NFER Teacher Voice Omnibus November 2011 Survey

Identifying and reducing bureaucratic burdens

Claire Easton and Bernadetta Brzyska

Department for Education

Contents

Introduction

The Department for Education (DfE) submitted five questions to NFER's Teacher Voice Omnibus Survey in November 2011. These covered the following topics:

- bureaucratic burdens that have prevented teachers from raising attainment and achievement of children and standards in school; and
- health and safety requirements that have got in the way of teaching or managing at school and/or taking pupils on school trips.

In addition to the questions submitted through the Omnibus survey for primary and secondary school teachers, DfE commissioned NFER to undertake a separate survey, comprising the same questions, of teachers in maintained special schools in England.

This report provides an analysis of the responses to the questions in both surveys, along with supporting information about the two questionnaires. Results are presented by school type (main sample and special), phase (primary and secondary) and by teacher seniority level (classroom teachers or senior leaders). Throughout the report, 'main sample schools' refers to the sample of teachers from the main omnibus survey and 'special schools' refers to those included in the second survey. The tables of special school findings are given in the Appendix of this report.

Context

Reducing local and central prescription and unnecessary bureaucracy are key priorities for the Government. Indeed, the *Importance of Teaching - The Schools White Paper 2010*[1] outlined their intention to remove unnecessary statutory duties and red tape. Instead, the paper promoted autonomy, self improvement and evaluation, making a commitment to '*free schools from externally imposed burdens and give them greater confidence to set their own direction.*' (p31).The questions posed in the November 2011 Teacher Voice Omnibus Survey will provide important data of the extent to which teachers feel that unnecessary bureaucratic burdens and health and safety requirements are impacting on the key functions of their roles – teaching pupils and/or managing their school, in order to raise attainment standards.

---

[1]Department for Education (2010) The importance of teaching – the schools White Paper 2010. [online]. Available https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/CM-7980.pdf [accessed 1 December 2011]

Analysis of findings

The sample

The main school survey was completed by a sample of over 1,500 teachers and the special schools survey by 68[2] teachers from 36 different maintained special schools. **Please note that findings from the special schools survey, and comparisons between the main sample and special school samples, should be treated with caution.** The main school sample was weighted to ensure representativeness. The sample included teachers from a wide range of school governance types and subject areas. Sample numbers were sufficient to allow for comparisons between the primary and secondary sectors. Detailed information about the samples is given in the supplementary section of this report and the appendix.

Main bureaucratic burdens facing schools and their origin

The first question asked teachers what the top two bureaucratic burdens that prevent them from raising the attainment and achievement of children and standards in their school were. Tables 1 and 2 present data relating to the first main burden identified by teachers, while Tables 3 and 4 present data on the second main burden.

Table 1 shows the responses from the main school sample.

---

[2] This gives a response rate of 23 per cent and exceeds the target of 50 teachers.

Table 1. What is the main bureaucratic burden that prevents you from raising the attainment and achievement of children and standards in your school?

	All	Primary	Secondary
Administrative tasks (e.g. paperwork, form filling and photocopying)	14%	15%	13%
Preparing for/marking/recording Assessment and Pupil progress	14%	16%	10%
Gathering/monitoring/inputting/ analysing/reporting data/evidence (e.g. in preparation for Ofsted)	14%	10%	19%
None	13%	14%	11%
Level, detail and format of and lack of flexibility in Planning/preparation required	9%	13%	4%
Paperwork associated with managing risk (including H&S, risk assessment, visits, safeguarding	6%	5%	7%
Ineffective communications such as meetings and emails	6%	5%	7%
Feedback/communication with parents/Report writing	3%	2%	4%
Policy change/new directive	3%	2%	4%
Other relevant/vague comment	3%	2%	3%
Local base (N)	1496	823	669

Top 10 responses as given by 'all teachers', so percentages may not sum to 100
Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total
Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2011.

Most frequently (14%), teachers identified the following as the top bureaucratic burdens preventing them from raising the attainment and achievement of children and standards:

- administrative tasks, such as paperwork, form filling and photocopying;

- preparing for/marking/recording assessment and pupil progress; and

- gathering, monitoring, inputting, analysing and reporting data/evidence (for example in preparation for Ofsted).

Interestingly, 13 per cent of respondents said there were *no* bureaucratic burdens that prevented them from raising the attainment and achievement of children and standards.

