

**South Australian
Catholic School
Teacher Workload Report
2014**

**A REPORT PREPARED FOR THE
INDEPENDENT EDUCATION UNION (SOUTH AUSTRALIA)**

May 5 2015

Dr Anthony Daly

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This research was conducted in the latter half of 2014 to identify pressure points in workload for teachers in South Australian Catholic schools. The aim of the study was to collect data and information that would provide an evidence base for negotiations regarding remediating clauses in the 2015 South Australian Catholic Schools Enterprise Agreement.

All IEU(SA) members employed in Catholic schools were sent an email inviting them to complete an online questionnaire during Terms 3 and 4 of 2014. Responses were received from 1,197 members, with a broadly representational cross section of participants in terms of school level, time fraction, experience and gender.

A number of workload concerns were highlighted by respondents, with the level of support received from the school often considered to be inadequate. Teachers' work life balance was negatively impacted by the feeling of being rushed and having to work through lunch time and out of hours. Results showed that:

- Although general levels of satisfaction with teaching and the current school were high, it is of concern that 17% of respondents were considering another career
- Early career teachers did not differ significantly from their more experienced colleagues in satisfaction or workload demands
- Demands for curriculum extension and other professional activities varied widely, indicating that some teachers were performing significantly higher workloads in some areas, which are possibly in breach of current limits
- Secondary school teachers reported the highest demands for assessment and reporting
- Middle school teachers reported high levels of assessment and reporting but higher demands on behaviour management than others
- The demands of management and colleague emails increased with schooling level, yet part-time staff did not report a pro-rata reduction in demand
- Parent and student email demands at middle and secondary level were significantly higher than other levels
- A secondary teacher, on average, would be spending 4.2 hours a week on emails
- Most teachers would work through most lunch breaks with secondary and middle school teachers highest at 3.3 days per week
- Early learning centre teachers spent longer working during school holidays and on weekends, but the whole cohort spent an average of 3.8 hours on weekends
- Students with special needs were a significant workload issue, with an average of 3.3 formally assessed students per class and 54% of respondents believing that the schools did not provide sufficient support
- The majority of respondents did not consider school support to be sufficient to meet the demands of report writing, information technology, the National Curriculum, the International Baccalaureate or AITSL requirements
- The vast majority of respondents (83%) felt rushed or pressed for time with 56% not satisfied with the balance between their work and the rest of their life
- Women were more likely to report always feeling rushed

INTRODUCTION

The Independent Education Union (SA) is the registered union and professional association that represents staff in non-government schools and private education institutions in South Australia. As a major stakeholder in the education sector, the Independent Education Union (IEU) advocates on members' behalf to advance and protect their professional and industrial interests.

Regulating aspects of teacher workload has been a consistent theme in enterprise agreement claims advanced by IEU members in Catholic and other schools. The SA Catholic Schools Enterprise Agreement currently regulates some of the more easily-quantifiable aspects, such as student contact time and other professional activities (e.g., required meetings and duties). In addition, class sizes have a benchmark rather than absolute maxima, with extra-curricular activities such as sport and cultural activities regulated with an hours and payment model. However, the unregulated aspects of teacher workload are reported anecdotally by IEU teacher members as an ongoing concern.

Members have also cited a number of other areas of concern:

- The intensification of communication with parents and students by email and social media
- Assessing and reporting, documentation and publication of curriculum documents and assessments
- Demands on time for individualisation of learning plans
- Increased demands of funded and unfunded special needs students in mainstream classrooms
- Implementation of National Curriculum, and demands associated with SACE and International Baccalaureate
- Open days and parent social functions

During negotiations for the 2013 South Australian Catholic Schools Enterprise Agreement, members directed the IEU to proceed to ballot with an understanding that a workload survey would be conducted to validate claims in the next round of enterprise agreement negotiations. Accordingly, this research was undertaken in the latter half of 2014 to identify pressure points in workload for teachers in Catholic schools. The aim of the study was to collect data and information that would provide an evidence base for negotiations regarding remediating clauses in the 2015 Catholic Schools Enterprise Agreement. All IEU(SA) members employed as teachers in Catholic schools were sent an email inviting them to complete an online questionnaire during Terms 3 and 4 of 2014.

