

EAST RENFREWSHIRE COUNCIL

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY 21 MARCH 2012

Report by the Director of Education

LOCAL NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE FOR TEACHERS (LNCT)  
TEACHER WORKLOAD REVIEW 2011 - 2012

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. The purpose of this report is to assess the impact of the actions taken to manage staff workload which are outlined in the workload management action plan. (Appendix 1)

**RECOMMENDATION**

2. The recommendation is that the Education Committee requests the Director of Education, together with LNCT colleagues, to:

- maintain levels of support in regard to workload management.
- identify further actions to be taken in order to manage workload more effectively.
- begin implementing a revised workload management action plan during 2012.

**BACKGROUND**

3. Partnership working between teachers and managers is a strength of the Education Department in East Renfrewshire. The Education Department values its staff highly and believes the route to improved relationships lies in its collegiate approach to managing teacher workload. Regular LNCT meetings and discussions on teacher workload are an ongoing feature of the Education Department's commitment to its teaching workforce. The department continues to make progress in managing teacher workload by consulting with teaching staff to evaluate the effectiveness of implemented actions and identify future priorities.

**REPORT**

4. The expected outcomes as a result of the action plan being revised and implemented are:

- Effective partnership working; and
- Greater satisfaction in the way workload is managed.

The report relates directly to the following outcome in East Renfrewshire Council's Single Outcome Agreement (SOA):

- Our public services are high quality, continually improving, efficient and responsive to people's needs.

Good progress has been made by the department in its efforts to manage teacher workload more effectively. The evidence gathered from consulting with teaching staff highlights the progress made by the Education Department in managing teacher workload. The staff also provided helpful feedback which will allow the department to direct future support in response to staff needs. Through further negotiation and planning with LNCT colleagues, the evidence will be used to revise the workload management action plan and identify actions that can be taken to help manage workload more effectively.

**FINANCE AND EFFICIENCY**

5. There are no financial and efficiency implications.

## **CONSULTATION**

6. All teaching staff were given the opportunity to participate in the consultation process. The levels of support in regard to workload will now be maintained and feedback from staff will inform a revised action plan to be implemented during 2012.

## **PARTNERSHIP WORKING**

7. The Education Department will continue to work with LNCT colleagues to decide upon future action.

## **IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROPOSALS**

8. Appropriate actions will be taken by the department to support teachers further in response to their needs.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

9. This report details staff perceptions toward workload management at this time, following response from the Education Department. The evidence provides an evaluation of actions taken since 2010 to manage teacher workload and highlights the progress made to date, in addition to areas of workload still to be addressed.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

10. The recommendation is that the Education Committee requests the Director of Education, together with LNCT colleagues, to:

- maintain levels of support in regard to workload management.
- identify further actions to be taken in order to manage workload more effectively.
- begin implementing a revised workload management action plan during 2012.

John Wilson  
Director of Education  
March 2012

Report Author  
Jennifer MacMillan, Consultation Co-ordinator (Intern)  
Tel: 0141 577 3944  
[jennifer.macmillan@eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk](mailto:jennifer.macmillan@eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk)

Under Supervision of  
Susan Gow, Head of Education Services (Staff, Parents and Corporate Services)  
Tel: 0141 577 3204  
[susan.gow@eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk](mailto:susan.gow@eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk)

Convener Contact Details  
Councillor A Lafferty, Convener for Education and Equalities Tel: 0141 621 1113  
Councillor E Green, Vice Convener for Education and Equalities Tel: 01505 850455

Appendix  
Appendix 1 LNCT Workload Management Action Plan 2011 - 2013

Key Words  
LNCT Teacher Workload Review 2011. LNCT Workload Management Action Plan 2011 – 2013.  
Key search words are "questionnaire, action plan, trade union working group.

## **EAST RENFREWSHIRE COUNCIL: EDUCATION DEPARTMENT**

### **LNCT TEACHER WORKLOAD REVIEW 2011**

#### **Section 1**

##### **Introduction**

In 2010 a Teacher Workload Review was conducted to identify the key workload issues for teaching staff in East Renfrewshire Council. The consultation involved teaching staff across the authority and established fifteen aspects of teacher workload which were seen as workload generators by teaching staff. Following this review and the identification of these workload themes, an action plan was developed by the Local Negotiating Committee for Teachers facilitated by East Renfrewshire Education Department. The action plan (appendix 1) featured five of the most pertinent workload generators identified by staff (forward plans, assessment and reporting to parents, Initial Teacher Education students, inclusion, and management/time issues) and outlined actions that could be taken to reduce workload associated with these specific workload areas. The actions were implemented over the subsequent months and the action plan was updated to include specific examples of actions taken.

The current review was commissioned with the primary aim of assessing the impact of these actions taken since the previous Teacher Workload Review. At the beginning of the current consultation the impact column of the action plan had still to be evidenced. This has subsequently been completed with information gained from the recent work with teaching staff across the authority. In addition to the primary objective of the current review, the other ten workload generators previously identified were also considered when designing the consultation. This ensured that principally the specific questions informed by the previous review could be addressed, but any novel workload areas not identified then could also be explored. The Teacher Workload Review 2011 was designed to involve staff across the authority through focus groups and an online questionnaire. In order to gain a representative view of opinions regarding workload across the authority, the consultation offered every member of teaching staff in East Renfrewshire Council the opportunity to comment through the focus groups, the questionnaire, or a combination of both methods.

##### **Methodology**

##### ***Questionnaire***

The questions in section 2 of the questionnaire (appendix 2) were derived from the action plan in order to ensure the impact of actions taken was established. Each workload theme was represented through a number of questions and specific examples of actions taken were also reflected in the questions. In addition, to gain a comparatively broad understanding of workload perceptions among teaching staff, some questions were included which related to the additional themes identified in the last review but which were not included in the action plan. A combination of open and closed questions was chosen as the format of the questionnaire, in order to generate data which explicitly addressed the aims but also to provide staff with an open forum to comment on workload more generally. Once the set of questions was developed the questionnaire was designed using an online survey software tool called Survey Monkey. To ensure the questionnaire was ready for distribution a pilot version was sent to members of the Local Negotiating Committee for Teachers who were asked to give feedback regarding; ambiguity in the questions, the accessibility of the questionnaire from the link provided, and the time the questionnaire took to complete.

After receiving this feedback any necessary changes were made and the questionnaire was distributed on Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> October to all teaching staff in the authority. They had a period of four weeks to respond. In total, five hundred and twenty seven members of teaching staff responded to the questionnaire (response rate of 39%). All responses were collected via the online survey tool and were guaranteed of both anonymity and confidentiality.

The questionnaire generated both quantitative (questions 1-18) and qualitative data (question 19-22) which was analysed via different methods. The quantitative data was imported into an excel spreadsheet and coded numerically to generate an entirely numerical dataset. This was achieved by assigning a numerical value to each answer in a question, for example when teaching staff were asked about their sector of work, the answers of Pre-Five, Primary, Secondary, and Special were assigned the values of one, two, three, and four respectively. The coding process was repeated for the first eighteen questions. The data was then transferred to a database called the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) which is commonly used to analyse numerical data. A series of statistical analyses were performed to identify the most common responses to each question, in addition to any statistical differences between variables. In contrast, the qualitative data was analysed using Thematic Analysis which involves identifying the most common themes and recording the regularity of those themes across all responses.

### *Focus Groups*

The questions for the focus groups were derived from the already developed questionnaire and reflected the themes of the questionnaire in a more open context. Furthermore, some workload generators only applied to promoted members of staff; therefore the focus groups were also used as an opportunity to gain information about workload generators which did not apply to all members of staff. In total there were six topics of discussion for Class Teachers (appendix 3), seven topics for Principal Teachers (appendix 4), and eight topics for Depute Head Teachers and Head Teachers (appendices 5 & 6 respectively). Separate focus groups were held for each type of teacher post to ensure those partaking in the focus groups would feel confident in expressing their honest opinions. The groups lasted for around one hour and involved up to twelve members of staff at any one time. A total of twenty five focus groups were held with Class Teachers, Principal Teachers, Depute Head Teachers and Head Teachers. Table 1 illustrates a summary of the focus groups held.