For this question, the most frequently reported responses from teachers in special schools were (see Table A.5):

- gathering, monitoring, inputting, analysing and reporting data/evidence (for example in preparation for Ofsted) (N = 13);
- level, detail and format of and lack of flexibility in planning and preparation required (N = 7).

Additionally, ten out of 65 teachers felt that there were no bureaucratic burdens stifling raising attainment and achievement of children and standards.

Phase and seniority

Analysis by phase of school from the main sample revealed the following differences:

- 13 per cent of primary school teachers indicated level, detail and format of and lack of flexibility in planning and preparation as the main bureaucratic burden, compared to four per cent of secondary school respondents;
- 19 per cent of secondary teachers said that gathering, monitoring, inputting, analysing and reporting data/evidence is the main bureaucratic burden that they experience, compared with 10 per cent of primary school respondents; and
- 16 per cent of primary school respondents indicated preparing for/marking/recording assessment and pupil progress as a burden compared to 10 per cent of secondary school teachers.

As might be expected, responses by seniority of respondent for the main school sample showed that 11 per cent of classroom teachers compared with just two per cent of senior managers identified issues around planning and preparation as preventing improvements to attainment and achievement. In addition, 15 per cent of classroom teachers said issues around assessment and pupil progress were particularly burdensome, compared to nine per cent of their senior counterparts. Teachers in the classroom could be more likely to feel pressure with completing planning and preparation for lessons and for assessment, and this could be directly affecting improvements to attainment and achievement.

Respondents' own schools seem to be the main source of bureaucratic burdens for most teachers. As shown in Table 2 below, almost a third of main sample school respondents

(30%) felt that their school was responsible for the main bureaucratic burdens that they had identified. The second most frequently reported origin for burdens was the DfE (21%), followed by Ofsted (19%), with only eight per cent of teachers blaming their local authority (LA). Responses from the special school sample revealed similar findings, with around a quarter of teachers stating that Ofsted (N = 18), DfE or their school (both N = 16) were the source of their main burden. See Table A.7 for a full breakdown of the data.

Table 2. Please indicate who you think is responsible for the top (i.e. the main) bureaucratic burden you identified above or select 'I did not identify any bureaucratic burdens.'

	All	Primary	Secondary
My school	30%	21%	41%
The Department for Education	21%	24%	17%
Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (OFSTED)	19%	22%	16%
I did not identify any bureaucratic burdens	14%	14%	13%
The Local Authority	8%	11%	4%
Don't know/Not sure	6%	6%	6%
Other organisation/group that is not listed above	2%	2%	1%
Other national public body	1%	1%	2%
Local base (N)	1535	841	690

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100
Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total
Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2011.

Analysis by seniority revealed that proportionally more classroom teachers (34%) indicated that their school was responsible for their main burden (compared with 12% of senior leaders). However, 31 per cent of senior leaders said that the source was the DfE, compared with 19 per cent of classroom teachers. This finding is unsurprising, as senior leaders may well be more familiar with DfE requirements than classroom teachers. The only other difference to note between classroom teachers and senior leaders' was their views on how burdensome the LA was, with 17 per cent of senior leaders identifying the LA as being responsible for their main burden, compared with only five per cent of classroom teachers.

Respondents were asked to give the name of other organisations or groups not listed in the question, where these were responsible for their main bureaucratic burden. Very few

respondents gave an answer. Where they did, they mainly identified national government bodies.

Table 3 presents data on the second main bureaucratic burden that prevents teachers from raising attainment and achievement of children and standards in their school. The most frequently cited option was 'None', with 28 per cent of teachers saying that there was no second main bureaucratic burden impacting on their work to improve attainment and standards. The next most frequently selected responses were gathering, monitoring, inputting, analysing, reporting data or evidence (for example in preparation for Ofsted) (11%); preparing for, marking, or recording assessment and pupil progress (10%); and administrative tasks (10%). Little difference emerged between primary and secondary respondents.

Table 3. What is the second main bureaucratic burden that prevents you from raising the attainment and achievement of children and standards in your school?

