, what are the reasons concerned?**

See Annex 6 for Teacher Training Agency (TTA) information on training pathways.

“The Government sets targets for training learned on its projections of future supply and demand. It could be argued that the present situation is rooted in the extensive cutbacks in targets during the 1980s. For a number of years, there has been under-recruitment as against these targets….The peak year for recruitment to training was 1993, when over 33,000 students started either the four year B.Ed or the one year PGCE. A feature of the last decade has been the decline of the B.Ed.

In 1990, a total of 11,838 students were recruited to B.Ed courses (9,524 primary, 2,314 secondary) compared to 11,956 PGCE (4,806 primary, 7,150 secondary). By 2000, the number enrolling on B.Ed courses had dropped dramatically: 8,960 (7,330 primary, 1,630 secondary) compared to 21,150 on PGCE courses (7,090 primary, 14,060 secondary). The growth in ITT has, therefore, been exclusively in terms of PGCE courses, highly influenced by Government financial incentives aimed exclusively at students on such courses.”


There are two main routes back into teaching for a person with Qualified Teacher Status. One is via the local education authorities or schools, the other via the TTA. These are described in more detail in Section 4.

3.2(b) **How have the total number of enrolments and composition of those studying to enter teaching changed over the past ten years in terms of (i) gender, (ii) age, (iii) ethnicity, (iv) socio-economic background and (v) academic achievement level? What explains these trends? Is there any evidence on the main reasons why students decide to enrol in teacher education programmes?**

See Annex 7 for enrolment historic trends.

**GTTR June 2002 ENGLISH STATISTICS**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>2002 Male</th>
<th>2002 Female</th>
<th>2002 Total</th>
<th>2001 Male</th>
<th>2001 Female</th>
<th>2001 Total</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>3188</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>2632</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined &amp; General Science</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env/Rural Science</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtic Languages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Modern Languages</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>-14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Technology</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Studies</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>-17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Secondary</td>
<td>8265</td>
<td>12122</td>
<td>20387</td>
<td>7288</td>
<td>11205</td>
<td>18493</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Middle</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Between 1994/95 and 1999/2000, enrolments on ITT courses fell by 3,270 (ten per cent). Enrolments on undergraduate education degrees fell from 12,000 to 7,800 in seven years, although PGCE numbers remained relatively stable, at around 19,000. The latest statistics for 2001 showed that applications for PGCE courses increased by 26 per cent on the previous year. This sharp rise is partly a result of Government policies creating incentives for graduates who qualify as teachers, such as no tuition fees and training allowances. However, seven per cent of PGCE places were unfilled in 2000/01.

Men and ethnic minority groups are under-represented on ITT courses. Since 1997, the TTA has taken a number of steps to address this issue but there is limited research evidence available.

The available evidence suggests that some black and Asian trainees are attracted to teaching by the prospect of becoming role models for minority ethnic children (e.g., Gariewal, ‘Experiences of Racism in Initial Teacher Training’ 1999), although this is not accepted by all minority ethnic entrants to the profession who resent being cast as advocates for black and Asian pupils or viewed as experts on their cultures (Wolverhampton Race Equality Council Consortium, ‘Recruitment and Retention of Teachers from the Ethnic Minority Communities’, 1999).

3.2(c) What proportion of those who qualify as teachers enter teaching? Is there any evidence on the reasons for not entering teaching? Are there any major trends in these regards? Is there any evidence on whether new entrants see teaching as a lifelong career or as a short-term one and the reasons for those views?

TTA data for 2001 shows that about 12 per cent drop out during their TTA course. Non-completion is regularly higher for secondary courses: primary completion may, however, appear higher because 54 per cent of trainees follow the B.Ed route (compared to only ten per cent for secondary) and only those in the fourth year of the course are counted by the TTA. (Performance Profiles 2001)

Over 30 per cent of those who successfully complete ITT do not teach full or part-time in State education. (DfES Statistics of Education 2001). Approximately four per cent teach in independent schools or in FE/UE, leaving 28.5 per cent not in service.
‘Of some 30,000 trainees in 1997, only just over 19,000 on DfEE figures were in any teaching in 1999 (full-time or part-time, in maintained or independent schools, or in further or higher education). On employers’ organisation figures, only 16,900 were in maintained schools, just over half the trainees (54 per cent).

In round figures, it seems that of every 100 final year trainees, on average, 12 do not complete the course successfully. Of the remaining 88, another 28 do not seem to enter teaching, even when this is interpreted to include independent schools and other sectors.’ On a narrow definition of entering LEA schools, only 54 can be accounted for full-time or part-time, permanent or fixed-term.

The stark fact is that about 40 per cent of the trainees cannot be traced to teaching in any form. The cost of initial teacher training, including training salaries, is currently £245 million. The loss to the public purse will, therefore, be about £100 million.


In recent years there has been a dramatic drop-out between entry to training and taking up employment as a teacher (up five per cent in the past five years). The latest available data relate to the cohort who completed training in 1998. Of these 12,430 started B.Ed courses in 1994 and 19,480 started PGCE in 1997. Only 9,640 students completed the B.Ed in 1998, a drop-out rate of 22 per cent. Seventeen thousand and ninety PGCE students completed (11 per cent drop-out rate). In modelling supply and demand, the DfES assumes a wastage rate of training of 25 per cent from B.Ed and 11 per cent from PGCE, with a further wastage of ITT completers ranging from 16 per cent of primary women to 30 per cent of secondary men. (DfE, ‘Teacher Supply and Demand Modelling: A Technical Description, 1998).

There is a surge in drop-out after students experience teaching practice. This loss is excessive, not only in terms of the costs involved but because of the urgent need to maximise supply. One effect of the introduction of financial incentives to train may be a further increase in this wastage, if it attracts students with a lower level of commitment.

Research conducted into why trainees leave during ITT courses has identified several main factors, including a perceived unsuitability for teaching and finding classroom control difficult, the demands of the course itself and the relationships between themselves and their mentors or class teachers. (e.g. Sands M., “Student Withdrawals from Teacher Training”, New Era In Education 74(2), 1993.).

Surprisingly, recent pronouncements by leading policymakers such as the Secretary of State for Education and the Chief Executive of the TTA have encouraged people to think of teaching, not as a career for life, but as an occupation one might undertake for a period of years, before
turning or returning to another occupation, having offered ‘public service’ as a teacher.

3.2(d) How do the starting salaries, other financial and non-financial benefits and working conditions of teachers compare with other government and non-government occupations with broadly similar qualification levels? How do the salaries, benefits and working conditions compare after 5 and 10 years of employment? What are the main trends in such relativities over the past 10 years? Is there any evidence on the impact of salaries, benefits and working conditions on decisions to enter teaching?

“The poor position of teachers relative to other graduates’ salary levels and progression has been evident for some time. We have repeatedly drawn attention to this and to the consequent problems of recruitment and retention to the teaching profession.

Teachers are disadvantaged in terms of both starting salary and salary progression. Teachers start at a salary disadvantage relative to other graduate professions and then fall further behind.

Research published by Incomes Data Services (IDS) in February 2001 included the latest data on graduate starting salaries and salary progression. The IDS data is based on graduate pay in companies which have specific graduate development programmes. Given that teaching is a graduate profession, the kind of companies surveyed by IDS provide the appropriate comparators for teaching. The IDS data is not based on the highest-paid graduate jobs, but on a range of graduate employers. The findings of the research conducted by IDS is similar to that carried out by the Association of Graduate Recruiters (AGR) and CSU.

IDS forecast, on the basis of its survey, that starting salaries for graduates as a whole would average £19,157 in 2001. Teacher starting salaries from April 2001 were £17,001. The gap between teachers and other graduate professions in terms of starting salary – that is, the increase which would be required to bring teacher starting salaries level - was 12.7 per cent. The IDS figure for starting salaries in 2001 is similar to the AGR’s forecast of £19,800 for starting salaries in 2001-02.

It is clear, despite the differentially higher increase for new entrants to teaching recommended by the STRB in its 2001 Report, that teacher starting salaries continue to lag well behind those of other graduate professions. These other graduate professions are ones with which teaching needs to compete directly and there can be no doubt that the poor level of teachers’ starting salaries is hindering recruitment to the profession.

The figures for teacher starting salaries compared with those of other graduates are the latest in a now established pattern of a decline in the
relative value of teachers’ starting salaries. In 1994, the starting salary for teachers was worth 96 per cent of median graduate starting salaries. According to IDS, in 2001 teachers’ starting salaries will have declined to just 89 per cent of average graduate starting salaries.

Of the organisations for which 2001 starting salaries were given by IDS, only a handful paid lower starting salaries than teaching. Even in the public sector, only one of the six named organisations paid a lower starting salary than teaching.

IDS reported that demand for graduates was likely to remain strong in 2001. Following a 9 per cent increase in graduate recruitment in 2000, the employers surveyed by IDS reported plans to recruit 19 per cent more graduates in 2001. The continuing strength of the graduate jobs market is likely to mean continuing high starting salaries for graduates generally. Starting salaries in teaching must compete if the profession is to have any chance of attracting the high proportion of graduates it requires each year.

In addition to the problem of starting salaries, we have reported over the years a continuing and worsening problem with regard to salary progression for teachers compared to other graduates. The IDS produced salary progression data based on matched samples, to measure salary progression within the companies surveyed. We can compare salary progression in such companies with that available to teachers by measuring the salary progression allowed within the teacher salary structure.

Teachers have lagged behind other graduates in terms of salary progression for a number of years. This disadvantage compared to other graduates continues, according to analysis of the latest data.

The table below sets out, in the same format as previous submissions, the position for teachers and for graduates generally. The figures for graduates generally show salary progression rates for two groups: those recruited in 1997 and those recruited in 1995. The three-yearly figures are for the former; the five-yearly figures for the latter. These are then compared to teachers’ rates of salary progression after three and five years respectively. Two examples are given for teachers: a teacher without a management allowance and a teacher with such an allowance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Progression After Three Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All graduates 47 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher (no management allowance) 17 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher (one management allowance) 26 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Progression After Five Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All graduates 75 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher (no management allowance) 30 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher (one management allowance) 39 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The position of teachers relative to other graduates in terms of salary progression after three years has therefore worsened since last year. This is due to two factors.

The first factor is that the differentially higher increases in teacher salaries at points 1-6 of the common pay spine have resulted in a lower rate of salary progression for teachers. This reinforces our view that the answers to the problems of teacher salary levels do not lie in tinkering with the existing pay structure.