Type of Post	Sector					
	Pre School	Primary	Secondary	Special	Total no. of groups	Total no. of staff
Class Teacher	1	7	6	1	15	55
Principal Teacher	N/A	1	2	N/A	3	22
Depute Head Teacher	N/A	1	1	N/A	2	19
Head Teacher	1	3	1	*	5	20
<i>Total no. of groups</i>	2	12	10	1	25	-

**Table 1** A breakdown of focus groups held with different types of teaching staff.

\* The Special sector Head Teacher was invited to join a Primary Head Teacher focus group.

The data generated from the focus groups was also analysed using Thematic Analysis. Each focus group script was individually analysed for emerging themes and subsequently all scripts were compared to identify the overall common themes.

### *Partnership Event*

During November 2011 an authority event was held to communicate some initial findings to all Head Teachers and teacher union representatives from each establishment. The attendees were presented with three topics for discussion which were taken from the open question section of the questionnaire. The topics covered included recent changes to forward plans, Staged Intervention paperwork, broad skills based frameworks, and the *Curriculum for Excellence* action plan. The attendees were also asked to discuss recent changes to reporting to parents and discuss workload more generally, identifying key observations or suggestions for future change. The groups provided written and verbal feedback which was used as another source of data to inform section two of this report.

## **Section 2**

### **Findings**

#### *Demographics*

In order to gain demographic information about the teaching staff who responded to the questionnaire, the staff completed questions which asked about their position in the school, their sector of work, their years of teaching experience, and the size of their school. These demographic variables were used to compare the responses of individuals, with the aim of identifying any significant differences which could be attributed to differing demographics. The majority of respondents were Class Teachers (71%) and the proportion of respondents from each teacher level is reflective of the numbers of staff who hold these positions in the authority. Furthermore, the statistics for each sector are also representative of the numbers of staff in the authority, with a comparatively similar number of Primary sector (47%), to Secondary sector (49%) responses. The most commonly selected teaching experience category was 6-15 years (32%) and the most common school size was 401-800 pupils (29%).

#### *Working Hours*

##### **i Questionnaire**

In the questionnaire, full time staff provided an estimation of their regular working hours each week. From the categories provided, 35% of staff selected the 46-50 hours per week category. A summary of the differences in hours worked, based on the type of teacher post is presented in table 2.

		<b>Number of Hours Worked (%)</b>					
<b>Type of Post</b>		35	36-40	41-45	46-50	Over 50	<i>Total</i>
	Class Teacher	1	11	28	32	28	<i>100</i>
	Chartered Teacher	0	15	55	30	0	<i>100</i>
	Principal Teacher	2	3	28	35	32	<i>100</i>
	Depute Head Teacher	0	0	14	29	57	<i>100</i>
	Head Teacher	0	0	14	57	29	<i>100</i>

**Table 2** The number of hours staff reported working in an average week as a percentage of all responses (%).

The weekly hours category of 46-50 hours was most commonly selected by Class Teachers (32%), Principal Teachers (35%), and Head Teachers (57%). However Chartered Teachers (55%) mostly reported working 41-45 hours per week, while Depute Head Teachers (57%) reported working over 50 hours per week. Part time teaching staff also provided details about their working hours by noting their pointage as full time equivalent and providing an estimation of the number of hours they work in an average week. The percentage of hours worked beyond their part time contractual hours was then calculated. On average, part time staff worked 37% longer each week than contractually obliged, based on their reports. Interestingly, the most commonly reported working hours of full time teachers (46-50 hours) are also in excess of their contractual hours by between 31% and 43%.

## ii Focus Groups

Working hours was an aspect of workload that was also explored in the focus groups in order to understand the reasons as to why staff worked longer than contractually obliged. Most staff felt that there was a combination of pressures from the authority, the school, and from themselves which led to them working longer hours. There was a strong perception amongst all teacher groups that the pace of change with new initiatives results in an increase in workload. Staff recognised that extra work was needed in order to adapt to the numerous new initiatives introduced at both a government and authority level. Although teachers reported that the changes made to their job increased their workload, they maintained support for change and progression which benefits the pupils. Staff reported however that they do not have the opportunity to reflect on changes already implemented, which would be useful for assessing the impact of these changes in their school. Some promoted staff reported no pressure from the Authority, but commented that the dedication of staff in East Renfrewshire results in staff working longer than obliged.

Another strong view amongst staff is that new initiatives are additional and cumulative as they do not replace any areas of workload. Staff also reported that the time line for the implementation of new initiatives can be very short, which staff say increases pressure and results in staff working extra hours to reach the targets set. Many teachers also commented that current expected levels of work are not achievable in 35 hours, resulting in staff extending their working hours to complete the work. Teaching staff acknowledged that their professionalism and their dedication to their work, their pupils, and their schools results in them working extra hours. In order to ensure they teach their pupils effectively and provide children with an enjoyable school experience, teachers reported working extra hours to run after school clubs for the pupils, to participate in whole school events, and to prepare stimulating and high quality lessons for pupils.

### *Working Time Agreement/Collegiate Calendar*

## i Questionnaire

In the questionnaire, staff were asked to report on the Working Time Agreement (WTA) in their school. The results showed 40% of staff thought their school's WTA was not useful for managing their workload, while 25% of staff felt the WTA was helpful for managing their workload. The remaining 35% of staff were undecided. Class Teachers, Chartered Teachers and Principal Teachers were undecided about the usefulness of the WTA, while Depute Head Teachers did not find the WTA useful. In contrast, Head Teachers reported that the WTA was useful for managing their workload.

Furthermore, 37% of staff thought the development activities identified in the School Improvement Plan were not given suitable time allocation in their school's WTA, while 32% thought these activities were suitably allocated. The remaining 31% were undecided. Class Teachers were undecided about the time allocation in the WTA, Chartered Teachers and Principal Teachers did not feel the activities were given sufficient time allocation, and Depute Head Teachers and Head Teachers felt the activities were given sufficient time allocation in the school's WTA.

## ii Focus Groups

During the focus groups, some staff noted that the WTA was more realistic than previously, as the activities necessary to implement the School Improvement Plan were given more

realistic time allocation. Furthermore, staff commented on the time allocated for reporting in the collegiate calendar and noted that additional time was allocated which was useful and again more realistic. However, staff also reported that changes to Target Setting, were introduced late in the school year once the agreements were made. Some staff felt this increased pressure as extra work was expected to be completed in the same time period.

### *Forward Plans*

#### *i Questionnaire*

Forward plans were a workload generator identified in the last Teacher Workload Review and some steps have been taken to help manage this workload for teachers, such as the development of broad skills based frameworks. Staff were asked in the questionnaire about the usefulness of these planners for forward planning. The findings showed 43% of staff thought broad skills based frameworks were useful for managing forward planning, compared to 31% who reported that the planners were not useful. The remaining staff were undecided (26%). When the responses of each type of teacher were compared, most teachers agreed that the skills planners were useful and Chartered Teachers (62%) mostly disagreed about the usefulness of the planners.

#### *ii Focus Groups*

It was reported that the planners were useful because they provided a better focus for staff by emphasising the learning outcomes, while the planners were also detailed but yet user friendly. Other members of staff reported that the planners were complicated and too long which made them 'off-putting'. Promoted members of staff explained that they had an input in the development of the planners which they valued and resulted in the planners being practical for staff use.