	All	Primary	Secondary
None	28%	28%	26%
Gathering/monitoring/inputting/ analysing/reporting data/evidence (e.g. in preparation for Ofsted)	11%	10%	12%
Preparing for/marking/recording assessment and pupil progress	10%	11%	8%
Administrative tasks (e.g. paperwork, form filling and photocopying)	10%	10%	9%
Ineffective communications such as meetings and emails	6%	4%	8%
Level, detail and format of and lack of flexibility in planning/preparation required	6%	8%	3%
Paperwork associated with managing risk (including H&S, risk assessment, visits, safeguarding)	5%	6%	3%
Policy change/new directive	3%	3%	4%
Lack of time/general workload	3%	2%	4%
Feedback/communication with parents/Report writing	3%	2%	4%
Local base (N)	1447	794	651

Top 10 responses as given by 'all teachers', so percentages may not sum to 100.
Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total
Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2011.

Special school responses revealed similar findings, with the highest proportion of teachers (N = 16) selecting 'none'. Twelve respondents said that gathering, monitoring, inputting, analysing, reporting data or evidence was their second main bureaucratic burden (see Table A.6).

As illustrated in Table 4 below, once again almost a third of responding teachers in the main school sample (32%) stated that their own school was responsible for the second main bureaucratic burden. This was followed by the DfE (18%) and Ofsted (16%). Very few teachers felt that an agency or organisation other than those listed is responsible for their second main burden.

Table 4. Please indicate who you think is responsible for the second main bureaucratic burden you identified above or select 'I did not identify a second bureaucratic burden.

	All	Primary	Secondary
My school	32%	23%	43%
I did not identify any bureaucratic burdens	19%	19%	19%
The Department for Education	18%	21%	15%
Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (OFSTED)	16%	19%	12%
The Local Authority	8%	11%	4%
Don't know/Not sure	4%	4%	3%
Other organisation/group that is not listed above	3%	3%	3%
Other national public body	1%	1%	1%
Local base (N)	1320	723	596

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100
Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total
Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2011.

Consistent with the findings presented in Table 2, a greater proportion of secondary school teachers (43%) than primary respondents (23%) stated that their school was the responsible agency. Proportionally fewer secondary school teachers (15%) identified the DfE as the source, compared with 21 per cent of primary school respondents. Similarly, a smaller proportion of secondary school teachers (12%) stated that Ofsted was the origin of the second main burden; by comparison 19 per cent of primary school teachers gave this answer. Teachers in special schools felt similarly to their colleagues in the main school sample, with the largest proportion holding their school accountable for the second main bureaucratic burden (N = 18), followed by the DfE (N = 15) and Ofsted (N = 11). See Table A.9 for a full breakdown of the data.

Analysis of the main school sample by seniority revealed that almost two-fifths of classroom teachers (38%), compared to ten per cent of senior leaders cited their own school as the source of their second main burden. This is perhaps unsurprising, given that senior leaders will have inputted into their school's policies and processes. Conversely, a greater proportion of senior leaders (27%) cited DfE (compared with 16% of classroom teachers). These findings were consistent across primary and secondary school samples.

Reducing bureaucratic burden

The survey asked teachers what could be done to reduce bureaucratic burdens to give them more time for activities necessary for directly raising the attainment and achievement of children and standards. As Table 5 below shows, the most frequent response was further capacity (in other words, skilled staff) to undertake bureaucratic tasks or to help teachers in the classroom (18% of respondents). A greater proportion of secondary school teachers (24%) gave this answer, compared with 13 per cent of primary schools teachers.

Overall, 13 per cent of respondents said that teachers should be given the respect/autonomy/independence/'professionalism' and ability to self-evaluate the progress of their students as a possible way to reduce burden; primary teachers were proportionally more likely to say this than secondary teachers (18% and 7% respectively). The same proportion (13%) felt that minimising or rationalising monitoring and recording of data, and phase of education had no bearing on this.

The most commonly suggested ways of reducing bureaucratic burden among special school teachers were focusing on initiatives to support teaching and learning, development of the child and giving teachers 'more time to teach' (N = 8) and reducing and rationalising monitoring/recording of data (N = 8). See Table A.11 for a full breakdown the special schools' data for this question.

Table 5. What can be done to reduce bureaucratic burdens to enable you to have more time for activities necessary for directly raising the attainment and achievement of children and standards in your school?