The second factor is that rates of salary progression for graduates generally after three years have continued to increase. This reflects the investment in graduates which has accompanied the emergence of a strong graduate jobs market. The position of teachers relative to other graduates after five years is similar to last year. It must be remembered, however, that this follows a dramatic deterioration in the relative position of teachers last year and still leaves teachers a long way behind other graduates.

Like salary levels, poor relative rates of salary progression send out all the wrong signals from a profession which needs to compete effectively against other graduate employers. Recruitment is unlikely to be improved where potential recruits know that without urgent action to improve the position of teachers they will fall further and further behind their fellow graduates should they choose teaching as a career. The STRB must recommend action to improve dramatically teachers’ rates of salary progression.

We can illustrate the full impact of poor relative starting salaries and rates of salary progression by using cash examples. In particular, we can look at the prospects for a graduate starting on the average starting salary predicted by IDS for 2001 and receiving the rates of salary progression after three and five years reported by IDS.

Such a graduate would start on a salary of £19,157 in 2001. This would increase to £28,161 after three years and £33,525 after five years on the basis of salary progression rates reported by IDS for 2000.

On the basis of the current salary structure for teachers, a newly-qualified teacher would start on £17,001 in September 2001. Assuming the award of no management allowances, this would rise (at today’s salary rates) to £19,821 after three years’ service and £22,035 after five years’ service. The net result would be that the salary gap between teachers and other graduates of £2,156 at the outset of their careers would widen to £8,340 after three years and to £11,490 after five years.

The problem of salary progression is compounded by the particular problems faced by teachers in mid-career due to changes to the salary
structure. Such teachers have missed out on both the higher salary increases awarded to teachers at the lower points of the common pay spine and on eligibility to cross the threshold. In 2000 a teacher’s salary at point 7 of the common pay spine was 32.4 per cent higher than that of a new entrant at point 2. In 2001, it was only 29.6 per cent higher. This reduction in differentials has undoubtedly had an adverse impact on morale for teachers in mid-career and has contributed to problems of retention.

It is clear from all the available data that the rewards for today’s graduates are greater than ever before. These rewards are boosting the expectations of graduates. A survey by High Fliers Research published in June 2001, sponsored by The Times, showed that graduates expected to earn around £25,000 in their first job after university. More than 40 per cent of this summer’s graduates did not plan to enter the employment market straight away. The proportion expressing an interest in teaching as a career was 10.1 per cent, up just 0.3 percentage points compared with last year despite the Government’s recruitment incentives. The Guardian/AGR GradFacts 2000 survey of students about to graduate showed that whereas only 9 per cent chose teaching as the industry sector they would most like to work in, 33 per cent selected it as the one they would least like to work in.

Teaching is facing unprecedented competition from other graduate employers at the very time that it needs to attract a very high proportion of graduates to hit today’s targets as well as to make up for years of under-recruitment.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police outside London</th>
<th>Teacher outside London</th>
<th>Police inner London</th>
<th>Teacher inner London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Salary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£19,842</td>
<td>£17,628*</td>
<td>£25,995</td>
<td>£20,733*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After 2 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£21,015</td>
<td>£19,524*</td>
<td>£27,015</td>
<td>£22,629*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teacher salaries based on April 2002 settlement

3.2(e) Is there any evidence on the numbers and types of former teachers who return to teaching, the age at which they typically return and the factors in their decision to return?

In 1998-9, the most recent year for which data is available, a total of 10,700 former teachers entered full-time teaching (DfEE, Statistics of Education: Teachers, 2000), representing 39 per cent of the total
teaching intake for that year. Six thousand re-entered nursery or primary schools, 4,700 secondary.

Women outnumbered men by more that 8:1 overall, whilst the ratio increased to 11:1 within the primary sector. The vast majority of female returners were aged between 40-49, suggesting they took time out of their careers to care for children. The age profile of male returners, conversely, was more evenly spread, which suggests their decision to return to teaching was less influenced by family considerations.

The percentage of teacher returners as a proportion of the total entrants to the teaching profession has fallen steadily since 1991. In 1989, teacher returners accounted for over half of the total yearly intake of teachers but by 1998 only 38 per cent of entrants were returners (DfEE ‘Database of Teacher Records’ 1998).

Possible reasons for the decline in returners could include new opportunities in the job market, the decline in relative salary and a growing negative perception of teaching.

Research conducted by the Teacher Supply and Retention Unit, based at the University of North London, has found that most returners in London were in their mid-30s and had come either from other employment or from caring for dependents. Two-thirds had taken a career break within eight years of qualification and over two-thirds had returned to teaching within two years of departure. Over a third felt that better pay would have encouraged them to return sooner, whilst almost a quarter suggested more flexible employment (job-shares/part-time work). (Hutchings M., Menter I., Ross A. and Thomson D., Teacher Supply and Retention in London; Phase One Report, University of North London, 1999).

According to TTA data, women typically take up refresher courses between the ages of 35-49. Men display a more even distribution of age, although there is a slight tendency for them to return after age 45.

“Fifty-one per cent of women stopped teaching between the ages of 25-34, which is the most common period to have children. Returning men, however, leave teaching at different stages of their careers. Over 21 per cent left aged 50 or over, compared to just 3 per cent for women, then overwhelmingly return to secondary and post-compulsory education. Penlington G., Who Returns to Teaching? The Profile and Motivation of Teacher Returners, IPPR/SMF, 2002.Page 13

Reasons identified in the above research on why teachers return to the profession included enjoyment of the job (29 per cent), its compatibility with family needs (25 per cent), altruism (12 per cent) and financial considerations (11 per cent). A small percentage returned for ‘negative’ reasons: 7 per cent felt it was the only career option available to them.
There has been a decline in the proportion of returners in the total entrants. In 1990, there were 32,600 entrants, of whom 17,300 (53 per cent) were returners. In 1999, there were the same number of entrants but only 12,500 (38 per cent) of them were returners.

A survey in 1991 found that 17 per cent of out-of-service teachers intended to return in the future, with 42 per cent undecided, 41 per cent not intending to return. Thirty per cent of women of childbearing age (but only 2 per cent of men of the same age) intend to return. Forty per cent of women gave flexible hours as the most important single measure that would encourage them to return, whilst pay was most important for men (STRB First Report, 1992).

3.3(a) *What initiatives have been undertaken or are planned to improve the attractiveness of teaching to potential new entrants and/or former teachers? For those policies that have been implemented, what is the evidence of their impact and cost? Where the impact has been either more or less marked than expected, what reasons are apparent?*

“The main thrust of the first Blair government’s policy on teacher shortage has been to introduce incentives to train as teachers. A variety of incentives has been on offer. A ‘golden hello’ scheme was introduced in 1999 for those training as science and maths teachers. This was extended to modern languages. A training salary of £6,000 was introduced from September 2000, with subjects attracting a bonus now extended to include English.

Chart 3.1 shows that these schemes have apparently been successful. Applications to science and maths courses were boosted considerably in 1999 – admittedly from a low base – by the first incentives. Modern languages applications rose in 2000 when they came within the remit. The new scheme has raised English applications significantly in the current year, with further rises also in maths and science. But we should remember that we are here only dealing applications.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>+2.0</td>
<td>+24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>+48.1</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>+13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>+36.1</td>
<td>+3.7</td>
<td>+9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>+17.1</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>+10.4</td>
<td>+5.2</td>
<td>+17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>+3.9</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>+18.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. As of week 41 (end of July).

Source: Graduate Teacher Training Registry (2000b).


The above table shows that admissions in 2001 increased by 5.5 per cent, compared to the previous year, much less than the widely publicised 18 per cent increase in applications and that admissions for MFL (expect Spanish) actually fell, in spite of the incentives.

‘Although we are only into the third year of that strategy, the data of this study raise considerable doubts about whether it is working: first, because of the wastefulness of the training process, it appears that whatever incentives might do for applications, they yield relatively few extra teachers for schools’.

Smithers A. and Robinson P., Teachers Leaving, University of Liverpool, 2001. Paragraph 8.1

The TTA has introduced what, at times, seems an increasingly desperate set of measures to improve initial recruitment, especially into secondary training. Strategies have included major advertising campaigns (‘no-one forgets a good teacher’, ‘those who can, teach’ and financial incentives. Employment-based routes into teaching have been promised and LEAs have been funded to employ Recruitment Strategy Managers. Each initiative tends to produce an immediate upturn in recruitment but this has often been short-lived and has not always produced applicants of the right quality.

This type of financial incentive should only be seen as a short-term measure. Research on the effect of DES bursaries found there was an increase in applications in the year after announcement but by the following year it had decreased to pre-bursary levels (N Straker ‘Teacher Supply in the 1990s’, 1991). Incentives of this type, therefore, cannot necessarily be relied upon in the long-term. Research at the University of York (see above) found that ‘although a lump sum payment was seen as a definite encouragement, fundamental changes to the working environment, the workload and the salary were more important. The fast-track scheme was one of the least encouraging of all the factors presented’.

A number of initiatives have been established specifically to encourage former teachers to return to the profession. A one-off payment of up to £4,000 was offered in 2001, awarded regardless of the rate by which a teacher returned. When this year’s figures relating to the returners are made available, the success of the scheme can be evaluated (over 2,500 teachers registered their details. (Hansard 22, October 2001, Column 40W)
From April 2001, every participant on a refresher course is eligible for a Government training bursary of up to £150 per week (maximum £1,500 for the duration of the course) in addition to childcare support of up to £150 per week for children aged five or under and £70 per week for children aged 5-14 (up to a maximum of £1,800 and £840 per child respectively). Introducing training bursaries to pay for childcare is a positive step towards overcoming the barriers to returning to work for parents.

The ‘Keeping in Touch’ programme was launched by the TTA in 1999. A database of teachers who have left the profession but wish to be kept up-to-date with developments has been established. A newsletter is sent termly, providing details of training programmes and curriculum developments, as well as a list of useful contacts.

Teachers on this scheme may return to the profession via whichever route they choose – the aim is to remain in contact with them and encourage them to view teaching as a possible future career.

3.3(b) Does your country seek to attract teachers from other countries? If so, what specific policies and steps have been taken or are planned? What is the extent of such recruitment and what implications does it have for the teaching profession?

A major source of supply teachers, particularly in London and the South East, is from overseas. The majority of such teachers come from countries with historic ties to Britain – Australia, New Zealand, Canada and South Africa.

Concerns have been expressed about their lack of knowledge of the English education system and the sustainability of retaining such teachers. Schools which would like to make permanent appointments, for example, are debarred unless the applicants have residency and their teaching qualification is recognised.

Current regulations do not allow for the automatic recognition of teaching qualifications gained abroad, unless the teacher is a national of a member state of the European Economic Area (EEA) and a trained qualified state school teacher in one of the following EEA member states: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom. This mutual recognition is the result of an agreement between those countries and covered by EC Directive 89/48.

