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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTES</td>
<td>Collaborative Teaching Environment Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASOS</td>
<td>Academic &amp; Student Orientation Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPS</td>
<td>Teacher Professionalism Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TES</td>
<td>Teaching Efficacy Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>Classroom Challenges Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDCS</td>
<td>Classroom Disciplinary Climate Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS</td>
<td>Differentiated Practice Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSDMS</td>
<td>School Shared Decision Making Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Satisfaction Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUPTS</td>
<td>Productive Use of Preparation Time Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLNS</td>
<td>Professional Learning Needs Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elementary Teachers Federation of Ontario Teacher Workload and Professionalism Study

Study Context

In June 2013, the Government of Ontario and the Elementary Teachers' Federation of Ontario (ETFO) signed a memorandum of understanding. One of the agreements in the memorandum called for consultation between ETFO and the Ministry of Education about the selection of a researcher "... to conduct a study of current and planned educational initiatives and student assessment at the provincial and school board level with a view to clearly focus such initiatives and assessments on student achievement, teacher workload, and teacher professionalism." Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group (Directions) was engaged by the Ministry of Education in October 2013 to undertake the aforementioned study and to align where feasible this study with a concurrent study of principal and vice principal workload.

Purpose of the study

- Define key concepts such as teacher workload and professionalism taking into account the Ontario context, including the Ontario College of Teachers Ethical Standards and Standards of Practice for the Teaching Profession.
- Review the literature devoted to the conditions that support effective teaching and learning (with particular relevance to student achievement and well-being) and the implications for teacher work and workloads.
- Survey teachers concerning such matters as workload, professionalism, professional support, job and professional satisfaction, efficacy, the exercise of professional judgment and opportunities and barriers to effective implementation of Ministry and school board initiatives to improve student achievement and well-being within the context of teacher workload and professionalism.
- Illustrate successful instances of the evolution of professional teaching practices in relation to school, district and system improvement initiatives in Ontario that are perceived to have a positive impact on teacher satisfaction and not to have had an adverse impact on teacher workloads.
- Conduct in-depth interviews with teachers, principals, vice-principals, superintendents, directors and trustees to explore perceptions about the conditions that contribute to successful implementation of provincial and district initiatives and teacher job and professional satisfaction.
Main Study Questions

The main questions that will be addressed by the overall study are:

- What factors contribute to teacher workload?
- What factors help or hinder the impact of workload on individual teachers?
- What professional learning might help teachers to manage their workloads?
- What changes in district practice might help teachers to manage their workloads?
- What changes in ministry practice and expectations might help teachers to manage their workloads?

Approach

Directions employed a mixed methods approach to addressing the main study questions. The approach involved reviewing relevant literature, surveying teachers, and conducting in-depth interviews with teachers, principals, vice principals, superintendents, directors, and school board trustees.

Literature Review

Introduction to the Review

There is a large and growing body of accumulated evidence about factors that have an impact on student achievement. These factors were summarized in John Hattie’s *Visible Learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement* (2009). Hattie argues that, in education, “almost everything works” (p. 15). To minimize the risk that policies and practices will be adopted that may make only a marginal contribution to student achievement at considerable cost, Hattie advocates that those concerned with improving student achievement look for factors that yield effect sizes in excess of $d = 0.40$, “a level where the effects . . . enhance achievement in such a way that we can notice real-world differences” (p. 17), a region that Hattie labels the zone of desired effects. He notes that teachers average an effect of $d = 0.20$ to $d = 0.40$ per year on student achievement, cautioning that “not all teachers are effective . . . and not all teachers have powerful effects on students” (p. 108). The table below (adapted

\[ \text{Table 1: Effect Sizes of Teaching Practices} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>$d = 0.30$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Quality</td>
<td>$d = 0.45$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Environment</td>
<td>$d = 0.35$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Table 1: Effect Sizes of Teaching Practices} \]