In addition, staff perceived the increase in professional dialogue for forward planning as a positive change which has reduced workload. Staff can now create plans for shorter periods of time which relieves workload and brings greater flexibility. The introduction of more professional dialogue also reduces paperwork and instead of creating lengthy forward plans staff need only present an overview of their forward plan to senior management. Those with regular teaching responsibilities reported that they were now able to receive instant feedback about their forward plan and also adapt their plan better to changing or newly arising situations. Furthermore, Head Teachers commented on the positive impact that increased professional dialogue has made to the workload of themselves and their staff.

### *Reporting to Parents*

#### *i Questionnaire*

Reporting to parents was considered in both the open question section of the questionnaire and in the focus groups. Responses to questions regarding recent changes to reporting were mixed, with both positive and negative feedback given. In relation to the new reporting format, some staff felt the reports were longer than the previous reports and the exemplar reporting format given to schools required considerable streamlining. Some staff also commented that the parents from their school did not like the new reporting format as instead of the report containing a concise account of the fundamental skills, such as literacy and numeracy, teachers had to report on every curricular area. In addition, the new format required the reporting of standardised test scores which some staff suggested parents did not understand. However, in complete contrast, staff in other schools communicated that



they received good feedback from parents regarding the new reporting format. The parents liked the additional information about their children and recognised the extra effort required from staff to complete these reports.

## ii Focus Groups

There was some recognition from teachers during the focus groups, that although the reports are still time consuming and adding to workload, they are worth the extra effort as they benefit pupils and their parents. From the point of view of promoted staff, they commented that the new reports took longer to check and the reporting format could have been more streamlined. Head Teachers noted that staff are unsure about reporting on *Curriculum for Excellence* and therefore they spend longer deliberating than they would have previously, which adds to their perceptions of workload. There was acknowledgement amongst staff that the workload associated with reporting to parents should decrease in the long-term, as the new reporting formats are fully developed and staff become accustomed to the new reports.

The staff of some schools had interesting suggestions to help manage the workload associated with reporting to parents which they have implemented, or are in the process of implementing. One school plans to create a questionnaire which will be issued to parents to find out what parents want from their child's reports. This will allow staff to develop a report which meets the needs of parents without spending long hours reporting on areas that parents may not want. In another school, instead of issuing lengthy written reports to parents, staff have produced more summative written reports and increased the length of parents meetings. The staff of this school felt that their parents prefer longer one to one contact with the teacher instead of a lengthy written document.

Furthermore staff remarked on the new forms of reporting, such as Target Setting and Tracking, which were recently introduced. Some staff felt Tracking via Click and Go was a useful tool which was a valuable source of information when reporting to parents later in the year. Other staff did not like the new Tracking system as it was an addition to the workload already present for reporting. Staff commented on the connectivity problems and the speed of access with 'Click and Go' which disrupted teaching time and added to workload. In addition, staff expressed that the sharing of best practice could be more advantageous than it is currently, especially for the purposes of developing reporting formats and ensuring there is consistency across schools.

### **Practice which has reduced workload in reporting to parents**

- *School staff Communicate with parents in order to establish what they want and need in regard to reporting, which leads to reporting which is more worthwhile and valued by parents.*
- *Schools adapt the written reporting format to meet the requirements of parents which means they can respond to the differing needs of parents across schools, and potentially reduce the workload of staff.*
- *Schools increased the length of parent's evenings and reduced the length of written reports to reduce workload, where parents deemed this to be useful.*

## *Assessment*

### *i Focus Groups*

Assessment was a significant point of discussion for staff in the focus groups and a number of themes emerged regarding this. The new assessment criteria of 'developing', 'consolidating' or 'secure' were prevailing topics of discussion for staff. They reported that insufficient guidelines were issued to give guidance for categorising pupils through this new assessment criterion, which has led to staff feeling apprehensive about assessing the pupils. They stated that the changes to assessment through *Curriculum for Excellence* have led to a less formalised assessment system which requires more development time than is currently allocated. Staff did recognise however that *Curriculum for Excellence* was a national agenda and not controlled at the local authority level.

The transition to a more flexible and creative curriculum is perceived by staff as a positive change but the shift to this from a prescriptive, structured curriculum has left staff feeling insecure when assessing pupils. Staff raised concern over the lack of structure in assessment, particularly for maths, as they reported difficulty in ensuring their pupils are achieving the expected standards for their ages and are progressing through the relevant stages. Staff felt this issue contributes to their workload as they deliberate over their work and need to seek advice from other members of staff, thus increasing the numbers of hours spent on a task. It was suggested that generating more structure, particularly for maths, would help reduce the amount of time spent and address the uncertainty felt by staff. Staff proposed a planner could be created, similar to the broad skills based frameworks, which would include some suggested resources that correspond to stages of progression for the pupils. This would help staff to identify the level of a pupil in a particular curricular area and use appropriate educational resources for that level.

Furthermore, during the focus groups, teachers across the authority raised the issue of moderation. The variation of resources being used by teachers was seen as positive for learning but presented problems when staff needed to record the resources they had used, for the attention of other staff. They have concerns that poor communication in this regard will result in pupils completing work more than once. Staff suggested that if there was greater consistency it would be easier to share resources and reduce workload. In order to achieve this consistency, staff suggested more 'in school' collegiate time and cluster working was necessary for developing assessments in line with *Curriculum for Excellence*. Staff expressed that more work needs to be done to ensure there is consistency within individual schools, across all schools in the same sector, and cross sector.

## *Sharing Good Practice*

### *i Questionnaire*

In the questionnaire, staff were asked if the sharing of good practice was helpful for reducing their workload. The responses showed 50% of staff felt that the sharing of good practice was not helpful for reducing workload, compared to 28% of staff who reported that this did reduce their workload. The remaining 22% of staff were undecided. Class Teachers, Chartered Teachers and Principal Teachers did not find sharing good practice helpful for reducing workload, but Depute Head Teachers and Head Teachers disagreed, reporting that it is helpful for reducing workload. In addition, those staff with less than 1 year of experience or 1-5 years experience found the sharing of good practice helpful, while the remaining staff of higher experience levels did not.

Staff were also asked if national ICT tools such as GLOW or the National Assessment Resource (NAR) were helpful for reducing workload. The majority of staff (69%) did not find these tools useful for reducing workload compared to 16% of staff who did find these tools useful. The remaining 15% of staff were undecided. Class Teachers, Chartered Teachers, Principal Teachers and Depute Head Teachers did not find these tools useful; however most Head Teachers agreed that GLOW and NAR are useful tools for reducing workload.

## ii Focus Groups

From information collected during the focus groups, it seems that staff find the principle of sharing good practice useful to ensure individual teachers and schools are not producing the same work which could be shared, and for the purposes of moderation. However staff commented that there is insufficient time allocated for collegiate or cluster working. National ICT tools for sharing good practice were described as not user friendly and time consuming to use.

## *Inclusion*

### i Questionnaire

The most significant change which has been made to the workload associated with inclusion is the changes made to the paperwork for Staged Intervention (STINT) and the Integrated Assessment Framework (IAF). Staff were asked if the integration of paperwork for STINT and IAF was useful for reducing workload. The findings showed 58% of staff did not think these changes had reduced workload, compared to 10% who felt the changes made to the paperwork had reduced workload. The remaining 32% of staff were undecided about the impact of these changes on workload. Interestingly, differences existed between the type of teacher post regarding the changes to STINT and IAF paperwork. Class Teachers, Chartered Teachers and Depute Head Teachers did not feel these changes had reduced workload. However, Principal Teachers were mostly undecided and Head Teachers found these changes to be useful for reducing workload. Furthermore the Primary and Secondary sectors did not find the changes to STINT and IAF useful. The Pre School sector were undecided and the Special sector felt the changes had reduced their workload.