The Education (Teachers) Qualifications and Health Standards Regulations 1999 (SI 1999 No. 2166), as amended, allow schools to appoint overseas-trained teachers without QTS in three circumstances:
• as trainees on an employment-based route
• as a temporary teacher in a school or a number of schools for up to four years without QTS
• as 'instructors' - persons offering particular skills who may be appointed when no qualified teacher with such skills is available.

3.3(c) **What issues are the highest priority for future policy development in attracting able people into the teaching profession? What are some policy options that could be considered? What are the likely views of key stakeholder groups on these priority issues and possible policy options?**

Recruitment problems could be solved if salaries were competitive, particularly for experienced teachers. Pay is one of the main reasons why scientists do not choose to teach – they can acquire high salaries in the private sector. Many of those who are discouraged by poor pay feel they have the right personality for the job (Coulthard M. and Kyriacou C., *Does Teaching as a Career Offer what Students are Looking For?*, University of York, 2000.)

There need to be improvements to the working environment and resources in schools, with personal access to ICT. Reduction in teacher workloads, particularly the amount of bureaucracy, is vital. Reduced class sizes should be extended to junior and secondary schools and there should be more, better trained and qualified classroom assistants, specifically to reduce the pressure on teachers.

• OFSTED inspections need to be balanced, with internal teacher control.
• Multi-discipline teams should be available in schools to work with difficult children and alleviate disruptive behaviour.
• More emphasis on career development.
• Further diversification of the routes into training courses, in particular, for undergraduates not studying National Curriculum subjects.

**SECTION 4: EDUCATING, DEVELOPING AND CERTIFYING TEACHERS**

4.1 **Are there major concerns about teacher education, development or certification? In what respects?**

The supply model employed in England is one developed by the DfES. It is a simple model based on national population figures and projected trends in the workforce. Places in ITT are funded on an annual basis, meaning there is no long-term view of the needs.
The TTA allocates funded places to ITT providers around the country. The system by which this process operates has been directly related to the quality of provision as reflected by inspection grades. The lack of consideration given to local and regional need by this system can lead to a gap between demand and supply, particularly as there is a strong tendency for teachers to seek employment near to the location of their initial training. Even if there appeared to be sufficient teachers nationally, they might not necessarily be in the right place or have the appropriate specialism.

All PGCE courses are expected to recruit as near to their targets as possible. There is, therefore, external pressure on the interviewing system: some students who are not suited to the profession slip through the net.

ITT providers are under enormous pressure. They have to recruit to their targets or they lose funding which, in turn, will lead to cutbacks in provision. At the same time, they have to recruit good students. The current ITT inspection system works on an output model and judges the quality of the course by the quality of the trainee, 75 per cent or more of whom are expected to be ‘good’ or ‘very good’. To give a student the benefit of the doubt at interview is to take a huge risk – one student could lead to the closing down of a course.

4.2(c) Are special education or training provisions made for established professionals from other occupations who would like to become teachers or for former teachers who would like to re-enter teaching, or for existing teachers who would like to retrain in areas of shortage or for teachers’ assistants who would like to upgrade? What is the scale of such programmes and what is the evidence on their effectiveness?

There are two main routes back into teaching for a person with QTS, via the LEA or schools and via the TTA.

By far the vast majority of teacher returners simply approach their LEA. They are often advised to attend some kind of refresher course, run by either the LEA or TTA, which once completed will stand them in good stead for getting a teaching appointment. Alternatively, many returners apply directly for jobs with local schools. The school then satisfies itself that the applicant is up-to-date with developments in teaching and runs the relevant police checks, before making the appointment. Approximately 80 per cent of teacher returners use these routes.”


The TTA sponsors 80 refresher courses around the country, for returners to update their skills and knowledge. The courses are run and organised by a variety of organisations, including universities, LEAs, schools and education consortia, but are funded centrally by the
TTA. They usually last 8-12 weeks and start at different points during the academic year, typically at the start of every school term.

Taking up a place at a refresher course does not guarantee subsequent employment, although the TTA indicates there is a high appointment rate among participants.

Teaching assistants’ potential to become teachers has only recently been recognised and developed. Although the numbers of support staff employed has increased by a third in the past five years, many have very little training and almost all are low paid.

There are a few schemes for staff who wish to progress from classroom assistant to qualified teacher. However, many have few educational qualifications and find that progression from access courses to QTS is long and difficult.

‘LSAs as the vast majority will not have the aptitude or inclination to become classroom teachers or associate teachers. In addition, it is necessary to build and retain a core of expertise, experience and good practice among classroom assistants who can act as role models and mentors for those just starting’.  


4.2(f) What types of professional development options and programmes exist for teachers? Who decides what type of learning opportunities teachers need? How are such programmes monitored for effectiveness? Are there any formal links between professional development programmes and maintenance of certification to teach, salary rises and career pathways? What audience is available on the impact of such links to teacher performance?

‘Paradoxically, while many occupations have come to emphasise knowledge and learning more, teaching, whose primary purpose is the transfer of knowledge and understanding, has not shifted significantly in this direction.

There is a growing expectation that teachers will reflect on their practice, absorb new research findings and participate in training and development courses. In this sense, receiving qualified teacher status no longer represents a career-long licence to practice within the profession. It is a licence that needs to be revalidated by continuous learning throughout each teacher’s career.’  


‘Nearly all of the teachers interviewed during this research expressed frustration at the limited opportunities they had to reflect on and develop their own practice, which they saw as a result of excessive
workload. There was also dissatisfaction with an increasingly centralised, standardised system of training and guidance’.


‘There was strong support for the idea of releasing expert practitioners from some of their teaching duties to help support the professional development of others. Some teachers demanded greater provision for sabbatical leave and other forms of extended professional development.

The Government has repeatedly stated that it sees professional development as having a higher profile and priority in its new reshaped framework for teacher appraisal and rewards and that it is essential for continuing the momentum towards higher standards and a ‘world class’ education system. Yet many of the efforts to provide opportunities for professional development are being experienced by teachers as extra burdens on demands because of the nature of their existing routines. Furthermore, teachers’ experience the learning opportunities on offer as, at best, mixed’.


SECTION 5: RECRUITING, SELECTING AND ASSIGNING TEACHERS

5.1 Are there major concerns about teacher recruitment, selection and assignment and in what respects?

“The limited pool of qualified staff available to take full-time teaching posts is a difficulty for many schools. Temporary, part-time, long-term supply and overseas staff are often the means by which headteachers are able to have someone in front of their classes and not have to send children home. Sometimes such appointments can be successful, at least in ‘holding the fort’, in the hope that an advertisement next year will bring forward a suitable person. But on many occasions, particularly in relation to supply, concern was expressed at how time-consuming it was to get cover and the quality of staff available.

The pressures of coping seem to be leading some headteachers to resort to ways of covering teaching that might be thought not entirely appropriate. Pressing non-teaching staff into service as teachers is a blatant example. But the over-ready use of temporary contracts, particularly when posts are advertised as permanent, is an issue.

Although, in the various ways, schools may be covering classes, one also has to be concerned at the quality of education that is possible. Pupils who find that their teaching is mainly in the hands of temporary staff – perhaps teaching outside their specialist subject and not entirely familiar with the curriculum – will not be getting the same opportunities as their contemporaries taught by high quality teachers. The under-
supply of teachers may not show up in vacancies but it does affect who is actually in the classroom. There may be someone there so that, in this sense, the vacancy is filled, but the skills clearly do not always match the job.” Smithers A. and Robinson P., *Coping with Teacher Shortages*, University of Liverpool, 2000. Paragraph 5.21-5.23

“The curriculum is increasingly being adjusted by removing or reducing subjects or options where the school finds it difficult to get the staff, particularly for the lower ability groups. Classes are also being joined for particular subjects. Teachers are also increasingly being expected to teach outside their subjects to enable the school to achieve curriculum coverage.” Common devices employed by schools include:

- modifications to the curriculum;
- increasing class or group sizes;
- reducing non-contact time;
- increased teaching outside subject.

Smithers A. and Robinson P., *Coping with Teacher Shortages*, University of Liverpool, 2000. Paragraph 6.1

“By means of these various organisational devices and the compromises on appointments illustrated, it is possible to see how, at the same time, there can be a teacher shortage and few teacher vacancies. The schools can be very thinly stretched but by one means or another contrive to have someone to teach all their classes. Getting everything to come together often imposes great demands on the headteachers and severe stresses and strains on the teachers, which may well exacerbate the recruitment problem by increasing wastage and absences.

Not all schools are affected. There may not be enough teachers to go round in some subject and some areas but there are teachers being trained and some schools are able to snap them up. What the shortages do lead to, however, is considerable unevenness in provision. Since the quality of education provided depends crucially on the teachers, it must follow that, within our national education system, there is considerable unevenness of opportunity.”


There is a tendency on the part of the Government to claim that teacher recruitment difficulties are largely a London problem but research conducted by Smithers and Robinson shows that they are widespread (see Table 7.1 below).
“The patterns differed somewhat between the primary and secondary phases. For primary schools, there was wide regional fluctuation. In inner London, 86.3 per cent of primary posts were reported as difficult to fill, in contrast to only 13 per cent on Merseyside and 29 per cent in Wales. Among secondary schools, although again Merseyside emerged on the low side for both vacancies and difficulty, the proportion of posts reported as difficult to fill was rather similar across the region. This could be because secondary schools throughout the country are having to contend with the severe and continuing under-recruitment and training in many of the subjects. Since for the primary phase the training target has been consistently met, the school recruitment difficulties in some regions must reflect, in part, the reluctance of the teachers to live and work there.” Smithers A. and Robinson P., *Coping with Teacher Shortages*, University of Liverpool, 2000. Paragraph 7.2

According to the Smithers and Robinson report, a number of features of the local environment appear to make it easier or more difficult for schools to recruit staff. These include:

- attractiveness of the area;
- house prices;
- remoteness;
- school standards;
- lack of sixth form;
- special measures; and
- faith schools.

Table 7.1: Difficulty of Filling Full-Time Posts by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Vacancies</td>
<td>% Difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner London</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer London</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merseyside</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorks &amp; Humb</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“In circumstances where there are not enough teachers to go around, it is inevitable that the shortages should show up more in some regions, locations and schools than others, but what does seem odd is that the schools on which the prospect of a fairer society depends most – those
which in the past have been found to be failing – should find it most difficult to get teachers.”
Smithers A. and Robinson P., *Coping with Teacher Shortages*,
University of Liverpool, 2000. Paragraph 7.17

“The main message of the study is that schools are finding it very difficult to recruit good teachers. Not enough are being trained to go around and about half the vacancies in our representative survey were described as difficult to fill. Analysis of the teacher training figures shows that for many years there has been a failure to reach the targets in a number of subjects. Admittedly, this is to some extent cyclical but even this is worrying since it is the inverse of the economic cycle implying that teaching is not competing successfully against a wide range of other occupations for the very large numbers of graduates that it needs. Recruitment to some subjects if better than others but all except history and PE are to some extent affected.