RESULTS

Participants

A total of 1,197 employees commenced the survey, although not all responded to every survey item, so frequencies and percentages vary throughout the report. There were 829 women (69.3%), 315 men (26.3%) and 53 unreported (4.4%). Table 1 shows that there was a broad representation of ages, although there were fewer in the 20 to 25 year and over 60 age groups. Table 1 also shows that there were few respondents from early learning centres and out of school hours care; the remainder were relatively equally spread across school levels. In terms of employment category, 976 were permanent employees (81.5%), 135 were on fixed-term contract (11.3%), with 10 employed on a casual basis (0.8%) and 76 unreported (6.3%). A total of 733 (61.2%) respondents were employed full time, 379 part time (31.7%) and 85 unreported (7.1%). Of the 379 part time employees, the full time equivalent (FTE) fraction varied between 0.1 and 0.9, with an overall average of 0.6 FTE (standard deviation = 0.21). The most common FTE fractions were 0.4 (17.2%), 0.6 (24.0%) and 0.8 (29.8%).

Table 1. Respondent age and school level

Age (years)	Frequency	Percent	Level	Frequency	Percent
20-25	40	3.3	Early Learning Centre	5	0.4
26-30	141	11.8	Junior Primary/Primary	466	38.9
31-35	110	9.2	Middle	163	13.6
36-40	134	11.2	Secondary	487	40.7
41-45	148	12.4	OSHC	1	0.1
46-50	137	11.4	Missing	75	6.3
51-55	184	15.4	Total	1,197	100.0
56-60	144	12.0			
>60	101	8.4			
Missing	58	4.8			
Total	1,197	100.0			

Less than one third of respondents (365, 30.5%) stated that they held a position of responsibility (POR). Of these, 324 chose to report the POR level, with 152 (46.9%) at Level 1, 123 (38.0%) at Level 2, 34 (10.5%) at Level 3, and 15 (4.6%) at Level 4. The release time provided for a POR post ranged between zero and 10.9 hours, with an average of 4.3 hours ($SD = 3.3$). Release time differed according to Level, with Levels 1 to 4 receiving on average, respectively, 2.6 hours ($SD = 2.4$), 4.9 hours ($SD = 2.8$), 8.5 hours ($SD = 2.6$), and 8.2 hours ($SD = 3.8$).

Years in teaching profession and present school, satisfaction and intent to change

Respondents had been in the teaching profession for an average of 20.0 years ($SD = 11.5$), ranging between 1 and 40 years. Respondents were, generally speaking, satisfied with the teaching profession with 73.8% ($n = 808$) stating that they were somewhat or very satisfied, 15.7% not very or

not at all satisfied ($n = 172$), and 10.5% ($n = 115$) were neutral. This was reflected, to an extent, with respondents' intention to look for another career, with 17.0% ($n = 164$) agreeing or strongly agreeing that they were considering another career, 55.2% ($n = 604$) disagreeing or strongly disagreeing, and 27.9% ($n = 305$) neutral.

The *Staff in Australia's schools 2013* survey (McKenzie et al., 2014) asked similar questions regarding teachers' level of job satisfaction and their intentions to seek an alternative career. That survey found approximately 87% of teachers were satisfied or very satisfied with their job and 18% indicated that they were considering an alternative career. Levels of satisfaction with the profession were somewhat lower in the current study (73.8%), but intent to change career was broadly comparable (17.0%).