### ii Focus Groups

During the focus groups, some staff commented that the paperwork associated with STINT and IAF had reduced and was therefore a positive change which reduced workload. Others reported that the paperwork was still time consuming, although there was recognition that the new forms improved communication. Many members of staff who attended the groups did not deal with STINT paperwork, some staff had a couple of pupils requiring STINT, and others had many pupils in their class who required the STINT procedures. It was therefore noted by staff that class sizes and the number of pupils requiring STINT had important implications for the associated workload. Staff also commonly reported that the coordinator of all IAF paperwork had a high workload, and there seemed to be greater onus placed on schools than previously for the responsibility of STINT and IAF paperwork. Staff also commented that the lack of awareness amongst parents in regard to STINT, leads to many parents requesting to meet with staff to gain a better understanding of STINT and its implications for their child's learning. One school explained that to reduce this aspect of workload they held an information evening, with an Educational Psychologist present, to explain STINT, the meaning of each STINT stage and to answer parent's questions.

### **Practice which has reduced workload in inclusion**

- *Staff raise the awareness of Staged Intervention procedures amongst parents which reduces the workload of staff.*
- *Schools provide information about the Staged Intervention procedures, with the help of an Educational Psychologist, to attach meaning to the stages involved, explain the subsequent actions that might be taken, and answer any questions parents may have.*
- *Schools hold information evenings to provide knowledge and raise confidence in Staged Intervention procedures.*

### *Initial Teacher Education Students*

#### *i Questionnaire*

When asked about the demands of mentoring Initial Teacher Education (ITE) students, 46% of staff were undecided. Beyond those undecided staff, 38% of staff found the demands of mentoring ITE students manageable, compared to 16% who found the mentoring demands unmanageable. Most Class Teachers and Chartered Teachers were undecided about the demands of mentoring ITE students, whereas most Principal Teachers, Depute Head Teachers, and Head Teachers found the demands manageable.

#### *ii Focus Groups*

During the focus groups ITE students were not identified as a significant workload generator. Promoted members of staff were asked about the workload associated with ITE students and they consensually commented that this did not pose a workload issue.

### *Management Time/Issues*

#### *i Focus Groups*

During the focus groups promoted members of staff were asked to comment on their workload since recent changes were made to management time. Since the last Teacher Workload Review, changes have been made to the format of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Head Teachers commented on the usefulness of this change suggesting the document is now more practical and aligned with what can be achieved. The SIP was seen as manageable and described as 'a real working document'. Head Teachers also reported that they are accustomed to generating a lengthy SIP and they will therefore need to adjust to creating a more streamlined and simplified version. In addition Depute Head Teachers felt the new SIP format was a good improvement, commenting that the SIP is now more meaningful and targeted toward learning and teaching, although it may not be any less time consuming to complete.

Another action taken, which was designed to help manage the workload of promoted staff, was focussed support from Quality Improvement Officers. Promoted staff commented that Quality Improvement Officers are always available to offer advice and are quick to respond

to staff. Promoted staff did not feel there had been an increase in the support they received, but nevertheless they still felt adequate support was provided when necessary. They recognised that the number of Quality Improvement Officers throughout the authority has reduced and therefore their remits have widened, placing constraints on the time they have available.

### *Support and Responsibility*

#### **i Questionnaire**

In the questionnaire, staff were also asked to comment on the level of support they received from their line-manager and the authority with areas of workload. The responses showed 44% of staff felt supported by the Senior Management Team in their school with workload issues, compared to 29% of staff who did not feel supported. The remaining staff were undecided (27%). When the demographic variables were compared a number of significant differences were found. Class Teachers were mostly undecided about the support they received from their line-manager and Chartered Teachers equally felt supported and unsupported. Principal Teachers, Depute Head Teachers and Head Teachers all reported feeling supported by their line-managers. Furthermore, the Pre School and Secondary sectors were undecided about the support they received, while the Primary sector felt supported, and the Special sector felt greatly supported. In regards to experience level, teachers with less than 1 year of experience and those with 6-15 and over 25 years of experience reported feeling supported by their line-managers. However, teachers with 1-5 years of experience were undecided, and those with 16-25 years of experience did not feel supported by their line-manager. During the focus groups some Class Teachers commented on the high level of support they received from the Senior Management Team in their school which had increased over the past twelve to eighteen months.

Furthermore 57% of staff reported that they had the opportunity to discuss their workload with their line-manager, compared to 28% of staff who reported that they did not have this opportunity. The remaining 15% were undecided. Most staff from varying sectors of teaching felt they could discuss their workload with their line-manager, only staff working in the Pre School sector did not feel they had this opportunity.

In addition to support from their line-manager, staff were also asked to provide their opinions on the support they have received from the authority with the implementation of *Curriculum for Excellence*. The responses showed that 39% of staff felt supported by the authority and equally 39% felt unsupported by the authority with the implementation of *Curriculum for Excellence*. The remaining 22% were undecided. Most staff from varying school sizes agreed that the authority had been supportive in the implementation of *Curriculum for Excellence*; however staff in eight schools with less than 150 pupils did not feel supported by the authority. Interestingly, 75% of staff reported that they had a responsibility to manage their own workload, compared to 12% who did not feel responsible for their own workload. The remaining 13% were undecided.

#### **ii Focus Groups**

During the focus groups there were comments that management staff were good at providing support to staff where it was needed. In some schools, management staff had produced an evaluation form which allowed staff to reflect on current workload levels and comment on the support they received from management. All responses were submitted anonymously which allowed staff to comment honestly and the management team responded to the overall perceptions of their staff. Class Teachers reported that this was a

useful exercise that allowed them to raise any issues and feel valued by management. There was also wide recognition that members of management in schools work long hours and consequently they do not always have the available time to consult with staff on a regular basis. The staff in the focus groups reported that they take responsibility for prioritising their own work and reaching the required standards, but in order to do this they need management and the authority to maintain support and recognise staff constraints.

**Practice which has reduced workload in support and responsibility**

- *School management seek the views to staff through questionnaires completed anonymously, to establish their opinions and perceptions of support.*
- *School leaders give staff the opportunity to raise any concerns, suggest changes, or comment on the level of support they already receive, which leads to staff feeling more valued by senior management.*
- *Senior management use information provided by staff feedback to move forward constructively, while useful suggestions for change may be implemented to the benefit of the school.*

*Progress to date*

In both the questionnaire and during the focus groups staff were asked to comment on the changes which have been the most beneficial in helping reduce or manage their workload. Around half of respondents reported that they did not feel any changes had occurred to workload. Other staff reported that changes to workload increased the level of work required. Some staff felt the changes made to forward planning made planning more time consuming and they found difficulty in preparing suitable active lessons which married with the outcomes of *Curriculum for Excellence*. Development work for *Curriculum for Excellence* was also seen by staff as a significant workload generator. Furthermore, staff noted that there is greater reliance on ICT equipment and systems, therefore when an IT problem occurs it has significant impact. The IT problems that were commonly reported included problems with speed of access and software issues such as computer screens freezing. In addition some staff noted that they had limited ICT skills, which presents problems when adapting to the new systems and equipment. Staff commented on the pace of change of new initiatives, suggesting that the constant change and need to adjust to those changes outweighs any improvements which may have led to a reduction in workload.

However, staff also reported that changes made over the past twelve to eighteen months helped them manage or reduce their workload. Some staff felt the changes to forward plans had reduced workload, with the introduction of more professional dialogue and the development of broad skills based frameworks. However, other staff noted that although the changes are positive and planning is now more meaningful, workload had not necessarily reduced. Staff also felt there had been an increase in collegiate working and the sharing of good practice through the use of GLOW and Cluster working. Furthermore the changes to the School Improvement Plan format were seen by some promoted staff as one of the most significant changes to workload. Head Teachers reported that they are called to fewer meetings than previously which has also reduced their workload.