	All	Primary	Secondary
Further capacity (skilled staff) to undertake bureaucratic tasks or help teachers in the classroom	18%	13%	24%
Respect teacher autonomy/independence/ 'professionalism' and ability to self-evaluate the progress of their students	13%	18%	7%
Reduce/rationalise monitoring/recording of data	13%	13%	13%
Focus on initiatives that support T&L/development of the child and give teachers 'more time to teach'	10%	10%	9%
Simplify/reduce/avoid duplication of paperwork	9%	11%	5%
Reduce burden of inspections by OFSTED	7%	8%	5%
Stability in policies/Reduce number of policies/changes to education	6%	6%	7%
More time/Release time to undertake bureaucratic tasks	6%	4%	7%
Reduce/standardise assessment	6%	7%	4%
Don't know/unsure/N/A/none	5%	4%	6%
Local base (N)	1350	738	614

Top 10 responses as given by 'all teachers', so percentages may not sum to 100.
Up to three responses were coded per respondent so percentages may sum to more than 100
Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total
Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2011.

Health and safety implications for teaching and managing in schools

The penultimate question asked teachers about the extent to which health and safety requirements got in the way of teaching and (for senior managers) managing their school.

Table 6. To what extent have health and safety requirements got in the way of teaching or if you are a senior manager, managing at your school?

	All	Primary	Secondary
To a great extent	10%	12%	8%
To a small extent	49%	53%	45%
Not at all	36%	32%	40%
Don't know/Not applicable	5%	3%	6%
Local base (N)	1527	843	679

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100
Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total
Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2011.

Table 6 shows that ten per cent of respondents in the main school sample indicated that health and safety got in the way of teaching and/or managing 'to a great extent'. However, it is worth noting that the largest proportion of respondents in the main sample (49%) felt that health and safety requirements got in the way of teaching or managing their school 'to a small extent', showing that overall, teachers feel that health and safety requirements are an issue. In comparison, a fifth of teachers (N = 12) in the special school sample selected 'to a great extent' and a similar proportion (N = 12) indicated 'not at all' (see Table A.12).

Analysis by seniority of respondent revealed that a slightly greater proportion of senior leaders (15%) felt health and safety requirements got in the way of them managing their schools to a 'great extent', compared to nine per cent of classroom teaching staff feeling that such requirements were a barrier to teaching. When looking at differences in responses between classroom teachers and their senior counterparts, the data show that proportionally more senior leaders (19%) than classroom teachers (10%) in primary schools selected 'to a great extent'.

Health and safety implications for educational trips and visits

Table 7 shows that overall, just over a third of teachers (36%) in main school sample felt that health and safety requirements got in the way of taking pupils on educational trips and visits to a great extent. A slightly greater proportion of teachers in secondary schools (41%) indicated that health and safety was a barrier compared with 32 per cent of primary school respondents. With three quarters of teachers stating that this is a barrier overall, the data show health and safety requirements to be a major issue for the organisation of trips and visits. Data from the special school sample showed similar findings with around a third of teachers (N = 24) selecting 'to a great extent' and about half (N = 35) indicating 'to a small extent' (see Table A.13). Only seven teachers in special schools said health and safety requirements were 'not at all' a barrier; for the main school sample, 20 per cent of all teachers selected this answer.

Some differences emerged by seniority of respondent for the main school sample. A greater proportion of classroom teachers (38%) felt that health and safety requirements got in the way of taking pupils on educational trips and visits compared to 29 per cent of senior leaders. Proportionally, fewer classroom teachers answered 'not at all' (18%) compared with a quarter (25%) of senior leaders.

Table 7. To what extent have health and safety requirements got in the way of taking pupils on educational trips and visits?

	All	Primary	Secondary
To a great extent	36%	32%	41%
To a small extent	41%	44%	37%
Not at all	20%	22%	16%
Don't know/Not applicable	4%	2%	6%
Local base (N)	1540	846	689

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100
Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total
Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2011.

Respondents were asked to describe how health and safety requirements had got in the way of teaching or managing and/or taking pupils on school trips. As illustrated in Table 8 below, proportionally more respondents (41%) described 'onerous paperwork' as getting in the way; generally teachers referred to paperwork being too time consuming in their open responses. A slightly greater proportion of secondary school teachers (45%) compared to 39 per cent of primary teachers gave this answer.