At the time of the survey, respondents had been at their current school for 11.0 years on average ($SD = 8.2$), ranging between 1 and 40 years. Their level of satisfaction with their current school was broadly similar to respondent satisfaction with the teaching profession. Over three quarters were somewhat or very satisfied (77.6%, $n = 850$), 12.7% were not very or not at all satisfied ($n = 139$), and 9.7% ($n = 106$) were neutral. This was also reflected with respondents' intention to move to another school, with 22.5% ($n = 246$) agreeing or strongly agreeing that they were considering another school, 50.6% ($n = 555$) disagreeing or strongly disagreeing, and 26.9% ($n = 295$) neutral.

The degree of respondents' satisfaction with current school or the teaching profession, or their intent to move, did not differ between men and women, age or years in the profession, type of contract, school level, or FTE fraction.

In line with the *Staff in Australia's schools 2013* survey, a category of early career teacher (ECT) was constructed, comprising those teachers with less than five years in the teaching profession. ECTs were, perhaps unsurprisingly, significantly less likely to hold positions of responsibility. ECTs reported spending significantly more hours each week in student contact time than their more experienced colleagues (22.0 vs. 18.4 hours). There were no significant differences between the two groups in any other workload or satisfaction measure. There were a few marginal differences between the two groups that did not meet significance criteria, but may be worthy of mention as possible emerging issues. These included ECTs reporting more weekly hours in relief lessons (3.2 vs. 2.6 hours), more days worked through lunch (3.2 vs. 2.9 days), less time dealing with emails from management and colleagues (1.9 vs. 2.3 hours), and fewer hours on average each week in subgroup meetings (0.8 vs. 1.0 hours). In summary, ECTs generally did not differ from their more experienced colleagues in levels of, or satisfaction with, workload, or satisfaction with the profession, current school, or work/life balance.

Curriculum extension and other professional activities

Table 2 shows the approximate workload hours for relief lessons, supervision (yard duty, bus duty etc.), attending staff meetings and subgroup meetings, attending parent/teacher interviews, and deemed curriculum extension activities outside normal school hours. There were no differences between type of contract, school level, age or years in the profession. However, men reported statistically significantly more relief lesson workload hours per week (3.2 hours) and deemed CEA

hours per year (38.1 hours) than women (2.5 hours, 30.1 hours). There were no other gender differences.

Those who worked full time reported significantly more workload hours than part-time employees in all areas except attendance at staff meetings. This is unsurprising and likely due to part time employees working fewer hours generally. The ranges and standard deviations in Table 2 show that there was great variability in the time spent on each activity.

Table 2. Workload hours for relief lessons, supervision, staff and subgroup meetings, and deemed curriculum extension activities (CEA) outside normal school hours

Duty	Criteria	Mean	SD	Range	N
Relief lesson load	Hours in Term 2	2.7	2.5	0-10.0	758
Supervision duty	Hours per week	1.2	0.8	0-9.0	798
Staff meetings	Hours per week	1.6	1.0	0-9.5	792
Subgroup meetings	Hours per week	1.0	1.0	0-9.0	758
Parent interviews	Hours in Terms 1 & 2	9.0	6.3	0-100	797
Deemed CEA	Hours in school year	32.5	26.8	5-100	691

In terms of curriculum extension activities, 40.2% ($n = 323$) of respondents were dissatisfied with the workload (59.8% satisfied, $n = 481$), with 42.0% ($n = 329$) stating that they were dissatisfied with the CEA remuneration (58.0% satisfied, $n = 455$). While it is not possible to determine a direct relationship between workload and pay satisfaction with these data, analyses showed that employees dissatisfied with their CEA activities workload were more likely to report being dissatisfied with their remuneration for those activities. Those with full time contracts were significantly less likely to be satisfied with their CEA workload, there were no differences in satisfaction with the remuneration. Nor were there differences between men and women, age or years in the profession, type of contract, or school level.

Around a quarter (27.4%, $n = 218$) of respondents (total $n = 796$) reported not having to attend prayer during the week, 71.2% ($n = 576$) attended prayer between 1 and 5 times each week, and 1.4% ($n = 11$) attended between 6 and 10 times each week. The average duration of each prayer attendance was 9.0 minutes ($SD = 6.8$).