In order to gain an overall view of the progress to date, staff were asked in the questionnaire to report their opinions on workload. The results showed 61% of staff did not feel any more in control of their workload than they did twelve months ago, compared to 20% who did. The remaining 19% of staff were undecided. Interestingly a number of differences were observed between the demographic variables. Most staff reported that they did not feel more in control of their workload, only Head Teachers reported that they did feel more in control of workload. In addition staff from the Primary and Secondary sectors did not feel more in control of their workload, whereas staff from the Pre School and Special sectors reported that they were more in control of their workload. Differences also existed between the numbers of hours respondents reported working in an average week. Those who reported working around 35 hours were undecided, those who reported working 36-40 hours felt more in control of their workload, and those who reported working 41-45 hours, 46-50 hours or over 50 hours did not feel more in control of their workload than they did twelve months ago. The findings show that for some staff (20%) there have been positive changes made which have reduced workload; however 61% of staff feel many areas of workload still need to be addressed.

#### *Areas of Workload still to be addressed*

In both the questionnaire and the focus groups, respondents were given the opportunity to summarise the areas of workload which they feel still need to be addressed in order to reduce or help manage workload. Staff commented that the levels of paperwork must be further streamlined as the current paperwork levels are very time consuming and result in staff spending insufficient time organising and preparing lessons. There was a strong opinion amongst staff that in order to deliver high quality lessons, preparation needs to be done out with working hours since the time is not available in the working day. In the focus groups staff commented that they feel frustrated when they know a lesson could have been planned and delivered better, but they simply did not have the time for the necessary preparation. By streamlining paperwork further and avoiding the duplication of paperwork, especially for STINT, staff felt more time would be available for lesson preparation.

In almost all focus groups, staff discussed the pace of change, explaining that they only manage the required levels of work by working extended hours at school or at home. Staff suggested that they would benefit from a period of time when change did not occur, to allow them to reflect on the already implemented changes. They also explained that many 'ad hoc' duties that may only take a small amount of time, add up to make a significant impact on workload. Staff also mentioned that reporting to parents and assessment in line with *Curriculum for Excellence* are areas of workload still to be addressed. Staff feel there is vagueness around *Curriculum for Excellence* which could be resolved by providing more clarity and support for staff when assessing and reporting.

Staff also suggested that sharing resources could be more efficient and therefore effective than it is currently. Staff reported that although national ICT tools (e.g. GLOW, NAR) have increased collegiate working and the sharing of resources, improvements could still be made in order to reduce workload further. Staff suggested that if the ICT tools were more effective and more time was allocated for collegiate working, resources could be shared to a greater extent in Clusters and across the authority leading to overall reductions in workload. Staff commented that the development of class materials is time consuming and a great deal of time must be devoted to researching and creating class materials. Staff explained that if schools worked together then materials could be developed quicker. Furthermore staff commented that if they were given suggested resources then they could use these as a

platform to build from, to ensure the pupils are challenged at the correct level for their ability.



### **Section 3**

## **TEACHER WORKLOAD REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE – DECEMBER 2011**

### **SUMMARY OF RESPONSES**

**RESPONSES RECEIVED: 527  
(39% OF TOTAL STAFF)**

<b>1. Which of the following best describes your position within the school?</b>		
	Response Count	Response %
A Class Teacher	373	71%
B Chartered Teacher (Full Status)	21	4%
C Principal Teacher	83	16%
D Depute Head Teacher	29	6%
E Head Teacher	18	3%
<i>Answered Question</i>	524	99%
<i>Skipped Question</i>	3	1%

  

<b>2. Which sector do you work in?</b>		
	Response Count	Response %
A Pre School	14	3%
B Primary	248	47%
C Secondary	254	49%
D Special	7	1%
<i>Answered Question</i>	523	99%
<i>Skipped Question</i>	4	1%

  

<b>3. How many years have you been teaching?</b>		
	Response Count	Response %
A Fewer than 1	26	5%
B 1-5 years	107	20%
C 6-15 years	165	32%
D 16-25 years	108	21%
E More than 25 years	117	22%
<i>Answered Question</i>	523	99%
<i>Skipped Question</i>	4	1%

  

<b>4. How many pupils are there in your school?</b>		
	Response Count	Response %
A Fewer than 150	30	6%
B 151-400 pupils	132	25%
C 401-800 pupils	152	29%
D 801-1000 pupils	83	16%
E More than 1000 pupils	128	24%
<i>Answered Question</i>	525	99%
<i>Skipped Question</i>	2	1%

<b>5. If full time, how many hours would you estimate you regularly work each week?</b>		
	Response Count	Response %
A Around 35	4	1%
B 36-40 hours	35	8%
C 41-45 hours	124	28%
D 46-50 hours	157	35%
E Over 50 hours	127	28%
<i>Answered Question</i>	447	85%
<i>Skipped Question</i>	80	15%

6. If part time, please enter pointage as full time equivalent (e.g. if you work 17.5 hours per week enter 0.5). Then please estimate the number of hours you regularly work each week.

- Part time teaching staff reported working 37% longer each week than contractually obliged.

<b>7. I find broad skills based frameworks help me to manage my forward planning efficiently.</b>		
	Response Count	Response %
A Strongly agree	30	6%
B Agree	179	37%
C Undecided	123	26%
D Disagree	111	23%
E Strongly Disagree	37	8%
<i>Answered Question</i>	480	91%
<i>Skipped Question</i>	47	9%

<b>8. I feel supported by the senior management team in my school with issues regarding my workload.</b>		
	Response Count	Response %
A Strongly agree	64	13%
B Agree	151	31%
C Undecided	130	27%
D Disagree	107	22%
E Strongly Disagree	34	7%
<i>Answered Question</i>	486	92%
<i>Skipped Question</i>	41	8%

<b>9. I feel more in control of my workload than I did 12 months ago.</b>			
		Response Count	Response %
A	Strongly agree	17	4%
B	Agree	80	16%
C	Undecided	96	19%
D	Disagree	191	39%
E	Strongly Disagree	108	22%
<i>Answered Question</i>		492	93%
<i>Skipped Question</i>		35	7%

<b>10. My school's Working Time Agreement is not helpful for managing my workload.</b>			
		Response Count	Response %
A	Strongly agree	44	9%
B	Agree	149	31%
C	Undecided	170	35%
D	Disagree	107	22%
E	Strongly Disagree	17	3%
<i>Answered Question</i>		487	92%
<i>Skipped Question</i>		40	8%

<b>11. The increased sharing of good practice has helped reduce my workload.</b>			
		Response Count	Response %
A	Strongly agree	23	5%
B	Agree	113	23%
C	Undecided	108	22%
D	Disagree	193	39%
E	Strongly Disagree	54	11%
<i>Answered Question</i>		491	93%
<i>Skipped Question</i>		36	7%

<b>12. I do not believe I have a responsibility to manage my own workload.</b>			
		Response Count	Response %
A	Strongly agree	14	3%
B	Agree	42	9%
C	Undecided	64	13%
D	Disagree	266	54%
E	Strongly Disagree	104	21%
<i>Answered Question</i>		490	93%
<i>Skipped Question</i>		37	7%

<b>13. I do not think ICT tools such as Glow or the National Assessment Resource have helped me and my colleagues reduce our workload.</b>			
		Response Count	Response %
A	Strongly agree	125	26%
B	Agree	209	43%
C	Undecided	75	15%
D	Disagree	66	13%
E	Strongly Disagree	14	3%
<i>Answered Question</i>		489	93%
<i>Skipped Question</i>		38	7%

<b>14. My line-manager gives me the opportunity to discuss my workload.</b>			
		Response Count	Response %
A	Strongly agree	56	11%
B	Agree	221	46%
C	Undecided	73	15%
D	Disagree	100	21%
E	Strongly Disagree	36	7%
<i>Answered Question</i>		486	92%
<i>Skipped Question</i>		41	8%

<b>15. I find the demands of mentoring Initial Teacher Education students unmanageable.</b>			
		Response Count	Response %
A	Strongly agree	16	3%
B	Agree	58	13%
C	Undecided	209	46%
D	Disagree	153	34%
E	Strongly Disagree	16	4%
<i>Answered Question</i>		452	86%
<i>Skipped Question</i>		75	14%