Table 8. Please describe how health and safety requirements have got in the way of teaching or managing and/or of taking pupils on school trips

	All	Primary	Secondary
Paperwork too onerous	41%	39%	45%
Acts as barrier to trips	16%	11%	22%
Paperwork other	11%	12%	10%
HR Supervision requirements	9%	11%	6%
Paperwork too stringent	9%	9%	9%
Fear of blame or responsibility	8%	7%	9%
In-school activities restricted/affected	7%	7%	7%
Trip destinations restricted	7%	8%	5%
Onerous H&S requirement(s)	6%	5%	6%
General H & S concern	4%	5%	2%
Local base (N)	1143	622	523

Up to three responses were coded per respondent so percentages may sum to more than 100
Due to the primary, secondary and all teacher categories being weighted separately, the number of primary and secondary respondents may not sum to the number of teachers in total
Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2011.

Little difference was evident between school phase except in relation to health and safety acting as a barrier to school trips. Proportionally, more secondary school teachers (22%) gave this answer compared to 11 per cent of primary school teachers. The three most frequently given responses from teachers in special schools were the following:

- paperwork too onerous (22 respondents);
- paperwork, in general (12 respondents); and
- onerous health and safety requirements (6 respondents).

See Table A.14 for a breakdown of all responses by teachers from special schools.

Conclusions and implications

The findings from the series of questions about bureaucratic burdens in schools across the two surveys revealed that the majority of teachers felt that there was at least one bureaucratic burden preventing them from raising attainment and achievement of pupils and standards. The most commonly given reasons included paperwork, assessing pupil progress and monitoring data.

The largest differences (of almost 10%) between primary and secondary school respondents related to planning and preparation and monitoring data and evidence. A larger proportion of primary school respondents felt that planning and preparation was burdensome compared to their secondary school counterparts, whereas the opposite was true for monitoring data and evidence, with proportionally more secondary school teachers indicating this as burdensome. For special schools, the largest proportion of respondents revealed monitoring data and evidence was a burden.

The main sources of burdens seemed to be the school itself – this was particularly true for classroom teachers, whereas proportionally more senior leaders indicated that the DfE was the main origin of burden.

Almost a fifth of survey respondents said additional skilled staff and/or help in the classroom would reduce bureaucratic burdens; this was particularly true for secondary school respondents. For special school teachers, most often their suggestions for reducing burden focussed around spending more time on teaching, learning and child development; reducing monitoring and data recording and stabilising policy changes.

Health and safety appeared to be a barrier to teaching/managing in school or to taking pupils on school trips, this is in line with the public perception that it is seen as burdensome. Over half of respondents indicated that health and safety requirements got in the way of teaching or managing schools to a small or great extent (49% and 10% respectively) and altogether 77 per cent of respondents stated it made school trips problematic to a small or great extent (41% and 36% respectively). According to open responses from teachers, health and safety requirements get in the way, generally, due to paperwork being too onerous. Similar findings were evident across primary, secondary and special schools.

Supporting information

How was the survey conducted?

This report is based on data from the November 2011 survey. The survey was completed by a panel of 1558 practising teachers from 1210 schools in the maintained sector in England. The survey was conducted online and teachers were asked to complete the questionnaire between the 4th and 16th November 2011. During the survey period, all 'open' questions (those without a pre-identified set of responses) were coded by a team of experienced coders within the Foundation.

What was the composition of the panel?

The panel included teachers from the full range of roles in primary and secondary schools, from headteachers to newly qualified class teachers. Fifty four per cent (849) of the respondents were teaching in primary schools and 46 per cent (709) were teaching in secondary schools.

How representative of schools nationally were the schools corresponding to the teachers panel?

There was an under-representation of schools in the highest quintile in terms of eligibility for free school meals in the sample of primary schools and under-representation in the highest and second highest quintiles in the sample of secondary schools. Both primary and secondary school samples had an over-representation of schools with low eligibility for free school meals. To address this, weights were calculated using free school meals factors to create a more balanced sample. Due to the differences between the populations of primary schools and secondary schools, different weights were created for primary schools, secondary schools and then for the whole sample overall. The weightings have been applied to all of the analyses referred to in this commentary.

Tables S.1, S.2 and S.3 show the representation of the weighted achieved sample against the population. Table S.4 shows the representation of the weighted teacher sample by role in school.