Workload outside 'normal' timetable

Respondents were asked how much time they spent each week dealing with behaviour management issues (e.g., implementing BM policy, meeting with students, parents etc.). Responses ranged between 0 and 9 hours, with an average of 1.5 hours each week ($SD = 1.5$). It is here that we begin to see significant differences between the school areas. Table 3 shows that teachers in middle schools reported spending significantly more hours each week dealing with behaviour management issues

than those in primary and secondary schools. This may be associated with age-related differences in disruptive behaviour (e.g., bullying and victimisation, Pellegrini & Long, 2002), although it is not possible to determine such a relationship with these data.

Respondents were also asked how much time they spent each week on assessment and reporting requirements. Table 3 shows that teachers in middle and secondary schools reported spending significantly more time each week dealing with assessment and recording than those in primary schools. There were no statistically significant differences in time spent dealing with behaviour management or assessment and recording between men and women, or between those on permanent and fixed-term contracts. While differences were initially apparent between full time and part time status, these disappeared after accounting for the FTE proportion. The more hours that teachers were contracted to work, the more time spent accordingly on behaviour management and assessment and recording. There were no significant relationships with age or years in the profession.

Table 3. Weekly workload hours dealing with behaviour management issues, and assessing and recording, outside normal school hours

Behaviour management	Mean	SD	Range	N
Area				
Early Learning Centres	0.4	0.8	0-1.5	4
Junior Primary/Primary	1.4 ^b	1.3	0-9.0	293
Middle	2.0 ^a	1.9	0-9.0	104
Secondary	1.5 ^b	1.5	0-9.0	308
Total	1.5	1.5	0-9.0	709
Assessment & recording	Mean	SD	Range	N
Area				
Early Learning Centres	6.4	2.5	4-10.0	5
Junior Primary/Primary	4.6 ^d	5.1	0-30.0	320
Middle	6.2 ^c	5.5	0-30.0	109
Secondary	7.2 ^c	5.5	0-30.0	345
Total	6.0	5.5	0-30.0	779

Note: Superscripts a > b, c > d, $p < .05$.

There were no differences between school types in the time spent each week dealing with email from parents and students. However, Table 4 shows that teachers in middle and secondary schools reported spending significantly more time dealing with emails from management and colleagues than their counterparts in junior primary and primary schools. There were no statistically significant

differences in dealing with emails from management, colleagues, parents or students, between men and women, or between those on permanent and fixed-term contracts. This latter result is worth noting. One could reasonably expect that full time employees would report spending more time on emails than part time employees, as was found with behaviour management above. However, that there were no apparent differences suggests that the time spent on emails transcends full/part-time status – the demands of email correspondence do not decrease proportionally with part time employment. There were no significant relationships with age or years in the profession.

Table 4. Weekly workload hours dealing with emails from management and colleagues, and parents and students, outside normal school hours

Management & colleagues email	Mean	SD	Range	N
Area				
Early Learning Centres	1.3	0.5	1-2.0	4
Junior Primary/Primary	1.8 ^b	1.3	0-10.0	318
Middle	2.3 ^a	1.9	0-10.0	111
Secondary	2.6 ^a	2.0	0-10.0	345
Total	2.2	1.7	0-10.0	778
Parents & students email	Mean	SD	Range	N
Area				
Early Learning Centres	0.7	0.6	0-1.0	3
Junior Primary/Primary	0.8	1.0	0-9.0	293
Middle	1.4	1.5	0-10.0	109
Secondary	1.6	1.5	0-10.0	337
Total	1.3	1.4	0-10.0	742

Note: Superscripts a > b, $p < .05$.