<b>16. The development activities identified in the School Improvement Plan are not given suitable time allocation in my school's Working Time Agreement.</b>			
		Response Count	Response %
A	Strongly agree	43	9%
B	Agree	139	28%
C	Undecided	149	31%
D	Disagree	134	28%
E	Strongly Disagree	19	4%
<i>Answered Question</i>		484	92%
<i>Skipped Question</i>		43	8%

<b>17. I feel the authority has supported teachers thus far in the implementation of Curriculum for Excellence.</b>			
		Response Count	Response %
A	Strongly agree	13	3%
B	Agree	177	36%
C	Undecided	105	22%
D	Disagree	132	27%
E	Strongly Disagree	60	12%
<i>Answered Question</i>		487	92%
<i>Skipped Question</i>		40	8%

<b>18. Changes made to Staged Intervention and Integrated Assessment Framework paperwork have proved very useful in reducing my workload.</b>			
		Response Count	Response %
A	Strongly agree	5	1%
B	Agree	42	9%
C	Undecided	155	32%
D	Disagree	191	39%
E	Strongly Disagree	91	19%
<i>Answered Question</i>		484	92%
<i>Skipped Question</i>		43	8%

**19. What changes made over the past year have been the most beneficial in help you to reduce or manage your workload?**

- Changes to forward planning (e.g. introduction of broad skills based frameworks and more professional dialogue)
- Increased sharing of good practice through cluster working (Many staff thought cluster working was a more effective platform for sharing good practice than GLOW and NAR.)
- Changes to the School Improvement Plan format
- Some staff reported that changes made over the past year had not reduced workload.

**20. How useful have recent changes to forward plans (e.g. Staged Intervention paperwork, broad skills based frameworks, Curriculum for Excellence action plan) been in helping you manage or reduce your workload?**

- Some staff though changes to Staged Intervention paperwork were an improvement as the paperwork became more focused and linked to outcomes.
- Broad skills based frameworks were useful for reducing workload.
- Overall reductions in paperwork, better consistency and more focus for staff.

- Other staff thought changes to forward planning and Staged Intervention increased paperwork.
- Some staff also reported that there was a lack of guidance and clarity which left them feeling confused and unsure how to use new documents, such as broad skills based frameworks.

**21. What changes have been made in your school for reporting to parents and how useful have these changes been in managing or reducing your workload?**

- The new reporting format was described by staff as containing too much information for parents and as being too long.
- Other staff explained that parents liked the additional information about their children and recognised the extra effort required of teachers to complete these reports.
- Staff reported that they were required to complete new Target Setting and Tracking reports which were additions to workload, however some staff commented that these tools were useful for reporting.
- Staff also commented that there was a greater reliance on ICT equipment for reporting than previously and technical problems with the Click & Go system were adding to workload.
- Some staff reported that their school had made internal changes that helped with workload such as extending parents meetings and shortening reports.

**22. Please feel free to make any further comments regarding workload generators and recent changes to workload which you feel have not been facilitated by this questionnaire.**

- The amount of paperwork required to be completed was reported as a workload issue and interferes with teachers' abilities to prepare interesting lessons for the pupils.
- Staff also reported that when new initiatives are introduced they do not replace previous aspects of workload therefore workload appears to continuously increase.

- The changes made through CfE require staff to locate resources for lessons which is time consuming.
- Staff recognised the need for progression and supported positive change but reported that the pace of change is too fast and they are not given enough time to adapt to new initiatives.

## **Section 4**

### **Progress to Date**

In the open question section of the questionnaire and during the focus groups, staff were asked to comment on the progress made to date.

1. Changes seen to reduce workload by staff:
  - Broad skills based frameworks for forward planning
  - More professional dialogue for forward planning
  - Increased sharing of good practice
  - Changes to the School Improvement Plan format
2. Changes seen to increase workload by staff:
  - Forward planning which is now more time consuming
  - Development work for *Curriculum for Excellence*
  - Greater reliance on unreliable ICT systems e.g. Click & Go
  - Pace of change with new initiatives which increases workload
3. In the questionnaire, staff were asked if they felt more in control of their workload than they did twelve to eighteen months ago.
  - 61% of staff did not feel any more in control of workload than they did twelve to eighteen months ago.
  - 20% of staff did feel more in control of workload than they did twelve to eighteen months ago.
  - 19% of staff were undecided about their level of control over workload, compared to twelve to eighteen months ago.



## **Areas of Workload Still to be Addressed**

In the open question section of the questionnaire and during the focus groups, staff were asked to summarise the areas of workload still to be addressed.

### **1. Paperwork**

- The amount of paperwork was reported to be impacting on the time staff had available to prepare high quality lessons for the pupils.
- Staff would like to have more time to prepare lessons.
- In particular, staff thought Staged Intervention paperwork could be streamlined further.

### **2. The Pace of Change**

- The pace of change was regarded as very quick and staff felt they would benefit from a period without change occurring, to reflect on current practices.

### **3. Reporting and Assessment**

- Reporting to parents and assessment in line with *Curriculum for Excellence* was an aspect of workload where staff felt more guidance could be given.

### **4. Sharing Good Practice**

- Staff reported that the current electronic systems for sharing good practice are not effective.
- Staff felt sharing good practice could be hugely beneficial, but more time should be allocated to collegiate working in schools and in Clusters.

### **5. Developing Teaching Materials**

- Staff reported that some suggested resources, particularly for maths, would be useful to help reduce the workload associated with developing or sourcing teaching materials.

## APPENDIX 1

### INFORMAL LNCT WORKING GROUP

#### LNCT WORKLOAD MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN 2010 – 2011 and 2011 – 2012

This action plan is a standing item on the agenda for LNCT meetings and progress towards meeting the action points is noted and discussed.

SESSION 2010 – 2011		PROGRESS MADE	ACTION PLAN 2011 – 2012
	ACTION	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	IMPACT
Forward Plans	<p>The Department will support schools by providing an action plan for the implementation of Curriculum for Excellence which takes a phased approach to the management of developments.</p> <p>The Department will support schools by providing broad skills based frameworks, developed by teachers and curriculum leaders, for each curricular area of Curriculum for Excellence, which can then be adapted to suit local circumstances for each school or cluster.</p> <p>Schools will refine forward plans, including the process of monitoring and giving feedback on these.</p>	<p>Link QIOs shared good practice identified in SQRs, HMIE inspections and disseminated this to HTs</p> <p>CfE action plan for 2010-2017 produced and disseminated to all educational establishments.</p> <p>Skills planners developed with the involvement of practitioners across all sectors, disseminated to all educational establishments.</p> <p>Training session on leading professional dialogue offered to senior managers through Leadership and Management Development programme led by HT with accredited good practice in this area &amp; at HT meeting in August 2010.</p> <p>Workshop delivered on leading professional dialogue – agenda item for HTs meeting.</p> <p>Good practice at primary and Pre 5 HTs meetings shared regarding planning and building professional dialogue.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ HTs found the CfE action plan useful.</li> <li>❖ Most staff found broad skills based frameworks helpful for managing their forward planning.</li> <li>❖ Staff in some schools reported that forward plans were now created for shorter periods of time which meant the plans were less time consuming, more useful, meaningful and flexible.</li> <li>❖ The most positive change to forward planning reported by teaching staff was the introduction of more professional dialogue.</li> <li>❖ Overall staff felt that professional dialogue was a beneficial change to forward planning as it reduces paperwork.</li> </ul>