What happens in conditions of teacher shortage is that the education system becomes even more polarised and inequitable. Some schools are able to attract the teachers they need, while others are left out in the cold. The schools that are most successful are the top independent schools, which offer high salaries, good working conditions, good facilities and the prospect of a fulfilling working life. They are not only able to recruit some of the best graduates but also draw in teachers who have proved themselves in other schools, both Stage and Independent. They can select according to the most exacting standards. Below them there is a whole raft of independent schools and some State schools, which on occasions lose staff upwards but draw in from other schools. They are also in a better position to attract newly qualified teachers and choose among them. At the bottom of the heap, however, are the schools glad to recruit the people they are able to get. In times of shortage they will tend to lose their best staff and find it hard to attract newly qualified teachers. Their main concern at times will be to have someone in the classroom rather than selecting to a standard.”

Smithers A. and Robinson P., *Coping with Teacher Shortages*,

5.2(c) On what basis are teachers employed – fixed-term contracts, tenure positions, and so on? What provisions exist for changing the basis of employment, e.g., from fixed term contract to tenure? Have there been any changes in these respects or are any planned? What are the reasons involved?

The latest DfES figures show that about 7 per cent of full-time teachers and 40 per cent of part-time teachers are on fixed-term contracts, about half for a year or less. There has been a great growth in temporary appointments. The reasons are varied but include:
• postponing an appointment because of being unable to find a suitable person for a full-time permanent post;

• as a safeguard against doubts about the quality of a candidate; and

• giving flexibility to the school.

Nor all temporary contracts arise as a result of recruitment difficulties but many do. In many of the cases cited in the Smithers and Robinson report, where appointment was postponed, the temporary member of staff was recruited from the short list drawn up for a permanent post. However, temporary appointments can sometimes arise this way, principally as a safeguard. Sometimes, all the newly qualified staff are put on one-year contracts as a matter of course, both as a trail and to give flexibility. Fixed-term contracts can be full-time or part-time. DfES statistics for 1999 show a doubling of part-time staff since 1985 to 67,000, or about 7 per cent of the workforce in full time equivalent. In 1997 to 1998, for example, 22 per cent of those leaving full-time posts moved to part-time posts and, conversely, 18 per cent of the full-time recruits came from part-time appointments. Part-time contracts can arise in a variety of ways. These can include:

• responding to difficulties of teacher recruitment;

• covering vacancies through filling-in or job-sharing;

• taking some responsibilities that would fall on existing staff.

Part-time contracts can also arise for positive reasons. There may be specific tasks, for example, which are best met by such appointments. The issue of part-time and temporary contracts merges into that of supply cover, especially when it is long-term. In fact, the difference in practice may essentially be only in how the appointment is made and who holds the contract. Schools are becoming increasingly reliant on supply cover. This is in part to cover for ill-health, out-of-school training in connection with numerous government initiatives, and increased load of monitoring and assessment. But it is also a response to the difficulties of recruitment. Long-term supply cover is used particularly in London and the south-east. Supply cover plays a major part in enabling schools to keep functioning in the face of staff shortages and absences. Concerns expressed by headteachers in the Smithers and Robinson report include:

• the availability of supply staff;

• the quality of supply staff;

• the cost of supply staff.
“Schools are also having to look beyond temporary appointments, supply teachers and recruiting overseas to ensure that there is at least someone to take their classes. They are sometimes inappropriately calling on their other staff to take on teaching duties. “
Smithers A. and Robinson P., *Coping with Teacher Shortages*, University of Liverpool, 2000. Paragraph 5.18

“As well as part-time contracts, schools are making extensive use of temporary contracts. Table 3.3 shows that only about half the full-time appointments to primary schools and three-quarters of those to secondary schools were “permanent”. Most of the rest were for a year or less. Some of the temporary appointments were sought to cover extended absence or to create necessary flexibility…. The great majority of part-time appointments were temporary.”
Smithers A. and Robinson P., *Coping with Teacher Shortages*, University of Liverpool, 2000. Paragraph 3.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Vacancy</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between one term and one year</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one term</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Primary</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one year</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between one term and one year</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one term</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3(b) **What initiatives have been undertaken or are planned to improve teacher recruitment selection or assignment procedures? For those policies that have been implemented, what is the extent of their impact and cost? Where the impact has been either more or less marked than expected, what reasons are apparent?**

“The Government has introduced a number of measures designed to recruit and retain teachers. These changes have been based on a new model of career progression. There has been a rise in the starting salary to £17,000 and an extension of the top of the pay scale through the introduction of performance related pay. Those who pass a threshold competence assessment can earn up to £31,000 without taking on management responsibilities. The new ‘fast track’ for ‘high potential’ teachers is intended to enable rapid promotion. There is now a new grade of teachers – the Advanced Skills teacher, who can earn
up to £45,000. Senior managers can now earn up to £36,000, while headteachers can earn up to £78,000. Schools are now able to award up to £5,000 per annum on top of salaries to retain teachers, and teachers working in London receive extra allowances to cover the higher cost of living. Some teachers can earn a supplementary income from extra duties, including providing cover for absent colleagues, staffing after school clubs and marking exam papers. It will be some time before the overall effect of these changes can be fully assessed. However, it is clear that the reforms have not yet sparked a major shift in recruitment and retention rates or altered the dominant image of teaching as an overworked, low status occupation. “


5.2(d) Are teachers assigned to schools or do they apply? Does this vary depending upon the type of post and their career stage? How does the system ensure an equitable distribution of teachers among schools? Have there been any changes in this respect or are any planned? What are the reasons involved?

“Traditionally, schools have been reactive (in appointing staff). A vacancy has arisen, they have advertised, sifted the responses, shortlisted and selected the best candidate.

Nowadays headteachers are finding that they have to get out there and actively recruit.

One of the frustrations is the speed with which likely looking applicants get snapped up.

In order to catch potential candidates, headteachers are interviewing within hours of an application arriving, contacting candidates at home in the evenings, interviewing off premises in hotels. “

Smithers A. and Robinson P., Coping with Teacher Shortages, University of Liverpool, 2000. Paragraph 4.1 – 4.5

According to Smithers and Robinson, schools are employing a number of methods to search out staff, such as:

• extensively networking with other schools to determine the quality of candidates unsuitable in other interviews;

• pre-emptive appointments. Headteachers are sometimes seeking out staff in advance of advertising. They also sometimes offer posts where there is no vacancy in order to hang on to a good second-choice applicant;

• headteachers are not above poaching or trying to steal a march on colleagues;
• some schools are keen to participate in PGCE training as a means of recruiting staff;
• there are instances of overseas applicants being appointed without any face-to-face contact at all;
• difficulties in making appointments have made primary schools increasingly wary of asking for specialisms and not being too specific in their requirements;
• some schools are prepared to take inappropriately qualified applicants and train them in the subject themselves.

"It might be thought that most of these things are what sensible managers would do in order to optimise their staffing. In the quasi market that education has become, it is to be expected that headteachers will want to actively recruit in an attempt to gain a competitive edge, but the issue is whether this is merely a shift from being reactive to being proactive or a response to teacher shortage. Apart from anything else, it is obviously very time-consuming and, in some cases, it has led to the collapse of standard fair and equal interviewing procedures."
Smithers A. and Robinson P., Coping with Teacher Shortages, University of Liverpool, 2000. Paragraph 4.16

The Smithers and Robinson report also found that the expectations of the headteachers were adjusting to what is possible. “No longer were they necessarily looking for high fliers but only for people who looked as though they could hold their own. This possibly explains the STRB’s somewhat surprising finding that headteachers were largely content with the appointments they were able to make – content in the circumstances. As we shall be seeing, the notion of an acceptable standard tended to vary with type of school, which is why some of the seemingly more attractive schools were also reporting recruitment difficulties.”
Smithers A. and Robinson P., Coping with Teacher Shortages, University of Liverpool, 2000. Paragraph 4.18

SECTION 6: RETAINING EFFECTIVE TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS

6.1 Are there major concerns about retaining effective teachers in schools and in what respects?

“In spite of the active and vigorous steps headteachers are taking to secure the best possible staff, they are having to plug the gaps in various ways and to adjust the timetable to cope with the teachers they have. All this is taking its toll of the headteachers themselves and imposing stresses and strains on the existing staff."
For headteachers and their senior colleagues, the main problems arising from the shortfalls in teacher supply have been the sheer amount of time it has taken to recruit, the tension of not getting people of the quality they want, and the extra teaching they are having to do themselves by either taking over classes or covering for absences."

"The recruitment problem is being exacerbated by the numerous initiatives which the Government currently has on the go. They are both increasing the workload and taking staff from schools."

"Many of the consequences of under-recruitment and extra load are passed down to the teaching staff. This has resulted in raised stress levels which have shown up in a spectrum of behaviours"

Such behaviour included:

- shouting at children;
- tiredness, headaches and withdrawal;
- absenteeism;
- illness; and
- resignation.

"It is evident that a number of headteachers and teachers are showing signs of stress. Teacher recruitment difficulties will have contributed to that. They are not the only cause. Under-funding over the years has tended to leave schools short of staff even if they have been able to achieve a full complement. There have also been the many changes successive governments have demanded of schools as they have sought to improve the education service. Prominent among these have been the many initiatives and the greatly increased accountability in terms of examination results and inspections.

But all of this would have been more tolerable if schools had been able to get the staff they needed. That they have not, has served to ratchet up the other tensions. Teacher shortage has, itself, contributed to more teachers leaving."
The full extent of the impact of under-recruitment to training on schools does not appear to have got back to, or been accepted by, the Government, the School Teachers’ Review Body and the Teacher Training Agency. In part, this is because of the heroic efforts that teachers have been making, at no little cost to themselves, of providing the best education of which they are capable, whatever the circumstances’. Smithers A. and Robinson P., *Coping with Teacher Shortages*, University of Liverpool, 2000. Paragraph 9.11-13

“The teaching profession is unable to recruit or retain enough teachers to sustain itself in the long-term. The generation of teachers who entered the profession in the 1960s and 1970s will retire in the next ten years. This will place extremely serious demands on the school system, irrespective of labour market conditions at the time. In order to maintain the momentum of educational improvement and reforms, policymakers will have to find ways to overcome both the cyclical and long-term weaknesses in the supply of high quality teachers.