In terms of the number of hours worked before and after normal timetabled school hours, the only significant difference found was that teachers in secondary schools worked more hours after school than their counterparts in junior primary and primary schools (see Table 5). As expected, full time employees worked more hours both before and after school than part time employees. However, after accounting for the FTE fraction, the difference in hours worked before school remained, such that full time employees worked more hours before school than part time employees, over and above the level that would otherwise be expected. There was no difference between men and women in the number of hours worked before or after school, or with age or years in the profession.

Table 5. Weekly workload hours before and after normal school hours

Before school	Mean	SD	Range	N
Area				
Early Learning Centres	3.0	2.2	1-6.0	4
Junior Primary/Primary	2.3	2.0	0-12.0	306
Middle	2.3	2.0	0-10.0	106
Secondary	2.4	2.4	0-15.0	334
Total	2.4	2.2	0-15.0	750
After school	Mean	SD	Range	N
Area				
Early Learning Centres	6.0	2.9	3-10.0	5
Junior Primary/Primary	5.9 ^b	4.8	0-20.0	319
Middle	6.8	5.0	0-20.0	110
Secondary	7.2 ^a	5.2	0-20.0	343
Total	6.6	5.0	0-20.0	777

Note: Superscripts a > b, $p < .05$.

Table 6 shows that secondary and middle school teachers worked through their lunch in the previous week significantly more often than junior primary and primary school teachers. As expected, full time employees worked through their lunch break significantly more often than part time employees, with the difference no longer evident when FTE fraction was accounted for. Men worked through their lunch break, on average, for 3.2 days ($SD = 1.3$) during the previous week, which was significantly more often than women (average 2.9 days, $SD = 1.5$). There were no significant relationships with age or years in the profession.

Table 6. Number of days in previous week worked through lunch break

	Mean	SD	Range	N
Area				
Early Learning Centres	2.2	1.6	1-5	5
Junior Primary/Primary	2.3 ^b	1.5	0-5	318
Middle	3.3 ^a	1.4	0-5	111
Secondary	3.3 ^a	1.5	0-5	346
Total	2.9	1.5	0-5	780

Note: Superscripts a > b, $p < .05$.

In total, 19.7% of respondents reported working more than 5 hours during the previous weekend. In terms of working during school holidays, 80.0% of respondents worked more than 5 hours and 24.8% more than 20 hours during their previous school holiday. Table 7 shows the only significant difference in the number of hours worked during the previous weekend or school holidays: teachers in secondary schools worked more hours over the previous weekend than junior primary and primary school teachers. There were no differences between men and women in hours worked at weekends and during holidays. There was a significant, albeit small, negative correlation with years in the profession, such that those with more years in the profession worked fewer of their lunch breaks ($r = -0.13, p = .000$). As expected, full time employees worked more hours over the preceding weekend. However, there was no difference in hours worked during the holidays: part time employees worked as many hours during the school holidays as their full time counterparts.

Table 7. Hours worked during the previous weekend and school holidays

Weekend	Mean	SD	Range	N
Area				
Early Learning Centres	5.0	1.9	3-8.0	5
Junior Primary/Primary	3.4 ^b	2.9	0-20.0	320
Middle	3.8	2.9	0-16.0	110
Secondary	4.2 ^a	3.5	0-20.0	346
Total	3.8	3.2	0-20.0	781
School holidays				
School holidays	Mean	SD	Range	N
Area				
Early Learning Centres	7.0	4.6	3-12.0	5
Junior Primary/Primary	5.3	4.4	1-17.0	318
Middle	4.9	4.4	1-17.0	111
Secondary	5.5	4.4	1-17.0	347
Total	5.3	4.4	1-17.0	781

Note: Superscripts a > b, $p < .05$.

Timetabled student contact time

Given the very broad variability in student contact hours (0 to 31 hours per week) it is difficult to distinguish any clear patterns. Table 8 shows the variability in contact time for full time employees, split across the primary, middle and secondary schools. There were no significant differences evident between men and women, age or years in the profession, or type of contract. The apparent under-loading of student contact time may be a product of not fully accounting for POR release time or pastoral care time, rather than an actual light average load.