from Hattie) provides both the average effect size (d) and its common language effect size indicator (CLE), the probability that the given effect will make a positive difference, or the percentage of students exposed to the factor who will gain in achievement compared to students not exposed to the factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Contributions</th>
<th>Meta-analyses (N)</th>
<th>Studies (N)</th>
<th>Effects (N)</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>CLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom cohesion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer influences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Contributions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual-perception</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>5035</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary programs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonics Instruction</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>5968</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated reading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension programs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>2653</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second/Third chance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Programs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Science and Mathematics**                                |                   |             |             |      |      |
| Mathematics                                                | 13                | 677         | 2370        | .45  | 32%  |
| Science                                                    | 13                | 884         | 2592        | .40  | 29%  |

| Others                                                     |                   |             |             |      |      |
| Social skills programs                                     | 8                 | 540         | 2278        | .40  | 27%  |
| Tactile stimulation programs                               | 1                 | 19          | 103         | .58  | 41%  |
| Play programs                                              | 2                 | 70          | 70          | .50  | 35%  |
| Creativity programs                                       | 12                | 685         | 837         | .65  | 47%  |
| Outdoor/adventure programs                                 | 3                 | 187         | 429         | .52  | 37%  |

| Teacher Contributions                                      |                   |             |             |      |      |
| Quality of teaching                                       | 5                 | 141         | 195         | .44  | 31%  |
| Teacher-student relationships                              | 1                 | 229         | 1450        | .72  | 51%  |
| Professional development                                  | 5                 | 537         | 1884        | .62  | 44%  |
| Expectations                                              | 8                 | 674         | 784         | .43  | 31%  |
| Not labeling students                                      | 1                 | 79          | 79          | .61  | 43%  |
| Teacher Clarity                                            | 1                 | na          | na          | .75  | 53%  |

| Teaching Strategies                                        |                   |             |             |      |      |
| Strategies emphasizing learning intentions                 |                   |             |             |      |      |
| Goals                                                     | 11                | 604         | 820         | .56  | 40%  |
| Behavioral organizers/advance organizers                  | 11                | 577         | 1,933       | .41  | 29%  |
| Concept mapping                                           | 6                 | 287         | 332         | .57  | 40%  |
### Strategies emphasizing success criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mastery learning</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller’s PIS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked examples</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategies emphasizing feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing formative evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategies emphasizing student perspectives in learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spaced vs. massed practice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer tutoring</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategies emphasizing student meta-cognitive/self-regulated learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meta-cognitive strategies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study skills</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-verbalization/self-questioning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategies emphasizing classroom-based teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Success</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving teaching</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative learning</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative vs. competitive learning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative vs. individualistic learning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **School Contributions**

Only a small portion (between 0 and 20%) of the variance in student achievement can be attributed to school-level variables, but school attributes do have a measurable impact on student learning.

i. **School Size**

Small schools offer more leadership opportunities for students, more collaboration among teachers, and more personal interactions among students and faculty. Larger schools are less expensive to operate and are able to offer wider range of courses and extra-curricular activities. Optimal school size (for high schools) is in the middle range: between 600 and 900 students, depending on the affluence of the student cohort and the proportion of minority students.

ii. **Small Group Learning**

Assigning learning tasks to small groups of students can be more effective than individual learning. For grouping to be maximally effective, materials and teaching must
be varied and made appropriately challenging to accommodate the needs of students at their different levels of ability.

iii. Acceleration

Acceleration typically involves progressing gifted students through an educational program at rates faster or ages younger than is conventional. Accelerated students benefit both academically and socially.

iv. Classroom Influences

There are a number of ways in which schools structure their classrooms that can have impact on student achievement

- *Classroom management* can have a powerful effect on student achievement and engagement. Effective classroom management requires that the teacher have the ability to identify and quickly act on potential behaviour problems and to communicate to students which behaviours are appropriate and inappropriate.
- *Classroom cohesion* is the sense that students and teachers are working toward positive gains. Goal directedness, positive interpersonal relations and social support contribute to classroom cohesion.
- *Peer influences* can have an impact on learning through helping, tutoring, providing friendship, giving feedback, and making class/school a place students want to come each day.