Table S.1 Representation of (weighted) primary schools compared to primary schools nationally

		National Population %	NFER Sample %
Achievement Band (Overall performance by KS2 2010 data)	Lowest band	13	13
	2nd lowest band	13	14
	Middle band	14	15
	2nd highest band	16	17
	Highest band	20	21
	Schools boycotting 2010 tests	23	21
	Missing	1	0
% eligible FSM (5 pt scale)	Lowest 20%	20	20
	2nd lowest 20%	20	20
	Middle 20%	20	20
	2nd highest 20%	20	20
	Highest 20%	20	20
	Missing	<1	<1
Primary school type	Infants	9	8
	First School	5	4
	Infant & Junior (Primary)	77	73
	First & Middle	0	
	Junior	7	13
	Middle deemed Primary	0	1
	Academy	2	1
Region	North	31	23
	Midlands	32	30
	South	37	47
Local Authority type	London Borough	11	14
	Metropolitan Authorities	21	21
	English Unitary Authorities	18	19
	Counties	51	46
Number of schools		**16,855**	**757**

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100
Some information is not available for all schools and some schools included more than one respondent
Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2011

Table S.2 Representation of (weighted) secondary schools compared to secondary schools nationally

		National Population	NFER Sample
		%	%
Achievement Band (Overall performance by GCSE 2010 data)	Lowest band	15	14
	2nd lowest band	18	17
	Middle band	17	22
	2nd highest band	17	20
	Highest band	19	20
	Missing	14	6
% eligible FSM (5 pt scale)	Lowest 20%	20	20
	2nd lowest 20%	19	20
	Middle 20%	20	20
	2nd highest 20%	20	20
	Highest 20%	20	20
	Missing	2	<1
Secondary school type	Middle	5	2
	Secondary Modern	3	2
	Comprehensive to 16	26	22
	Comprehensive to 18	32	42
	Grammar	2	1
	Other secondary school	0	
	Academies	32	31
Region	North	29	27
	Midlands	33	31
	South	38	43
Local Authority type	London Borough	13	12
	Metropolitan Authorities	21	23
	English Unitary Authorities	19	19
	Counties	47	46
Number of schools		**3,273**	**453**

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.
Some information is not available for all schools and some schools included more than one respondent.
Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2011.

Table S.3 Representation of all schools (weighted) compared to all schools nationally

		National Population %	NFER Sample %
Achievement Band (By KS2 2010 and GCSE 2010 data)	Lowest band	13	14
	2nd lowest band	14	15
	Middle band	15	17
	2nd highest band	16	18
	Highest band	20	20
	Schools boycotting 2010 tests	19	14
	Missing	2	1
% eligible FSM (5 pt scale)	Lowest 20%	20	20
	2nd lowest 20%	20	20
	Middle 20%	20	20
	2nd highest 20%	20	20
	Highest 20%	20	20
	Missing	1	0
Region	North	30	24
	Midlands	32	30
	South	37	45
Local Authority type	London Borough	11	13
	Metropolitan Authorities	21	22
	English Unitary Authorities	18	19
	Counties	50	46
Number of schools		**20,082**	**1,210**

Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100
Some information is not available for all schools and some schools included more than one respondent
Source: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2011.

Table S.4 Comparison of the achieved (weighted) sample with the national population by grade of teacher

Role	Primary schools				Secondary schools			
	population		weighted sample		population		weighted sample	
	N*	%	N	%	N*	%	N	%
Headteachers	16.8*	10	77	9	3.2*	2	7	1
Deputy Headteachers	11.7*	7	89	10	5.3*	3	26	4
Assistant Headteachers	6.5*	4	49	6	11.4*	6	69	10
Class teachers and others	131.8*	79	637	75	160.0*	89	593	85

Population N is expressed in thousands
Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100
Sources: NFER Omnibus Survey November 2011, DfE: School Workforce in England (including pupil:teacher ratios and pupil:adult ratios), January 2010
http://www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s000927/index.shtml [30 Nov 2011].

How accurately do the findings represent the national position?

Precision is a measure of the extent to which the results of different samples agree with each other. If we drew a different sample of teachers would we get the same results? The more data that are available, the more precise the findings. For all schools and a 50 per cent response, the precision of that response is between 47.52 per cent and 52.48 per cent. For secondary schools the same precision is + and – 3.68 percentage points and for primary schools it is + and – 3.36 percentage points.

With the weightings applied to the data, we are confident that the omnibus sample is broadly representative of teachers nationally and provides a robust analysis of teachers' views.