Table 8. Full time student contact time in hours, by school type

Area	Mean	SD	Range	N	Deemed max	Max – actual
Junior Primary/Primary	21.3	8.4	0-31	163	24.00	-2.7
Middle	22.0	5.6	2-31	79	23.25	-1.3
Secondary	20.0	5.6	0-31	268	22.50	-2.5
Total	20.7	6.7	0-31	510	-	-

Students with special learning needs

Respondents were asked how many students with formally identified special learning needs (including behaviour) they had, on average, in each of their mainstream classes. Numbers ranged between 0 and 6 in each class, with an average of 3.3 students. When asked if the school provided sufficient additional measures, 53.9% ($n = 411$) responded with “No” and 46.1% ($n = 351$) responded “Yes”. Table 9 shows the additional measures, if any, that were provided by the school.

Table 9. Additional measures provided by schools to support students with formally identified special learning needs

Additional measure	Frequency
Reduction in class size	86
Additional classroom support by Education Support Officers	442
Release from classroom responsibilities where needed	72
Specialist support	170
Additional professional development opportunities	221
Appropriate technology support	113
A variation in the teacher’s student contact time	32
A reduction in other duties	26
None	178

In terms of the demands placed on respondents’ time by students with special learning needs, 29.0% ($n = 224$) stated that the demands were great, with 69.3% ($n = 534$) stating demands were little or moderate and 1.8% ($n = 14$) stating there were no demands. The majority of respondents (57.7%, $n = 429$) stated that the support that they received to meet those demands was not sufficient.

Regarding additional demands placed on teachers, Table 10 summarises responses to the level of demand for each item. It shows that over half of respondents considered report writing to place a great deal of demand on their time, and almost one third of those who had relevant responsibilities thought that the National Curriculum and International Baccalaureate placed great demands.

Table 10. Level of additional demands placed on teachers

Demand	A great deal		Moderate/little		None		Total (n)
	%	(n)	%	(n)	%	(n)	
Report writing	53.0	410	46.2	357	0.8	6	773
Information technology	23.8	186	73.3	572	2.8	22	780
Research Project	17.5	50	33.0	94	49.5	141	285
SACE	28.4	122	54.1	232	17.5	75	429
National Curriculum	30.3	236	66.1	514	3.6	28	778
International Baccalaureate	31.4	43	17.5	24	51.1	70	137
AITSL	11.1	86	71.6	556	17.3	134	776
Professional development	17.9	139	79.9	620	2.2	17	776
Behaviour management	21.8	168	73.8	570	4.4	34	772

Note: Responses do not include those for whom the demand did not apply, i.e., Research Project, SACE & International Baccalaureate.

Teachers were then asked whether they considered that support received from the school was sufficient to meet demands. Table 11 shows that the majority of respondents did not consider school support to be sufficient to meet the demands of report writing, information technology, the National Curriculum, the International Baccalaureate or AITSL requirements.

Table 11. Whether support received to meet additional demands placed on teachers was sufficient

Demand	Yes		No		Total (n)
	%	(n)	%	(n)	
Report writing	40.7	309	59.3	451	760
Information technology	46.6	348	53.4	398	746
Research Project	54.6	77	45.4	64	141
SACE	63.3	221	36.7	128	349
National Curriculum	44.9	333	55.1	409	742
International Baccalaureate	46.3	31	53.7	36	67
AITSL	45.8	291	54.2	345	636
Professional development	65.5	488	34.5	257	745
Behaviour management	60.6	442	39.4	287	729

Work/life balance

Respondents were asked a series of questions derived from the *Australian Work and Life Index* (Pocock, Skinner, & Williams, 2007) to gain a measure of teachers' work/life balance. Teachers were asked to indicate how often: (a) work kept them from spending the amount of time they would like with family or friends, (b) work interfered with their community activities, and (c) they felt rushed or pressed for time in general. They were also asked how satisfied they were with the balance between their work and the rest of life. Table 12 shows that over half of respondents (52.9%, $n = 401$) felt that work often or almost always interfered with spending time with family or friends. More than one third of respondents (34.2%, $n = 259$) stated that work often or almost always interfered with community activities. The majority of respondents (82.9%, $n = 628$) felt rushed or pressed for time often or almost always, with over half (56.3%, $n = 214$) not very or not at all satisfied with the balance between their work and the rest of life.