2. Curricular Contributions

Curricular interventions typically focus on reading or mathematics, but other, specifically focused programs can also contribute to learning and achievement

i. Reading

Reading curricula must ensure students acquire a set of learning strategies to construct meaning from texts. There need to be planned, deliberate, explicit, and active programs to teach specific literacy skills.

- *Visual perception* is the process of organizing and interpreting letters on a page. Visual and auditory perception are both important predictors of reading ability.
- *Phonics instruction* teaches beginning readers the alphabetic code, letter-sound correspondents, and how to use this knowledge to read words. Direct instruction methods have been most powerful in teaching phonics skills.
• *Vocabulary* instruction and knowledge of word meanings generally help growth in reading comprehension.

• *Repeated reading* consists of re-reading a short and meaningful passage until a satisfactory level of fluency is reached. This approach contributes to students’ ability to automatically apply word recognition and decoding skills and develop reading fluency.

• *Comprehension* programs teach students specific strategies to augment their reading comprehension.

• *Second-and-third-chance programs* can make a significant contribution to improved reading outcomes among students with poor reading skills when the programs are: well-designed, reliably implemented, and involve one-to-one implementations. These programs, especially Reading Recovery, are most effective when used as a supplement to, rather than a substitute for, classroom teaching.

• *Writing programs* that teach students the processes and strategies involved in writing and the conventions of a writing genre, and provide guided feedback can lead to significant improvements in student writing.

ii. **Mathematics and Science**

• *Mathematics* curricula tend to be particularly effective among lower ability students; when aids are provided to reduce cognitive load; and with feedback from teachers to students and students to teachers. Direct instruction and problem solving are among the most effective approaches.

• *Science* curricula that are skills-based and emphasize analytic and process skills, integrated laboratory activities, and higher cognitive skills and appreciation of science outperform students in classes that emphasize knowledge of scientific facts, laws, theories, and applications.

iii. **Other Programs**

• *Social skills programs* are usually provided for learners whose behaviour is either highly internalized (socially isolated/withdrawn) or highly externalized (exhibitionist). Programs are generally designed to achieve higher levels of social appropriateness, social problem solving skills, self-control, or social perspective taking. These programs tend to effective with respect to enhancing peer relations and social outcomes, but less effective with respect to improving academic achievement.
- **Tactile stimulation** is a type of sensory enrichment or stimulation used with infants, often those at risk of developmental delays, to encourage their development. The effects of these programs are greatest on social and personal outcomes and lowest on visual/auditory outcomes.

- **Play** is an important learning activity, particularly for younger children. The effects are largely derived from learning about peer relations, learning how to learn from peers, and facing and meeting challenges. Socio-dramatic play (a type of free play in which children engage in creative and imaginative social interactions) has the most striking effects.

- **Creativity programs** based on the idea that training, practice, and encouragement in using creative thinking skills can improve students’ thinking fluency, flexibility, and originality in their responses to questions and problems. An emphasis on instructional strategies and direct instruction makes a major difference in the effectiveness of creativity programs.

- **Outdoor education programs** can be effective in enhancing self-esteem and improving academic achievement. Programs that involve an element of teaching, rather than simply providing outdoor experience, are most effective. The success of outdoor programs stem from the way activities are structured to emphasize very challenging learning intentions, clear success criteria, optimized peer support, and constant feedback.