SESSION 2010 – 2011		PROGRESS MADE	ACTION PLAN 2011 – 2012
	ACTION	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	IMPACT
Assessment and Reporting to Parents	<p>The Department will support schools by sharing good practice in relation to streamlining parents' meetings. One session of the Leadership and Management Development programme will be scheduled for this.</p> <p>Schools will develop reporting formats which link to the four capacities and Curriculum for Excellence, considering workload implications and national advice.</p> <p>The Department will support schools by sharing good practice in this area, when it is identified.</p>	<p>Working with parents session arranged as part of Leadership and Management Development programme</p> <p>All schools working on CfE reporting formats. All clusters working on this to agree common approach to developments for each cluster.</p> <p>Exemplar reporting format provided around the principles of reporting in line with national advice and guidance in Building the Curriculum 5. This was for all sectors and shared with all educational establishments for personalisation and use.</p> <p>New reporting formats currently being gathered by QIMs.</p> <p>Link QIOs share good practice.</p> <p>Working groups in schools composed of practitioners.</p> <p>Assessment and Reporting partnership group leading developments on authority approach to this. Draft guidelines issued for feedback.</p> <p>Continuing work into next session as both valuable and manageable.</p> <p>Reporting discussed with Parent Council Chairs and also at HT meetings.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Some staff thought the new Target Setting and Tracking systems would reduce the amount of time spent on reporting later in the year, although workload is currently increased.</li> <li>❖ DHTs, HTs, and teachers with less than 1 year of experience felt the increased sharing of good practice had reduced workload.</li> </ul>
Inclusion	<p>The Department will support schools by arranging CPD on new Additional Support Needs legislation, the new staged intervention procedures (STINT) and Integrated Assessment Framework (IAF) procedures, including paperwork.</p> <p>The remit of the Policy, Planning and Allocation</p>	<p>ASN Co-ordinators' forum – very well attended and very positive feedback. Very good progress has been made with the implementation of STINT – reported by link QIOs and L McDill (all schools covered by link QIOs). Teachers are reporting that new STINT forms are less work in terms of time to complete. These have reduced unnecessary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Some staff reported that the paperwork required for STINT and IAF had reduced.</li> <li>❖ Staff working in the special sector reported that changes to STINT and IAF paperwork had reduced workload.</li> </ul>

SESSION 2010 – 2011		PROGRESS MADE	ACTION PLAN 2011 – 2012
	ACTION	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	IMPACT
	<p>Group and mechanisms for placing Pupil Support Assistants (PSAs) will change to include responsibilities for cluster schools.</p> <p>Revise LNCT 13.</p>	<p>duplication of paperwork allowing staff to focus on the job in hand. Also evidenced in transition reviews and HMIE inspections.</p> <p>In terms of IAF – the steering group has agreed that STINT paperwork will be the education department's single agency assessment document, therefore further reducing the need for duplication of information. Schools have expressed their gratitude for this.</p> <p>No issues have been reported centrally in relation to cluster management of PSAs. There is no reduction in the overall budget and the department operates a needs led criteria based approach to allocation of posts.</p> <p>LNCT 13 – a meeting has been planned for 20 June 2011. This will take account of responses to the inclusion consultation.</p>	
ITE students	<p>Schools will be reminded about the decrease in the intake of ITE students to teacher education programmes at universities in Session 2010 – 2011.</p> <p>The Department will monitor the spread of student placements via the Practicum system.</p> <p>The Department will raise awareness in schools of the time required to mentor student teachers and recommend that consideration be given to time for this to be built into the collegiate agreement where appropriate.</p> <p>The Department will remind schools of the advice contained in LNCT 23 specifically in relation to consultation on student placements.</p> <p>The Department will participate in the national</p>	<p>Schools reminded at HTs meeting of decrease in student intake.</p> <p>Practicum system working well as a monitoring tool. To date no issues reported centrally about numbers of student placements required.</p> <p>Schools have been able to accommodate number of requests made by HEIs.</p> <p>Very few requests received centrally from HEIs to source additional student placements.</p> <p>Issues raised by schools addressed at Western Consortium ITE Co-ordinators' meetings.</p> <p>Letter of thanks from Graham Donaldson</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Most staff were undecided about the demands of ITE students.</li> <li>❖ ITE student demands were not raised as a major workload issue in either the questionnaire or the focus groups.</li> <li>❖ When asked directly staff were undecided or mostly felt the demands of ITE students were manageable.</li> </ul>

SESSION 2010 – 2011		PROGRESS MADE	ACTION PLAN 2011 – 2012
	ACTION	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	IMPACT
	review of teacher education led by Graham Donaldson.	regarding quality of engagement in review process. (School visits and focus groups of staff centrally.)	
Management Time / Issues	HTs should consider remits of Principal Teachers and senior management staff in light of the reduction in management time and in relation to the working week.	<p>Link QIOs visits to schools, Heads of Service visits to schools, HMIE reports highlight effectiveness of leadership (including distributed leadership and opportunities for this), SQRs and cluster transitions also have strong focus on this.</p> <p>100% collegiate agreements submitted and signed off.</p> <p>Support for schools also provided by QIOs with specific remits e.g. NQTs, student performance, literacy, numeracy, enterprise. Staff with responsibility for specific areas can access support from QIOs other than those linked to schools.</p> <p>DHT &amp; PT forums also provide mechanism for professional dialogue relating to remit responsibilities.</p> <p>Attendance of key personnel at national training in revised guidelines for job sizing.</p> <p>Link QIOs advice to schools in relation to redesigning remits – contacts with schools of similar size to exchange information/ideas/good practice.</p> <p>Promoted remits constantly under review and linked to PRD procedures.</p> <p>Parental involvement in recruitment and selection of HTs and DHTs – opportunity given for parents to contextualise person</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Promoted staff felt QIOs were always available to provide advice when needed and were quick to respond.</li> <li>❖ Promoted staff felt QIOs shared good practice which was useful.</li> <li>❖ HTs commented on the new streamlined version of the School Improvement Plan and felt it was a positive change to workload.</li> <li>❖ Most promoted staff felt the new School Improvement Plan format was simplified, less time consuming, and more targeted toward learning and teaching.</li> </ul>

SESSION 2010 – 2011		PROGRESS MADE	ACTION PLAN 2011 – 2012
	ACTION	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE	IMPACT
		<p>specification. Training sessions provided.</p> <p>Feedback from Investors in People – staff commented on the difference which the new school improvement planning format was making to workload. The document was a slimmer more focused approach to improvement planning and had become more of a 'living' document.</p> <p>Improvement planning training session held for recently appointed and acting HTs.</p> <p>Investors in People feedback included that support and challenge provided by the centre was a positive thing. Schools were always supported.</p> <p>Investors in People feedback included that concern for health and wellbeing of staff was very strong.</p> <p>Investors in People feedback included that there was a very positive culture and ethos in the education department.</p> <p>Investors in People feedback on Leadership and Management Development Programme stated that CPD on coaching skills had impacted positively on participants' 'people management' skills.</p>	

## **Appendix 2**

East Renfrewshire Council: Education Department

Teacher Workload Review 2011 Questionnaire

### **Section 1**

1. Which of the following best describes your position within the school?

Teacher  
Chartered Teacher (Full Status)  
Principal Teacher  
Depute Head Teacher  
Head Teacher

2. Which Sector do you work in?

Pre School  
Primary  
Secondary  
Special

3. How many years have you been teaching?

Fewer than 1  
1-5  
6-15  
16-25  
More than 25

4. How many pupils are there in your school?

Fewer than 150  
151-400  
401-800  
801-1000  
More than 1000

5. If full time, how many hours would you estimate you regularly work each week?

Around 35  
36-40  
41-45  
46-50  
Over 50

**6a. If part time, please enter pointage as full time equivalent (e.g. if you work 17.5 hours per week enter 0.5).**

\_\_\_\_\_ FTE

**6b. Then please estimate the number of hours you regularly work each week.**

\_\_\_\_\_ Hour

**7. I find broad skills based frameworks help me to manage my forward planning efficiently.**

Strongly agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

**8. I feel supported by the senior management team in my school with issues regarding my workload.**

Strongly agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

**9. I feel more in control of my workload than I did 12 months ago.**

Strongly agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

**10. My school's Working Time Agreement is not helpful for managing my workload.**

Strongly agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

**11. The increased sharing of good practice has helped reduce my workload.**

Strongly agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

**12. I do not believe I have a responsibility to manage my own workload.**

Strongly agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

**13. I do not think ICT tools such *Glow* or the National Assessment Resource have helped me and my colleagues reduce our workload.**