Teacher shortages and low morale are closely related. The danger is that teacher shortages place even greater strain on serving teachers and further stifle opportunities for creativity and professional autonomy. The profession could be locked into a spiral of decline. The challenge is to identify practical policies that can release the creative energy of the teaching profession in ways which contribute directly to the agenda of improvement and transformation that policymakers need to articulate. If this challenge can be met, teaching will be able to attract more high quality graduates, thus preventing teacher shortages even in terms of economic boom’.


As indicated below, the resignation rate is highest amongst the youngest teachers. ‘Some 18 per cent of the teachers leave during their first three years. If this is added to the training loss, it seems that nearly 60 per cent of the trainees do not survive in teaching beyond three years.

The losses mean that teaching is not renewing itself. The largest cohorts, nearly double the present size, are rapidly approaching retirement age and are already being affected by ill health retirement.’ Smithers A. and Robinson P., *Teachers Leaving*, University of Liverpool, 2001. Paragraph 8.12-13

“Teachers overwhelmingly put ‘lack of time’ as the main impediment to their ability to fulfil their daily responsibilities satisfactorily. It is the clearest single message emerging from this study and reminds us that what brought teachers into teaching, and what is impelling many of them to leave, is the denial of opportunities to get to know children, to make time for them as learning and growing individuals.
It is not the physical conditions of teachers’ work which demoralise - conditions which would be intolerable in other professions. Teachers are prepared to tolerate these if their work has vitality and brings them satisfaction; although poor physical conditions contribute to stress. The IPPR report (Edwards 2002) coined the term ‘intrinsic satisfiers’ to denote those things which gave teachers’ satisfaction - creativity and autonomy. They concluded that professional wastage would only be reduced by enhancing the positive features of the job - the core work of classroom contact with pupils, responsibility and freedom to determine the course of events in the classroom, to apply initiative and creative skills to both content and pedagogy.

What deeply matters is time – time as a resource for learning and teaching, time for the important. Time is the unifying thread, which runs through teachers’ stories, but is not a simple quantitative issue. Teachers tend to work longer hours than they did a decade or two decades ago but the difference is a marginal one. Even some patterns of work, ratio of teaching to non-teaching time for example, have not undergone a radical change in that period. For 56% of the working week teachers are not teaching pupils, only a slight improvement on comparable to the figure for the early seventies and mid nineties. The compounding factor is that those who were in teaching at that time lived on the promise that once the National Curriculum and attendant assessment had bedded down the balance would be redressed. This did not happen. What followed was wave on wave of new initiatives so that teachers finally lost confidence that things would ever be different.

While teachers recognise the importance of non-teaching time they become concerned when the burden exceeds the fifteen hour benchmark that was seen by virtually everyone as the upper limit for the week. ‘Evaporated time’, time lost to classroom teaching, may in fact have decreased in recent years but it has been replaced by other responsibilities such as monitoring of behaviour outside classrooms. One of the most substantive changes to non-teaching activities is in time devoted to formal meetings, a mere six and half minutes per week in the seventies rising to around two hours a week today; a reduction of almost an hour a week from the 1994 high of 2.9 hours. While such shared occasions might be viewed as a good, or not so good, use of teacher time, it does provide a significant indicator of a shift away from face-to-face contact with pupils in the classroom.

Meetings have become an imperative because of the need to keep everyone abreast of centrally-driven policies. Many of these are, however, seen as unlikely to enhance pupils’ educational experiences. Inspection, statutory testing and performance management were the three priorities most often cited by teachers as contributing least to pupil learning and, not coincidently, as most inimical to teachers’ working conditions. Demanding so much of a teacher’s time and energies these three initiatives in particular failed the cost-benefit
analysis, or ‘practicality ethic’. Yet, each in its own way, has had a significant impact on the nature of classroom teaching and learning.

The profile of teachers’ work evidences a marked increase in whole class teaching at the expense of pupil-directed work and exercise of pupil choice. This is a direct consequence of an OFSTED mandate, which despite resting on dubious evidence (Reynolds and Farrell, 1999) has contributed to the decrease in time spent with individual pupils, whether going over work together or discussing homework on a one-to-one basis. One of the knock on effects of this is for pupils’ homework to become each teacher’s homework, marked in the absence of the pupil and thereby reducing the opportunity to listen, to give time, to explore misunderstandings. Marking homework ‘in absentia’ can only serve a formative function if the teacher is able to invest a significant amount of his or her time in providing written feedback.

On the plus side teachers now enjoy more assistance in the classroom than a decade ago. One third of teachers now have such support for more than eleven hours a week, which compares with only one in ten eight years before, as reported by Campbell and Neill. This benefit of this extra help is seen by teachers as in redressing the balance of class teaching, deploying classroom assistants in small group and individual work and in preparation. The corollary to this is the marked fall in the use of auxiliary help for assessment and recording.

It is in the pattern of the teacher’s day and working week that we find explanations for the pervasive sense of loss - the loss of opportunities for the spontaneous and the unpredictable, for one-to-one discussion, for time off task. Where is the space in this new busy driven day and pressure for targets, teachers ask, for learning without measurement, without one eye on the clock?

This is not to deny the satisfaction, even elation, that a teacher may experience when a child does well on a test, when she exceeds her own or the teacher’s expectation. Yet, again and again, the need expressed is for a balance, a contextualisation of achievement, a time, place and educational purpose for testing and targets.

The debate returns insistently to the issue of control. Being in, or our of, control has been shown to be the single most important predictor not only of job satisfaction, but also of physical and mental health. That link is amply demonstrated by teachers’ numerous references to health and well-being during our interviews.

The literacy and numeracy strategies have, however, met with overwhelming support. That positive view is attenuated, however, by issues of preparation, balance and control. The twin strategies are embraced for a variety of reasons – enhancing teachers’ confidence and skill in teaching in those areas, the innovative methods they have
introduced and the structure and security they bring. Their prescriptive nature releases teachers from constant invention and improvisation, which is both a plus and a minus, but in a high pressure and high stakes environment, something to be embraced. Both strategies require intensive preparation time but, at the same time, serve to plug gaps in teachers’ knowledge and expertise. A similar ambivalence is found in the evaluation of the strategies by the Canadian team (Earl et al, 2001). While they reported that teachers were very positive about the benefits of this large-scale reform, the report carried with it a warning of ‘collateral damage’, a reference to the imbalance in the curriculum.

There is certainly evidence here of a growing imbalance in the curriculum. Five hours a week for Maths as against half an hour for music. As many hours in a week for English as for History, Geography, Design and Technology, ICT and Art combined. And within that statistic lies a clear indication of a move away from integration of knowledge, which, in the world outside, is increasingly seen as necessary for continuing life long learning. Actually the trend is to import content to literacy and to export strategies to other subjects (e.g. how to take notes).

Teachers’ choice of words is in itself illuminating. References to, ‘squeezing’, ‘tightening’, ‘narrowing’ all convey a sense of being constricted, hemmed, channelled into activities in which there is little or no professional reward. One consequence of is for teachers to compensate the lack of complete coverage of the curriculum during class time with after school clubs. Many of these, under the generic name of ‘study support’ (financed through the New Opportunities Fund) have taken on a compensatory character. Rather than expanding, and enriching learning, as advocated in the Study Support Code of Practice, (DfES 2000), there has been a tendency to extend curriculum and assessment pressures into out of hours and Easter or summer catch-up programmes.

The issue of balance applies also to what is achieved in school and what is taken home. While teachers perhaps stay no longer in school than they once did they take home more. The overfilled box journeying between home and school, as depicted on the report’s cover, is symbolic of the Third Millennium teacher. It is no longer possible to separate personal; and professional lives or to be effective without taking the school home with you. Sundays are no longer the day or rest, a time of relaxation or renewal but a day to retrieve one week and prepare for the next. At least some family break up was attributed by teachers to an out-of-kilter home life. There is not one but many stories of how those tensions are manifested – in households where teachers are married to teachers, teachers living with an unemployed partner, single parent households, single parents with infant children, widows and widowers with grown up children. In each the impact is different and the coping strategies more or less manageable.
Staying on at school to display children’s work is now overtaken by more pressing external demands. The teacher, with a family to go back to, leaves school at six o’clock frustrated at yet again sacrificing something that he deems to be a gratifying priority. The pleasurable duty of display has to be set aside for routine and morale-sapping administrative tasks. Yet, apparently simple things like the exhibit of children’s work is not an administrative task to be delegated to classroom assistant, but a celebration of the real outcomes of teaching; even more so when engaged and discussed with colleagues. The collegial discussion of children’s work is not only satisfying but also challenging and an important occasion for assessment, reflection and self-evaluation. The quality of work on the walls of a classroom is the, for a teacher, a reflection of herself.

Three issues dominated in the questionnaire returns, written comments and elaborations in interview – time, initiative overload and pressure to meet curriculum targets. These are not separate issues but cluster together under the generic title of ‘workload’. However neutrally ‘workload’ may be treated as a descriptive term it is one heavily charged with emotional connotation. It is as much about personal lifestyle as professional fulfilment. Politicians may caricature teachers as ‘moaning’ and policy-makers may point to Canada, the United States, the Pacific Rim or other countries of the world where the pressures are the same. This is a manifestation of globalisation, a widely shared belief that education is primarily for economic benefit and that schools and teachers are ultimately responsible for national growth and decline. Not only is there a lack evidence to support such a view, but also were it true teachers would have to be given respect and support that such a significant responsibility merits. No strategy for change can be effected without recognising and rewarding those charged with making it happen. “


6.2(a) Summarise the data on the number of teachers who leave the profession each year – if possible by age, extent of teaching experience, gender, teaching area, reasons given and destination. Do they leave more from certain types of schools or regions, or at certain points of their careers than others? Are there any major trends in these regards and any evidence of the factors involved?

“Our survey found that, during the summer term 2001, 36,483 teachers had resigned from full-time permanent contracts in maintained primary and secondary schools in England and Wales. This is over ten per cent of the total. Converted to an annual rate (about 70 per cent of the
resignations fall in the summer term)\(^1\) this comes to 14.5 per cent or about one in seven teachers moving or leaving.

Chart 2.1 gives the details. There was variation with region, with schools in London, the South East and Eastern regions losing most staff from both primary and secondary phases. Northern England fared rather better. But not as well as Wales where school staffing seemed remarkably stable.

As well as full-time permanent teachers there are full-time fixed-term contracts and part-time staff. Our survey found that they added a further 12,880 resignations, making 49,363 in all. Grossed up this suggests an annual figure of 70,500, or a resignation rate of 15.8 per cent on a headcount or full-time equivalent basis. When just full-time staff are considered, turnover in primary schools becomes 16.5 per cent.