3. **Teacher Contributions**

Teachers have a large impact on student achievement, but some teachers have a larger impact than others. A number of factors are relevant to the contributions teachers make to student achievement.

i. **Quality of teaching**

Quality teachers are those who challenge, who have high expectations, who encourage the study of their subject, and who value surface and deep aspects of their subject. While the effects of quality teaching are strong and beneficial, the effects of poor teacher quality tend to persist for years and there is little evidence of compensatory effects of more effective teachers in later grades.

ii. **Teacher-Student Relationships**
Building relationships with students implies agency, efficacy, respect by the teacher for what the student brings to the class, and allowing the experiences of the child to be recognized in the classroom. Building relationships with students requires that teachers possess the skills of listening, empathy, caring, and having positive regard for others.

iii. **Professional Development**

Professional development is an effective way to improve job performance and satisfaction among teachers, and has a lower but still positive effect on student outcomes. The most effective forms of professional development include: observation of actual classroom methods; microteaching (teachers conduct mini-lessons to a small group of students and then engage in post-discussions about the lessons); video/audio feedback; and practice.

iv. **Expectations**

 Teachers form expectations about student ability and skills and these expectations affect student achievement.

v. **Teacher clarity**

Teacher clarity includes organization, explanation, examples, guided practice, and assessment of student learning. It remains consistently important for the teacher to communicate the intentions of their lessons and success criteria.

4. **Teaching Strategies**

Being strategic as a teacher involves finding ways to engage and motivate students, teaching learning strategies appropriate to different circumstances, and constantly seeking feedback about how effective the teacher is with all the students.

i. **Learning Intentions**

Learning intentions are the declarative and procedural knowledge that students are meant to learn from any particular lesson.

- *Goals* that are challenging motivate students to align their efforts with the demands of the goal and to prompt them to invest mental effort in the learning task.
- *Behavioural and advanced organizers* inform students of what they are expected to achieve and link new learning to prior knowledge and experience.
- *Concept mapping* is a graphical representation of the material that the students are expected to learn.
ii. **Success Criteria**

   Success criteria make explicit to the learners the criteria the teacher will use to evaluate their work.

   - *Mastery learning* focuses on clear explanations and demonstrations to ensure that all students acquire the requisite knowledge.
   - *Keller’s Personalized System of Instruction* is a specific implementation of mastery learning that uses programmed, student-centered instruction.
   - *Worked examples* alleviate cognitive load by providing learners with a problem and the designated steps required for its solution.

iii. **Feedback**

   There are two types of feedback. Students provide feedback to the teacher about what they know, understand, and do not understand, as well as any misconceptions they may have formed. Teachers provide feedback to students about learning tasks and to correct errors and misconceptions.

   - *Formative evaluation* is frequent testing to gather information that will enable the teacher to modify his or her instruction to improve student performance.
   - *Skilled questioning* of students by their teachers improves student achievement.

iv. **Seeing Learning from the Learner’s Perspective**

   The student’s particular experiences with learning have a large impact on student achievement.

   - *Spaced* opportunities distributed across time for learners to practice what they have learned, rather than concentrated in a single practice event, enhances student achievement.
   - *Peer tutoring* has many academic and social benefits for both those tutoring and those being tutored. For the student-tutors, it presents an opportunity to learn how to become their own teachers.

v. **Student Self-Regulated Learning**

   Self-regulated learning promotes student achievement by encouraging students to think about their own thinking and learning.

   - *Meta-cognitive strategies* include instructing students about how to approach new tasks, how to evaluate their own progress, and how to monitor their own comprehension of the material being taught.
• **Study skills** programs improve the learner’s ability to manage their learning through such practices as note-taking and summarizing.

• **Self-verbalizing and questioning** involves learners questioning themselves about what they are asked to learn, and is especially effective prior to a lesson or learning task.

vi. **Classroom-Based Teaching**

A number of specific approaches to classroom-based teaching have been investigated and shown to be advantageous to student achievement.

• **Reciprocal teaching** develops students’ meta-cognitive abilities by encouraging them to adopt the role of the teacher.

• **Direct instruction** is sometimes erroneously confused with didactic instruction, in which students are treated as passive receptors of knowledge. Direct instruction involves careful delineation of learning intentions and success criteria; development of a “hook” to grab students’ attention; presentation of information, modeling of what is expected, and checking for understanding; guided practice under the teacher’s direct supervision; summarization of what students have learned; and opportunities for independent practice.