APPENDIX: Additional survey of special schools

Sixty eight teachers from 36 different maintained special schools in England responded to the survey.

Sample breakdown

Table A.1 Respondents by region

Government Office Region

	Sample	Population	Sample	Population
	N	N	%	%
North East	0	60	0	6
North West/Merseyside	6	159	9	17
Yorkshire & The Humber	5	70	7	7
East Midlands	5	74	7	8
West Midlands	15	121	22	13
Eastern	2	90	3	10
London	14	136	21	14
South East	10	157	15	17
South West	11	85	16	9
	0	60	0	6
TOTAL	68	952	100	100

Table A.2 Respondents by FSM

Eligibility for Free School Meals (% pupils eligible on 5 pt scale)

	Sample	Population	Sample	Population
	N	N	%	%
Lowest 20%	2	20	3	2
2nd lowest 20%	1	8	2	1
Middle 20%	10	56	15	6
2nd highest 20%	25	266	37	28
Highest 20%	30	602	44	63
TOTAL	68	952	100	100

Background information

Table A.3 Respondents by phase

Do you currently teach/are you currently involved with:

	Frequency	Per cent
	N	**%**
Mainly the primary curriculum	24	35
Mainly the secondary curriculum	30	44
An equal split between the primary and secondary curricula	14	21
Total	68	100.0

Table A.4 Respondents by role

Please indicate which role you currently fit into:

	Frequency	Per cent
	N	**%**
Headteacher	19	28
Deputy Headteacher	2	3
Assistant Headteacher	1	2
Post-threshold Teacher	36	54
Qualified Teacher Status: teachers who have successfully completed their induction	4	6
Qualified Teacher Status: Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs) who have yet to complete their induction	5	7
Total	67	99

Identifying and Reducing Bureaucratic Burdens

Table A.5

What are the top two bureaucratic burdens that prevent you from raising the attainment and achievement of children and standards in your schools? If you are a member of your school's senior management team, please identify the top two bureaucratic burdens you encounter in this role.

First bureaucratic burden

	Frequency	Per cent
	N	**%**
Administrative tasks (e.g. paperwork, form filling and photocopying)	4	6
Policy change/new directive	3	5
Preparing for/marking/recording Assessment and pupil progress	6	9
None	10	15
Writing school policies	1	2
Ineffective communications such as meetings and emails	4	6
Gathering/monitoring/inputting/ analysing/reporting data/evidence (e.g. in preparation for Ofsted)	13	20
Paperwork associated with managing risk (including H&S, risk assessment, visits, safeguarding	4	6
Level, detail and format of and lack of flexibility in planning/preparation required	7	11
Liaising with partners/outside agencies	1	2
Buildings/maintenance	2	3
Managing human resources/supply cover	4	6
Dealing with pupil behaviour/attendance	1	2
Completing a SEF	2	3
Lack of time/general workload	1	2
Administration relating to SEN pupils	1	2
Other relevant/vague comment	1	2
Total	65	100

Table A.6

What are the top two bureaucratic burdens that prevent you from raising the attainment and achievement of children and standards in your schools? If you are a member of your school's senior management team, please identify the top two bureaucratic burdens you encounter in this role.

Second bureaucratic burden

	Frequency	**Per cent**
	N	**%**
Administrative tasks (e.g. paperwork, form filling and photocopying)	3	5
Policy change/new directive	2	3
Preparing for/marking/recording assessment and pupil progress	4	6
Writing individual educational plans (IEPs)/target setting	1	2
None	16	25
Writing school Policies	1	2
Ineffective communications such as meetings and emails	3	5
Gathering/monitoring/inputting/ analysing/reporting data/evidence (e.g. in preparation for Ofsted)	12	19
Level, detail and format of and lack of flexibility in planning/preparation required	5	8
Liaising with partners/outside agencies	1	2
Feedback/communication with parents/report writing	2	3
Managing human resources/supply cover	2	3
Dealing with pupil behaviour/attendance	3	5
Lack of time/general workload	2	3
Administration relating to SEN pupils	2	3
Don't know	2	3
Other relevant/vague comment	4	6
Total	65	100

Table A.7

Please indicate who you think is responsible for the top (i.e. the main) bureaucratic burden you identified above or select 'I did not identify any bureaucratic burdens'.