Strongly agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree



**14. My line-manager gives me the opportunity to discuss my workload.**

Strongly agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

**15. I find the demands of mentoring Initial Teacher Education students unmanageable.**

Strongly agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

**16. The development activities identified in the School Improvement Plan are not given suitable time allocation in my school's Working Time Agreement.**

Strongly agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

**17. I feel East Renfrewshire Council has supported teachers thus far in the implementation of Curriculum for Excellence.**

Strongly agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

**18. Changes made to Staged Intervention and Integrated Assessment Framework paperwork have proved very useful in reducing my workload.**

Strongly agree      Agree      Undecided      Disagree      Strongly Disagree

**19. What changes made over the past year have been the most beneficial in helping you to reduce or manage your workload?**

---

---

---

---

---

**20. How useful have recent changes to forward plans (e.g. Staged Intervention paperwork, broad skills based frameworks, Curriculum for Excellence action plan) been in helping you manage or reduce your workload?**

---

---

---

**21. What changes have been made in your school for reporting to parents and how useful have these changes been in managing or reducing your workload?**

---

---

---

---

---

**22. Please feel free to make any further comments regarding workload generators and recent changes to workload which you feel have not been facilitated by the questions contained in this questionnaire.**

---

---

---

---

---

## Appendix 3

### Focus Group Questions

#### (Classroom Teachers)

**Since the last LNCT workload review a number of steps have been taken by schools and the education department to try to reduce workload for teachers.**

1. Reporting to parents was identified as a workload generator in the last teacher workload review and it was included in the action plan. **What changes have been made in your school for reporting to parents and how useful have these changes been in managing or reducing your workload?**
  - CfE reporting formats
  - Increased time allocated in collegiate calendar
2. Assessment was another workload generator identified in the last teacher workload review and a number of changes were enacted from the action plan. **How useful have changes to the paperwork for Staged Intervention and Integrated Assessment Framework been in reducing workload?**
3. Forward Plans were another workload issue and actions have been taken regarding this workload generator. **Have any changes been made to forward plans in your school?**  
**Has the workload associated with forward plans reduced?**
  - Action plan for CfE
  - Broad skills based frameworks
  - Introduction of more professional dialogue which has reduced paperwork in some schools
4. It is recognised that teachers regularly work beyond their contractual hours but I would like to understand the reasons behind this issue. **Why do you and your colleagues work longer hours than contractually obliged?**
  - Internal pressure – school
  - External pressure – local authority
  - Self choice
  - Combination
5. **What changes made over the past year have been the most beneficial in helping you to reduce or manage your workload?**

- 6. What workload generators do you feel still need to be addressed in order to make your workload more manageable?**

## Appendix 4

### Focus Group Questions

#### (Principal Teachers)

**Since the last LNCT workload review a number of steps have been taken by schools and the education department to try and reduce workload for teachers.**

1. Reporting to parents was identified as a workload generator in the last teacher workload review and it was included in the action plan. **What changes have been made in your school for reporting to parents and how useful have these changes been in managing or reducing your workload?**
  - CfE reporting formats
  - Increased time allocated in collegiate calendar
2. Assessment was another workload generator identified in the last teacher workload review and a number of changes were enacted from the action plan. **How useful have changes to the paperwork for Staged Intervention and Integrated Assessment Framework been in reducing workload?**
3. Forward Plans were another workload issue and actions have been taken regarding this workload generator. **Have the actions taken to reduce workload associated with forward plans been useful?**
  - Action plan for CfE
  - Broad skills based frameworks
  - Introduction of more professional dialogue which has reduced paperwork in some schools
4. Since the last workload review Quality Improvement Officers have been providing extra support with specific remits. **How useful has this extra support from QIOs been in helping with recent changes to management time?**

QIO Support with:

  - Newly Qualified Teachers
  - Student placements
  - Literacy
  - Numeracy
  - Enterprise

- 5. It is recognised that teachers regularly work beyond their contractual hours but I would like to understand the reasons behind this issue. Why do you and your colleagues work longer hours than contractually obliged?**
- Internal pressure – school
  - External pressure – local authority
  - Self choice
  - Combination
- 6. What changes made over the past year have been the most beneficial in helping you to reduce or manage your workload?**
- 7. What workload generators do you feel still need to be addressed in order to make your workload more manageable?**

## Appendix 5

### Focus Group Questions

#### **(Depute Head Teachers)**

**Since the last LNCT workload review a number of steps have been taken by schools and the education department to try and reduce workload for teachers.**

1. Reporting to parents was identified as a workload generator in the last teacher workload review and it was included in the action plan. **What changes have been made in your school for reporting to parents and how useful have these changes been in managing or reducing your workload?**
  - CfE reporting formats
  - Increased time allocated in collegiate calendar
2. Assessment was another workload generator identified in the last teacher workload review and a number of changes were enacted from the action plan. **How useful have changes to the paperwork for Staged Intervention and Integrated Assessment Framework been in reducing workload?**
3. Forward Plans were another workload issue and actions have been taken regarding this workload generator. **Have the actions taken to reduce workload associated with forward plans been useful?**
  - Action plan for CfE
  - Broad skills based frameworks
  - Introduction of more professional dialogue which has reduced paperwork in some schools
4. **How useful has support from the education department been in helping with recent changes to management time?**

eg Support with:

  - Newly Qualified Teachers
  - Student placements
  - Literacy
  - Numeracy
  - Enterprise
5. **What difference has the new format for School Improvement Planning made to workload?**

6. It is recognised that teachers regularly work beyond their contractual hours but I would like to understand the reasons behind this issue. **Why do you and your colleagues work longer hours than contractually obliged?**
- Internal pressure – school
  - External pressure – local authority
  - Self choice
  - Combination
7. **What changes made over the past year have been the most beneficial in helping you to reduce or manage your workload?**
8. **What workload generators do you feel still need to be addressed in order to make your workload more manageable?**



## Appendix 6

### **Focus Group Questions**

#### **(Head Teachers)**

**Since the last LNCT workload review a number of steps have been taken by schools and the education department to try and reduce workload for teachers.**

- 1. Reporting to parents was identified as a workload generator in the last teacher workload review and it was included in the action plan. What changes have been made in your school for reporting to parents and how useful have these changes been in managing or reducing your workload?**
  - CfE reporting formats
  - Increased time allocated in collegiate calendar
- 2. Assessment was another workload generator identified in the last teacher workload review and a number of changes were enacted from the action plan. How useful have changes to the paperwork for Staged Intervention and Integrated Assessment Framework been in reducing workload?**
- 3. Forward Plans were another workload issue and actions have been taken regarding this workload generator. Have the actions taken to reduce workload associated with forward plans been useful?**
  - Action plan for CfE
  - Broad skills based frameworks
  - Introduction of more professional dialogue which has reduced paperwork in some schools
- 4. How useful has support from the education department been in helping with recent changes to management time?**

Eg Support with:

  - Newly Qualified Teachers
  - Student placements
  - Literacy
  - Numeracy
  - Enterprise
- 5. What difference has the new format for School Improvement Planning made to workload?**

- 6. It is recognised that teachers regularly work beyond their contractual hours but I would like to understand the reasons behind this issue. Why do you and your colleagues work longer hours than contractually obliged?**
- Internal pressure – school
  - External pressure – local authority
  - Self choice
  - Combination
- 7. What changes made over the past year have been the most beneficial in helping you to reduce or manage your workload?**
- 8. What workload generators do you feel still need to be addressed in order to make your workload more manageable?**