Chart 2.1: Resignations of Full-Time Permanent Teachers\(^1\) by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Primary Resignation</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Secondary Resignation</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner London</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer London</td>
<td>2,223</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1,968</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>4,333</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>3,626</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorks &amp; Humb</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>17,808</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>17,855</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,182</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>18,301</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Resignations from full-time permanent contracts effective from end of summer term 2001.
2. Grossed up from sample to reflect number of schools in region.

Chart 2.2 compares the annual resignation rates expressed on the various bases with the latest published survey of the Employers’ Organisation for Local Government (2001) giving figures for 1999. In all cases, the summer 2001 resignations appear to be running some four percentage points higher. Although such comparisons must be

---

\(^1\) We have taken this figure from our study, *Teacher Turnover* (Robinson and Smithers, 1991), where we surveyed schools after each of the three resignation dates. We realise this is only one year and the information may be somewhat dated, but there do not appear to be any nationally agreed statistics on this point. Discussions with LEAs suggested that they work to a rule of thumb of two-thirds leaving in the summer, but we stayed with our figure of 70 per cent as a more conservative basis for grossing up.
interpreted with caution, the extent of the difference points to a rapidly rising rate.

This is borne out by a time series collected by the Employers’ Organisation (2001 plus private communication). Chart 2.3 shows resignations since 1993 (when sixth-form colleges were removed to become part of the further education sector). They rose steadily, year by year, until 1997 when there was a sudden surge due to an impending change in the pension regulations making early retirement more difficult. This reduced resignations in 1998 since when they have risen sharply particularly in the secondary phase. Our survey continues that trend. Employers’ Organisation figures show resignations increased from 25,900 in 1998, to 34,800 in 1999, to 43,900 in 2000. Our survey indicates that in 2001 they reached 52,100.

### Chart 2.2: Annual Resignation Rates Compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Primary Survey</th>
<th>EO5</th>
<th>Secondary Survey</th>
<th>EO5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Permanent1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Equivalent4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Full-time permanent resignations annualised on assumption that 70 per cent of resignations occur in summer term.
2. All full-time teachers, whether permanent or fixed contract.
3. All teachers whether full or part-time, permanent or fixed contract.
4. All teachers, converted to full-time equivalents.

1. Full-time permanent teachers.

Source: Employers’ Organisation’s annual Survey of Teacher Resignations.

Resignations are from schools, not the system, so include those moving between schools. There are thus movers and leavers. Leavers are those giving up teaching in maintained schools to take alternative employment (including teaching in independent schools, or another sector, or working in education in the penumbra of jobs that has grown up around education), taking a break for maternity or family care, or going for some other reason. Among the leavers, it is convenient to distinguish the retirees. The retirees include those retiring early - some through ill-health - as well as those reaching retirement age. We shall be looking in detail at these various destinations in Chapter 6.

Chart 2.4 shows the resignations of full-time permanent teachers falling into these three categories. The steep rise in resignations since 1996 has occurred among both movers and leavers. It suggests that as shortages have grown, mobility in the system has increased. More departures lead to greater opportunities for remaining staff to trade up.
Chart 2.4: Resignations by Destination

1. ‘Movers’ those moving to other posts in maintained primary, secondary and special schools; ‘leavers’ those leaving including to take posts in independent schools and other sectors, to take other education and non-education employment, to have a break for maternity or other reasons, or to leave for other reason; retirers those taking retirement including normal age, early and ill-health.


Our survey suggests that the churning had increased even more by summer 2001. We found that 36,483 full-time permanent teachers were resigning, of whom 19,082 were moving to teaching posts in other maintained schools. Chart 2.5 shows that, in addition, 6,002 of the fixed-term and part-time teachers were transferring to other schools. But altogether 17,162 teachers were leaving and 7,117 were retiring.

Chart 2.5: Resignations Summer 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Full-Time Permanent</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N(^1)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movers</td>
<td>19,082</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>11,714</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirers</td>
<td>5,687</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36,483</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Grossed up from sample

Chart 2.6 shows that the younger teachers were particularly likely to resign. In part this was because they were more likely to move. Moves
between schools were at their height for the 25-29 age group and thereafter decreased with age band.

But younger teachers were also more likely to leave the profession with the departure rate running at 6.3 per cent a year for the under 30s. This is equivalent to 17.7 per cent of a cohort leaving over three years. The most stable employment period for teachers is between the ages 40 and 49, with relatively few movers or leavers. But already there are some early (ill-health) retirers. In the next age band, 50-59, about 4.5 per cent of the teachers a year are retiring. Currently, nearly 60 per cent of the profession are aged over 40, and 37.6 per cent are in the 40-49 age band alone. Younger cohorts tended to be only about half this size, so the profession is in danger of not renewing itself.

Chart 2.7 shows that female teachers are more likely to leave the profession than men, in part because of family commitments. Since they currently comprise 85 per cent of the primary teachers and nearly half the secondary teachers, and the proportions are increasing, this could be expected to influence future resignation rates. Male teachers tend to be older and more likely to retire.

Summer resignations in our 2001 survey suggest that schools will have been looking to replace 49,363 teachers for September. In addition, the government has been finding some extra money for schools and the number of secondary pupils is rising. Last year 8,100 extra posts were created, four-fifths full-time. Assuming a similar increase this year, total vacancies are likely to have been of the order of 57,500.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range (%)</th>
<th>Non-Resignation Rate Overall</th>
<th>Non-Resignation Rate Movers</th>
<th>Leavers</th>
<th>Retirers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25 (4.6%)</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 (14.6%)</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 (11.3%)</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39 (9.8%)</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 (37.6%)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 (21.2%)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Plus (0.9%)</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Data supplied by the Employers’ Organisation.
2. Per cent full-time permanent staff by age.
Our survey indicates that about 25,000 places will have been taken by teachers moving between schools, leaving 32,500 to be filled by new supply, teachers returning to the profession and recruitment from other sources such as overseas."

Smithers A. and Robinson P., Teachers Leaving, University of Liverpool, 2001. Chapter 2

“In response to the open-ended question “Why are you leaving teaching in a maintained school?” our 102 interviewees volunteered 290 reasons. Most of these (247, 85.2 per cent) were expressed negatively, explaining the push away from teaching. Only 43 (14.8 per cent) gave reasons for moving towards something else and they often implied a criticism of the conditions in teaching, for example, better salary and prospects. Chart 5.1 shows the pattern which emerged in a content analysis of the responses.

Workload, pupil behaviour and government initiatives emerged as the three major reasons for giving up teaching. Salary, stress and status/recognition were referred to by over a fifth. There were significant mentions too for career prospects, resources/facilities, school management and difficult parents. The only positive reasons to be given at all frequently were career prospects, travel, and salary, with five, most moving to independent schools, mentioning a new challenge.

The reasons given by primary and secondary teachers were broadly similar, but workload (73.9 per cent) and government initiatives (42.1 per cent) featured more prominently in the concerns of primary teachers. Pupil behaviour (15.8 per cent) seemed to loom less large for them, with stress (26.3 per cent) being the third most frequently given reason.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chart 5.1: Reasons Given for Resigning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Data supplied by the Employers’ Organisation.
2. Per cent full-time permanent staff by gender.
Workload | 57 | 2 | 59 | 57.8
---|---|---|---|---
Pupil Behaviour | 46 | - | 46 | 45.1
Govt Initiatives | 37 | 1 | 38 | 37.2
Salary | 15 | 8 | 25 | 24.5
Stress | 22 | - | 22 | 21.6
Status/Recognition | 19 | 1 | 20 | 19.6
Career Prospects | 5 | 13 | 18 | 17.6
School Management | 15 | - | 15 | 14.7
Resources/Facilities | 13 | 2 | 15 | 14.7
Travel | - | 12 | 12 | 11.8
Parents | 11 | - | 11 | 10.8
New Challenge | - | 5 | 5 | 4.9
Other\(^2\) | 4 | - | 4 | 4.0
Total | 247 | 43 | 290 | 100.0

1. Per cent of 102 interviewees
2. Two moving with husband, one wanting to live nearer home, one wanting to take advantage of the reduced fees charged by an independent school to children of staff.


“Unpacking the broad categories of mover, leaver and retirers, we can see in Chart 6.1 that just over half the resignees in our summer 2001 survey (52.3 per cent) were transferring to other maintained schools. This is consistent with the increases detected in recent Employer Organisation surveys and probably reflects the greater scope for moving on that exists in an under-staffed system.

In addition, 11.5 per cent were moving elsewhere in education, either to other teaching, for example in an independent school, or to an associated post such as an adviser. Only a small proportion (5.5 per cent) were taking employment outside education. Four-fifths of the retirers were going early. Nearly 4.0 per cent of the resignations were taking a break for maternity or family reasons. But there was also a relatively large group (11.2 per cent) whose destinations were apparently unknown.
Chart 6.1: Destinations, Summer 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th></th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N¹</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>N¹</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching in Maintained School</td>
<td>9,364</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>9,718</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Teaching</td>
<td>1,436</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Education</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Employment</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>3,363</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2,324</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity/Family</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/ Not Known</td>
<td>2,273</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,182</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>18,301</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Grossed up from sample

These were included among our interviewees and it is evident that many were leaving with no immediate plans. Their intention is just to get out of teaching and see what turns up.”


“What emerges from the interviews is that the main motivation for many seems to be to get out of teaching in state schools. How they do this depends on age. Those over 55 are taking early retirement, those in their middle years are leaving without anything particular in mind, and the younger ones are giving up to travel. Language teachers seemed particularly prone to quit and it is possible that they have a rougher ride given the disinclination of the English to learn foreign tongues.

Those resigning to take other employment usually are moving to independent schools, or to one of the numerous posts that have grown up in recent years around teaching. Very few were taking established posts outside education. …

Not all the resignees were leaving irrevocably. It is likely that those taking time out to travel will return to this country, probably to teach, but it is by no means certain that this will be in the maintained sector. Others taking a break or working elsewhere could conceivably be induced to return.” Smithers A. and Robinson P., Teachers Leaving, University of Liverpool, 2001. Paragraph 6.21 - 23

“During the interviews with the 102 leavers we asked them to name three things that could be done to bring them back into teaching. Nearly fifth, 20, including 12 early retirees and eight others said nothing would tempt them back and refused even to contemplate the question. The other 82 between them put forward 12 changes they would like to see, with
reduced workload, the most frequently mentioned, coming up 29 times. These are listed in rank order in Chart 7.1.