Table 12. Work-life interference and satisfaction with work-life balance

	Almost always % (n)	Often % (n)	Sometimes % (n)	Rarely % (n)	Never % (n)	Total (n)
Kept from spending time with family, friends	12.7 (96)	40.2 (305)	40.6 (308)	5.7 (43)	0.8 (6)	(758)
Interfered with community activities	7.8 (59)	26.4 (200)	47.3 (358)	15.9 (120)	2.6 (20)	(757)
Rushed or pressed for time	37.1 (281)	45.8 (347)	15.9 (120)	1.2 (9)	0.0 (0)	(757)
	Not at all % (n)	Not very % (n)	Neither % (n)	Somewhat % (n)	Very % (n)	Total (n)
Satisfied with balance between work and life	15.6 (118)	40.8 (309)	19.8 (150)	21.5 (163)	2.4 (18)	(758)

The only significant gender difference here related to feeling rushed, with women more likely to report that they almost always felt rushed or pressed for time. There were no significant differences between permanent and fixed term employees. Full-time employees were more likely than part-time employees to report that work always interfered with community activities and less likely to report that work rarely or never interfered. There were no differences between teachers in early learning centres, primary, middle or secondary schools.

DISCUSSION

A broad cross section of IEU(SA) members employed in Catholic schools responded to the workload survey, resulting in a sample that was generally representative in terms of school level, time fraction, experience and gender. It was apparent that workload aspects which are already regulated by the current enterprise agreement are generally not contentious, but it appears that unregulated aspects are problematic. It is likely that greater workload in these areas, which are often outside 'normal' working hours, would then contribute to employees feeling rushed and reporting dissatisfaction with their work/life balance.

Respondents were generally satisfied with the profession and their current school, which corresponded broadly with their intent to leave the profession or school. Levels of satisfaction with the profession were approximately 13 percentage points lower in the current study than figures reported in a recent national study of staff in Australia's schools (McKenzie et al., 2014). Early career teachers in the IEU(SA) study generally did not differ from their more experienced colleagues in levels of satisfaction with the profession, current school, or work/life balance, or their satisfaction with workload. That around three quarters of these IEU members were somewhat or very satisfied is reassuring, yet that leaves a significant proportion who felt neutral or dissatisfied, which was reflected in responses to survey questions relating to workload.

A large proportion of respondents were dissatisfied with the workload related to curriculum extension activities (CEA), and with the CEA remuneration. Perhaps unsurprisingly, employees dissatisfied with their CEA workload were more likely to report dissatisfaction with their remuneration for those activities. Of note is the upper limit of the wide range of hours spent on CEA. Some respondents reported up to nine hours per week in subgroup meetings, 100 hours in parent interviews over two terms, and 100 hours in deemed CEA over the school year. There was also a wide range of hours reported for workload dealing with behaviour management issues, and assessing and recording. Some respondents reported spending up to 30 hours each week on these aspects, outside of normal school hours, which is clearly excessive.

There were no statistically significant differences between those on permanent and fixed-term contracts in dealing with emails from management, colleagues, parents or students. This is counterintuitive, as one would expect full time employees to report spending more time on emails than their part time colleagues. This suggests that the time spent on emails transcends full/part-time status, where the demands of email correspondence do not decrease proportionally with part time employment.