	Frequency	**Per cent**
	N	**%**
The Department for Education	16	24
Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (OFSTED)	18	27
Other national public body	1	2
The Local Authority	6	9
My school	16	24
Other organisation/group that is not listed above	1	2
Don't know/Not sure	4	6
I did not identify any bureaucratic burdens	5	8
Total	67	100

Table A.8

Please give details of the other national public body that is responsible for your main bureaucratic burden.

	Frequency	**Per cent**
	N	**%**
The Government	1	100
Total	1	100

Table A.9

Please indicate who you think is responsible for the second main bureaucratic burden you identified above or select 'I did not identify a second bureaucratic burden'.

	Frequency	**Per cent**
	N	**%**
The Department for Education	15	24
Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (OFSTED)	11	18
Other national public body	1	2
The Local Authority	4	7
My school	18	29
Don't know/Not sure	2	3
I did not identify any bureaucratic burdens	11	18
Total	62	100

Table A.10

Please give details of the other national public body that is responsible for your second main bureaucratic burden.

	Frequency	**Per cent**
	N	**%**
The Government	1	100
Total	1	100

Table A.11

What can be done to reduce bureaucratic burdens to enable you to have more time for activities necessary for directly raising the attainment and achievement of children and standards in your school? If you are a member of your school's senior management team, please respond in relation to this role.

	Frequency N	Per cent %
Reduce school level bureaucracy (i.e. through effective use of meetings/communications/email)	3	5
Stability in policies/Reduce number of policies/changes to education	7	12
Simplify/reduce/avoid duplication of paperwork	5	8
More time/Release time to undertake bureaucratic tasks	5	8
Further capacity (skilled staff) to undertake bureaucratic tasks or help teachers in the classroom	6	10
Respect school autonomy/ independence/self evaluation	5	8
Reduce/rationalise monitoring/recording of data	8	13
More funding	2	3
Support with streamlining/rationalising/improving school-level systems and processes (i.e.by using IT)	1	2
Provide schools with clear communications in order to assist in prioritising bureaucratic tasks	1	2
General comment in support of reducing bureaucratic burdens/paperwork	1	2
Focus on initiatives that support T&L/development of the child and give teachers 'more time to teach'	8	13
Reduce/rationalise lesson planning requirements	2	3
Consult on/test new initiatives before implementation	1	2
Share resources (such as lesson plans, policies & skilled support) across school/s	1	2
Relax regularity of data collection or document update	1	2
Respect teacher autonomy/independence/ 'professionalism' and ability self-evaluate the progress of their students	4	7
Minimise bureaucracy around H&S/school trips/Child protection	2	3
Reduce burden of inspections by OFSTED	2	3
Reduce/standardise assessment	6	10
Don't know/unsure/N/A/none	3	5
Other relevant/vague comment	2	3
Total	76	127%

Health and Safety

To what extent, if any, have health and safety requirements got in the way of the following activities?

Table A.12

Teaching or, if you are a senior manager, managing at your school.

	Frequency	**Per cent**
	N	**%**
To a great extent	12	19
To a small extent	38	59
Not at all	12	19
Don't know/Not applicable	3	5
Total	65	100

Table A.13

Taking pupils on educational trips and visits.

	Frequency	**Per cent**
	N	**%**
To a great extent	24	36
To a small extent	35	53
Not at all	7	11
Total	66	100

Table A.14

Please describe how health and safety requirements have got in the way of teaching or managing and/or of taking pupils on school trips.

	Frequency	**Per cent**
	N	**%**
Paperwork too onerous (e.g. time consuming)	22	41
Paperwork too stringent (e.g. 'over the top')	4	7
Paperwork other (vague e.g. 'paperwork')	12	22
Adult requirements problematic e.g. CRB	1	2
Fear of blame or responsibility	4	7
Other/vague concern	1	2
HR Supervision requirements	3	6
Onerous H&S requirement(s)	6	11
H& S too stringent	1	2
Time wasted	1	2
Acts as barrier to trips	3	6
Trip destinations restricted	1	2
Planning required/lack of spontaneity	4	7
In-school activities restricted/affected	2	4
Pupils otherwise missing out	3	6
Financial costs increased for parents/school	2	4
Extra training/qualification required	3	6
Problem identified but overcome/considered necessary	1	2
Other relevant/vague comment	4	7
Total	78	144%