**Chart 7.1: Tempting Teachers Back**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Workload</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Pupil Behaviour</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Salary</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Status/Recognition</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer Initiatives</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better School Management</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller Class Sizes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Non-contact Time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Assessment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other¹</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 4 better facilities, 1 more money in education, 1 more academic school

In many ways the list that emerges is the mirror image of the reasons given for going (Chapter 5). Workload again tops the list, closely followed by pupil behaviour. The two factors weighed almost equally for secondary school teachers, but the regularity with which primary teachers mentioned workload put it ahead. Workload was often identified in the round, but particular aspects that were singled out included less paperwork (specified by seven) and a limit on working hours (specified by three). Twelve mentioned smaller classes and eight more non-contact time, but these were sufficiently distinctive to be treated as separate categories.

Salary comes higher up the list of inducements to return than it does on the reasons for going. This seems to be because the interviewees were suggesting that it would take a higher salary for them to come back and put up with all the hassle.

Prominent among the causes of the hassle were government initiatives and curriculum changes. Several said they would consider coming back if there were no more government changes and others said they would like to see the social inclusion policy ended. Under curriculum and assessment the aspect that came up most frequently was less emphasis on testing and examinations, though more flexibility and better vocational education at key stage 4 were also wanted by several.
Among the other changes the leavers would like to see are more recognition and status for teachers. Several specifically mentioned trusting teachers more as professionals. Better management of schools came up frequently. But the teachers were not thinking of it in the almost industrial sense it is conceptualised today, but as showing more understanding of people and being more supportive.”


“What is striking about the leavers is just how many were resigning to get away from teaching rather than being positively attracted to something else. Among our interviewees about half were leaving with nowhere else in mind, either just giving up, taking early retirement or signing up for supply in the hope that something would turn up. Even some of the positive moves offer a comment on the attractiveness of teaching. The half leaving to do something else were mainly going to work in independent schools, in education posts around teaching, or to travel. There was little sign of them being poached by other employers.

The teachers’ wish to escape is especially sad when we see, as in Chapter 7, what brought them into the profession in the first place. They nearly all came with high ideals wanting to work with children and pass on their understanding. But they are going, with potentially many more years of useful service in them, mainly because of:

- Workload;
- Pupil Behaviour;
- Government Initiatives.

Workload was the reason most frequently given. For many, there just seemed too much to do. Holding down the job seemed to take over the best part of the evenings and weekends. “Leaving to get a life” was how it was commonly explained to us. When pressed to be more specific the teachers referred to the large amount of paperwork involved in the recording, reporting, appraisals and inspections. This is in addition to the preparation and marking which could become excessive in large classes. The teachers also complained how their time at school was eaten into by covering for shortages and absences, so most of the work around teaching had to be done in the evenings and at weekends.

The government itself has generated much of this increased workload through its attempted reforms. Adjusting to changes takes time and effort so some transitional increase in workload could have been anticipated. But, in the view of the teachers we interviewed, too much has been attempted at once and a lot of what has been introduced has been ill-thought out and subject to continual modification. It is also true that the greater emphasis on accountability of itself increases the paperwork.
Issues to do with workload and government initiatives have already been highlighted, but the teachers’ concerns with pupil behaviour have received less attention. Potentially this could be more serious because what the teachers seem to be encountering are the latest manifestations of a long-term and deep-seated change in our society away from self-control and respect for others. In the classroom this can result, as our teachers said, “in a constant uphill battle”. In this they feel unsupported by parents and also sometimes by the headteacher.

It is this constant low-level struggle which is causing many teachers to re-think their futures rather than particular episodes of violence and really bad behaviour. They saw the government’s policy of social inclusion as contributing to the difficulties because it can lead to several seriously disruptive children being in the same class (one teacher mentioned seven). A major factor in the teachers switching to the independent sector - which could involve a struggle with their principles - was the opportunity to teach rather than being engaged in crowd control. As one put, “I feel I will be getting back to teaching for pleasure again”.

As we saw in Chapter 5, a number of other reasons for going were also mentioned. Stress came up frequently - “Get rid of it before it gets rid of you” - presumably a consequence of excessive workload, difficult pupil behaviour and other dissatisfactions. Salary, recognition, and resources and facilities all came into play, but the key concerns for the government to address are workload, pupil behaviour and its own policies.”


6.2(b) What is the average number of absences that teachers have per year? Is absenteeism more of an issue for some types of teachers or schools than others? What are the major trends in regard to teacher absenteeism?

See Annex 8

6.2(j) What is the usual retirement age for teachers? Have there been any changes in retirement provision, or are any planned? What are the reasons involved?

“Resignations are from schools, not the system, so include those moving between schools. There are thus movers and leavers. Leavers are those giving up teaching in maintained schools to take alternative employment (including teaching in independent schools, or another sector, or working in education in the penumbra of jobs that has grown up around education), taking a break for maternity or family care, or going for some other reason. Among the leavers, it is convenient to distinguish the retirees. The retirees include those retiring early - some through ill-health - as well as those reaching retirement age.”
Chart 2.5: Resignations Summer 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Full-Time Permanent</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N ¹</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movers</td>
<td>19,082</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavers</td>
<td>11,714</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirers</td>
<td>5,687</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36,483</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Grossed up from sample

Smithers A. and Robinson P., Teachers Leaving, University of Liverpool, 2001. Paragraph 2.6

6.3(a) What initiatives have been undertaken or are planned to improve the retention of effective teachers? For those policies that have been implemented what is the evidence on their impact and cost? Where the impact has been either mire or less marked than expected, what reasons are apparent?

In April 2001, £44m funding was made available for teacher recruitment and retention in 2002 by Government. It is distributed via LEAs to help those schools that face the biggest challenge in attracting and retaining good teachers. Some schools have received up to an extra £44,000.

Schools create recruitment packages tailored to their own needs and specific circumstances. For example, heads could spend their money on:
- housing subsidies for teachers, support for childcare and wider family care, travel costs, recruitment campaigns covering groups of schools; or additional salary payments to improve recruitment and retention.

The funding boost is targeted where it is needed most, mainly on secondary schools in high-cost or challenging areas, but where there is particular need, Education Authorities can choose to spend up to 20 per cent of the money to help primary schools. (DfES press release April 2001)

6.3(b) What issues are the highest priority for future development in retaining effective teachers in schools? What are some policy options that could be considered? What are the likely views of key stakeholder groups on these priority issues and possible policy options?

“The findings of this study offer some pointers as to what might be done to ameliorate and ultimately reverse the growing teacher shortage. Essentially, these are:
• Reduce the very high levels of wastage from the training process;
• Improve the retention of teachers by addressing their concerns.

Much is already underway. The DfES, for example, has commissioned a major independent study of teacher working practice and workload from PriceWaterhouseCoopers (2001), which it is to be hoped will provide a basis for the negotiation of a more balanced working life for teachers. The Audit Commission (2001) is about to undertake a major study of recruitment and retention into local public services. The DfES, itself, is about to commission research into teacher retention. Salary levels come under review each year through the School Teachers’ Review Body.

But the specific areas we would identify from this research which so far perhaps haven’t received sufficient attention are Training Waste, Pupil Behaviour and Initiative Overload.

We were frankly astonished to find how few of the trainees actually enter teaching. The training targets that the providers struggle to meet are forty per cent higher than they would need to be with a better retention rate. As far as we know, this massive drop-out is not understood. It may even be an illusion. But it should be investigated to find out what is happening and whether it can be reduced. When there were only a few universities teacher training came to be regarded as an alternative form of higher education with no real obligation to teach. It is possible that some of that attitude persists today. School-based training generally has a higher throughput and it could be expanded.

Schools are at the sharp end of changes in society and there is no panacea. But there are at least three steps that could be taken. First, more effort should be directed to teaching appropriate behaviour during the years of early schooling. Secondly, the balance of teachers’ rights and pupils’ rights should be more clearly defined so that teachers are fully aware of, and are comfortable with, the means available to them to reinforce good behaviour. Too often teachers now feel that “the kids are untouchable”.

Thirdly, education must be looked at from the point of view of the children and the basic question asked: what is the justification for requiring them to be in school in the first place. The answer ought to lead to a reconsideration of what is available in upper secondary schooling to ensure that there is something there which genuinely adds to the lives of all young people. It is possible that the recently published White Paper (DfES, 2001) will provide the opportunity to do that.

Here the ball would seem to be firmly in the government’s court. For what to it must have seemed very good reasons it has pressed on with numerous disparate initiatives. As Alec, one of our case studies put it,
“lots of ideas, all in separate boxes, pouring down different tubes, but all landing in one place – on us!”

The government claims to have a big picture for education, but we wonder how much analysis it has conducted of the system’s capacity to assimilate change. Even now it is not too late to carry out such an analysis and prioritise future developments accordingly. Otherwise the transformation it is attempting will be counterproductive. As more and more teachers are unsettled and leave, it will become harder to deliver even what was being achieved before. Without good and committed teachers, education policies are so many castles in the air.

Is teacher shortage solvable? Since it seems endemic and worldwide in successful economies radical solutions are being advocated. Lord Puttnam (Griffiths, 2001), Chairman of the General Teachers Council, is canvassing the idea of a relatively small number of teachers supported by numerous assistants. Others, like David Hargreaves (1997), Chief Executive of the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, have argued that information and communications technology will ultimately take over many of the teacher’s functions.

But the requirement for teachers may not be so easily got round. Teaching is essentially an interpersonal activity, the essentials of which have not much changed in more than two millennia. The upside of the present study, however, is that the teacher shortage does not look a problem beyond reach. Our survey of resignations in summer 2001 suggests that schools will have been seeking to replace 24,400 leavers and retirers for September. In addition, we estimate an extra 8,100 posts will have been created making some 32,500 in all.

At first sight, it seems as if the 30,000 final-year trainees would meet most of this demand. But, as we have seen, only about 60 per cent make it to the classroom and nearly 20 per cent more leave during the first three years. If retention could be improved we would be close to a solution.

As it is, we are left with a gap of about 14,000. Returners to the profession could be expected to fill half these places (DfES figures suggest more, but its definition of returners includes those moving from part-time to full time which we have already taken into account). Teacher shortage in September 2001, therefore, amounts to 7,000 posts and it is these that headteachers will have been struggling to fill by all the means we described in *Coping With Teacher Shortages* (Smithers and Robinson, 2001), including extensive recruiting abroad.