In terms of the number of hours worked before and after normal timetabled school hours, the only significant difference found was that teachers in secondary schools worked more hours after school than their counterparts in junior primary and primary schools. As might be expected, full time employees worked more hours both before and after school than part time employees. However, after accounting for the FTE fraction, the difference in hours worked before school remained. In other words, full time employees worked more hours before school than part time employees, but this was over and above the level that would otherwise be expected. The range of reported weekly workload hours before and after normal school hours showed wide variability, but the high upper limits were noteworthy. Each week, some respondents worked up to 15 hours before school and 20

hours after school. In addition, respondents reported working through their lunch break, on average, three days each week.

This high workload was also apparent beyond the normal, Monday-to-Friday working week, with a fifth of respondents reporting that they worked more than five hours during the previous weekend. Over three-quarters of respondents reported working more than five hours during their previous school holiday and nearly one quarter worked more than 20 hours during the holiday. Of note is the finding that part time employees worked as many hours during the school holidays as their full time counterparts.

Respondents had more than three students, on average, with formally identified special learning needs in each of their mainstream classes. Over half of respondents reported that their school did not provide sufficient additional measures to support these students. Nearly one third of respondents stated that the demands placed on their time by students with special learning needs were great, with over half stating that the support they received to meet those demands was not sufficient. Regarding additional demands placed on teachers, over half of respondents considered report writing to place a great deal of demand on their time, and almost one third of those who had relevant responsibilities thought that the National Curriculum and International Baccalaureate placed great demands. When asked whether they considered that support received from the school was sufficient, the majority of respondents did not consider that the support was sufficient to meet the demands of report writing, information technology, the National Curriculum, the International Baccalaureate or AITSL requirements.

Given these high levels of reported workload and dissatisfaction with related support from their schools, it is perhaps not surprising that many respondents reported high levels of work/life interference and low levels of satisfaction with their work/life balance. Over half of respondents felt that work often or almost always interfered with spending time with family or friends. More than one third stated that work often or almost always interfered with their community activities, whereas four out of every five respondents felt rushed or pressed for time often or almost always. This pattern of work interfering substantially with the rest of life was reflected in satisfaction with work/life balance: over half of respondents were not very or not at all satisfied with the balance between their work and the rest of life.

Conclusion

While workload pressures differed between ELC, primary, middle and secondary settings, teachers' work life balance in all sectors was negatively impacted by the feeling of being rushed and having to work through lunch time and out of hours. The level of support received from the school was often considered by respondents to be inadequate, particularly when dealing with special needs students. It is apparent that this area of workload is open to a codification, as the issue falls into the category of "known knowns".

Of the currently codified aspects, CEA has the highest dissatisfaction level (40%), with 42% dissatisfied with the remuneration level. Accordingly, CEA limits and remuneration should be reconsidered at the upper end of the spectrum. In addition, the wide range of self-reported

workloads in some areas suggests the need for a more uniform specification of the scale of expectations of teachers, particularly for those with a formal POR position.

Some workload pressures relate to externally-imposed demands, the timing of which may not, admittedly, be in the schools' control. However, consideration should be given to appropriate scheduling of internal and external initiatives and reducing demands, thereby minimising the impact of demands that are less amenable to school control.

The common theme with this pattern of workload is the time that employees typically spend on the various tasks. If these tasks and duties are considered by all to be valid and valuable, additional time must therefore be made for them, within a realistic and reasonable workload. This might result in the time currently available for some components being trimmed somewhat to allow more time for tasks that are proving to be emerging issues of concern.

REFERENCES

- McKenzie, P., Weldon, P., Rowley, G., Murphy, M., & McMillam, J. (2014). *Staff in Australia's schools 2013: Main report on the survey*. Melbourne, Vic: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Pellegrini, A. D., & Long, J. D. (2002). A longitudinal study of bullying, dominance, and victimization during the transition from primary school through secondary school. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 20*, 259-280.
- Pocock, B., Skinner, N., & Williams, P. (2007). *Work, life and time: The Australian Work and Life Index 2007*. Adelaide, SA: Centre for Work + Life, Hawke Research Institute, University of South Australia.