Interestingly, the gap of 7,000 appointment is not so very different from the extra posts that schools have been creating in response to rising secondary numbers and the Chancellor’s direct payments to schools. In this sense it is a failure of planning.
We would argue that current levels of teacher shortage are potentially solvable by conventional means. In our view, the strategy should be less about trying to get more to apply to teacher training than of holding on to the people who have trained. We have suggested that this will involve reducing the excessive dropout from teacher training and making teaching more attractive by responding to the concerns of teachers. Some of the levers are in the government’s hands, like workload and the impact of its own initiatives, but others, such as the changing attitudes and behaviour within society, are less tractable. But there is nothing which is impossible; nothing which better understanding and genuine commitment on the part of the government could not secure.

Without decisive intervention, however, the situation will get worse. The large number of teachers recruited during the seventies, and who for long have been the backbone of the profession, are fast approaching retirement. An important factor in the recruitment and retention of those teachers was the recommendations of an independent review, the Houghton Report (1974). It could be that an independent inquiry would be the way forward for the present government also.”


“if the shortage of teachers is to be reversed and a full-blown crisis of recruitment and retention avoided, improvements in pay will have to be accompanied by radical changes to the daily experiences of teachers in schools. This is not just because the current situation is unsustainable…. If both schools and the culture of education practitioners are to be transformed, then the creativity and energy of the professionals need to be drawn on fully …only if the system changes in ways that provide the desired kind of experience are we likely to recruit, retain and motivate enough high-quality teachers to meet our future educational needs.” Horne M., Classroom Assistance: Why Teachers Must Transform Teaching, Demos, 2001. Page 19
Table 15: Problems adversely affecting teachers’ workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many National Initiatives</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure to meet curriculum targets</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large class size</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for appraisal/inspection</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor pay</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level of resources/equipment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted space</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly maintained buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge/information</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 15 shows, the degree to which a particular problem impacts on the teachers’ workload can be placed in one of four overall groups. The greatest impact arises from the overall lack of time available for completing the various demands. Of the 267 teachers in the sample 79% (212) ranked this statement giving a severity index that was nearly twice as large as the next two most frequently ranked items, the number of national initiatives and the pressure to meet curriculum targets. These two statements, in turn were ranked between twice and three times as frequently as the next cluster which included class size and the need to prepare for inspections. The last group, including opportunities for professional development/training, lack of space, working in poorly maintained buildings were not seen as creating a problem.

It would seem that teachers are more prepared to tolerate poorly maintained buildings and lack of space the stress and pressures of coping with an overcrowded curriculum and frequent new initiatives. This is in itself an interesting finding suggesting that solutions which seek to transfer routine or administrative tasks to classroom assistants in order to free teachers to tackle curriculum matters may not meet teachers’ main concerns. The evidence shows that creating space for teachers to devote more time to implementing new initiatives and assessing curriculum targets does not fulfill the teachers’ main wish that ‘there should be more time just to enjoy being with children’ as Galton and Fogelman described it in 1998.”
“Our recommendations are essentially about change and are derived from sound and valid evidence of the need to do things differently. The evidence from this and other studies is that, without fundamental rethinking, teaching will cease to be a sensible career option. It is clear that, for many teachers, professional satisfaction is diminishing and teaching is becoming less and less rewarding.

Two decades ago Prime Minister Callaghan called for a ‘great debate’ on education. That never happened in the sense of an open, wide-ranging and informed discussion of education’s prime purpose and what schools are for. The need for shared, informed understanding is now more vital than ever. The first recommendation is addressed to those who hold the levers of power as well as the wider public constituency to whom politicians listen ever more carefully and anxiously.

1. Recognise the critical nature of the issues
At the heart of the issue lies the very nature of teaching and learning. The quality and vitality of that process is the common bond between teachers and pupils. Both parties suffer when the spontaneity and fun has gone out of teaching. Its key constituent is time. When time is the driver it means time to pack everything in, to ritually cover the ground, to ‘make’ time through forfeit, sacrificing the important on the altar of the urgent. ‘Making time’ then becomes a question of filling every available space, reducing break times, increasing after hours time, filling up home time, measuring not the quality of homework but the number of hours put in. Yet, paradoxically there is something more that teachers want. There is a missing discourse.

The problem is that filling the spaces runs counter to everything we have learned in the last few decades about learning, about the nature of knowledge, about motivation, emotional intelligence, physical and mental health, when, where and how the brain does its best work. It is futile for government agencies to commission and publish work on thinking skills, creativity and lifelong learning on the one hand while, on the other, diminishing the space and time for thinking. Or is it that departments and agencies of government themselves don’t have the time to join up their own thinking?

Time is, however, only the servant of policy and practice and that is where the issue lies. Teachers are now so tightly locked into time-driven curriculum and assessment policies that for them and their pupils time has eventually run out. Recognising this and understanding the invidious situation it promotes is the prelude to any policy change that may follow.
2. Redress the imbalanced curriculum and its deep-lying fault line
Evidence on imbalance within the curriculum is not hard to find. Redressing the balance, however, will not be achieved by taking time from one subject and giving it to another. The deep lying fault line is in the construction of ‘subjects’ themselves. The paradigm case is ICT. Time is set aside to teach ICT. ‘Setting aside’ is the operative word; adding to the curriculum, as if ICT did not permeate every aspect of children’s lives. Likewise numeracy and literacy are not ‘subjects’ to be learned in isolation. Nor are they even simply skills. They are habits and values. They are for life and they permeate every aspect of learning. They are tested by what children, young people and adults do with their literacies and how they value them.

The evidence is strong that the literacy and numeracy strategies have been welcomed by teachers. One of their primary achievements has to been fill the gaps in teachers’ knowledge both in terms of content and methodology. They have given teachers more confidence in teaching, particularly in numeracy. Indeed ‘maths’ is a subject with an unhappy legacy, which many teachers carry with them from their secondary school experience.

It has also to be recognised that these twin government strategies have served primarily as a form of professional development and that with a growing shared professional competence they may wither on the vine. So, as the system matures and as teachers grow in confidence they will need encouragement to loosen the tight boundaries of literacy and numeracy and ICT ‘hours’ and discover how these may infuse learning and teaching and may be in turn be fused in a more learning-centred, thinking-centred approach.

When we fundamentally address this way of thinking about the curriculum we may begin to deal with time not as the enemy and teachers may come to see the curriculum not as a problem but as a new opportunity.

3. Make testing the servant, not the dictator, of what is taught and learned.
Teachers’ priorities are driven as much by what is tested than what is mandated by the curriculum. Children do not want to let their teacher down. Teachers do not want to let the school down. In collusive conspiracy they work together to improve test scores while agreeing in common that these fragile proxy measures do not tell the story of learning. Neither do they truly reflect the character of teaching nor the effectiveness of school. We have learned much in the last few years about the purposes and nature of assessment, not least from the work of Black and William (1998). Assessment and feedback, we know, has the capacity to be destructive of learning, can distort its essential aims, and can confuse its diagnostic, formative and summative purposes.
National testing performs an important function in monitoring standards and benchmarking. Headteachers and teachers are today more aware of data and its uses and often find the ‘reality’ check of internal and external assessment a useful support. When this is turned into a stick to beat them with is when they become defensive and demoralised. When assessment is pursued for the wrong reasons it not only devalues assessment itself, but also devalues what it is intended to measure. The problem is that none of these insights are new. They are known to researchers. They are known to policy-makers and civil servants. But they are part of the lock-in phenomenon. Once created and once embedded they are difficult to dismantle.

Reform of testing, as is the case with curriculum, cannot be pursued in isolation. They are inseparable twins. Nor will they seriously address the issues by dilution, review and mandate from the top down. Teachers’ confidence in a better world has been dented by promises over the lifetimes of four successive governments. Teachers, their unions, professional associations and networks have a leading role to play not simply in advising government, but in actively shaping educational futures. They need to be given that opportunity.

4. Never mind the quantity, develop the quality of classroom support

More classroom assistance is seen by some as the panacea. It also suggests ways of alleviating the burden on teachers by relieving them of tasks, ironically some of which give them greatest satisfaction. Simply increasing numbers is patently not the answer. There is a wide spectrum of quality among learning support (or ‘classroom’) assistants and as wide an understanding of their role. They can be a source of immense help to teachers but also a source of frustration and extra imposition. Classroom assistants too can become frustrated with the lack of clarity around their role and resentful when they are used as an extra teacher without commensurate salary.

There is, therefore, a need for development and training in the nature and parameters of the job. This should not lead to a uniform, fragmented job description, but it does imply the development of a more holistic understanding on their part of school and classroom, teaching and learning. It should be accompanied with an ability by teachers to deploy classroom assistants in ways that they see as most effective, while enhancing the confidence of the learning support assistant.

5. Make provision for teachers to work with, and learn from, teachers

While learning support assistants have their place and value, what teachers would welcome most is support from other teachers. Teachers enjoy and profit from collaboration with their colleagues. Planning, implementing, cooperative teaching, and evaluating is the keystone of professional growth. The NUT’s initiative on peer coaching
has been received warmly by teachers, because, as we know, teachers learn from other teachers. Time for teachers to work together has to be placed, therefore, high on the policy priority list. In a context of teacher shortage, curriculum and testing pressures, this seems like a vain hope. But reversing the vicious circle and creating a more virtuous circle is the key to addressing the issue.

The vicious circle is one in which tired teachers leave the profession and newly qualified teachers find it hard to stay the course. So retention and recruitment assume the status of a self-fulfilling ‘crisis’. In under-staffed schools there is no time for luxuries such as peer evaluation, peer coaching or co-operative teaching. Time becomes ever more precious and pressurised. Supply cover fails to address the issue because conscientious teachers do not want to ‘lose time’ with their class and heads find it hard to let teachers out of the classroom for courses, conferences or professional development. The virtuous circle is powered by job satisfaction, sustained by teachers doing what teachers enjoy and do best, fuelled by opportunities for collegial learning and professional renewal. That is what will keep teachers in teaching and help to reverse the attrition trend.

We are not oblivious to other dimensions of teacher dissatisfaction. The world outside school has changed radically and it has carried into the classroom. Children and families are not what they used to be. Issues of pupil behaviour and discipline, lack of support from some parents, new forms of violence and intimidation, drug and health related issues all have to be taken into the equation. These issues do not detract from the case, but also should not be allowed to deflect attention from the central concern. Indeed it becomes all the more imperative to examine the extent to which an inappropriate and pressurised curriculum may simply exacerbate the problem. Placing a changing social and economic context into the equation compounds the need for greater collegial, managerial and community support for teachers.

6. Put workload in its place
Workload needs to be understood in context. It has to be addressed in the nature of teachers’ work. It is about what we expect of teachers and how we evaluate and reward them. It is fundamentally about how we construct learning and teaching, curriculum and assessment and the imperative of reconstruction. That is the single most important message from this study.”