• **Problem-solving teaching** engages learners in defining the nature of a problem; identifying, prioritizing, and selecting approaches to its solution; and evaluating the application of solutions and their outcomes.

• **Co-operative learning** involves small groups of students accomplishing learning tasks together. Each member of a group is responsible not only for learning what is taught but also for helping others in the group learn. Co-operative learning is more effective than competitive learning, and both are more effective than individualistic learning.

Over the past three decades, education authorities in many western countries have instituted centralized school reforms in a bid to improve student achievement and outcomes (e.g., Day & Gu, 2007). The specific nature of such reforms has differed from country to country, but increased accountability (for teachers, schools, and public school systems), standardization and testing have been consistent elements (Olmos, Van Heertum & Torres, 2011). In many cases, reforms have included government mandated curricula, prescribed instructional practices, and standardized (and sometimes high-stakes) tests. These accountability-based reforms have been widely criticized for their perceived threats to teacher professionalism and for their impact on teacher workloads.
Teacher professionalism is based on expertise, professional judgment and professional autonomy. The defining characteristics of professionalism include: knowledge of the major theories associated with a particular domain; extended specialized training; and a code of ethics that guides behavior (Leicht & Fennell, 2001). Working in situations of complexity and uncertainty, professionals draw on their knowledge, training, and experience to make decisions about their work. The autonomous use of their professional judgment is a key component of professionalism (Freidson, 2001). Teacher professionalism implies that teachers make their own curricular and instructional decisions to meet the particular needs of the students in their classrooms (Wills & Sandholtz, 2009). Teacher autonomy is not boundless: teachers’ decisions must be guided by accepted theory and professional standards, their behaviors must adhere to a professional code of ethics, and they are obligated to serve the best interests of their students.²

For teachers, as with most well-educated workers, autonomy and job satisfaction are inextricably linked (Koustelios, Karabatsaki, & Kouisteliou, 2004; Richer, Blanchard & Vallerand, 2002; Ross & Reskin, 1992). For many teachers, autonomy is not only important to their job satisfaction but is also felt as key to their ability to address the needs of their students (Crocco & Costigan, 2007). In short, threats to teacher autonomy are perceived as interfering with their professionalism, and the hallmarks of accountability-based reform—standardization and testing—are seen by many (though not necessarily by teachers) as intrusions upon teacher autonomy.

In addition to their impact on teacher professionalism, the large-scale educational reforms implemented in many Western countries over the last few decades have been perceived as contributing to an increase in teacher workload and an intensification of teachers’ work (Apple, 2009). The demands of accountability are believed to have increased teacher workloads, particularly in the requirements for monitoring and reporting on students’ progress toward the attainment of prescribed outcomes (Johnson & Hallgarten, 2002).

Although many observers have noted the similarities among reforms implemented in many different Western countries, reform initiatives have differed in meaningful ways in different contexts. The relationship between centralized school reforms and their perceived threats to teacher professionalism is context dependent. Some types of reforms are more likely than others to be perceived as threatening to teacher professionalism; the local implementation of reforms within districts and schools plays an important role regarding how reforms are perceived; and individual teachers also perceive and respond to reforms in different ways. In a

² As explained elsewhere in this report, in Ontario, professional and ethical standards are addressed by the Standards of Professional Practice and Ethical Standards of the Ontario College of Teachers.
similar vein, the effects of centralized school reforms on teacher workload depend a great deal on how reforms are implemented. In the following sections we describe the patterns of centralized reforms that have been implemented in three different contexts: the United Kingdom, the United States and in the province of Ontario. In each case, we review the evidence concerning the effects those reforms have had on teacher professionalism and on teacher workload.

School Reform in the United Kingdom
Education reform in the UK provides an interesting case study of the effect of centralized reform on teacher professionalism because many of the reforms introduced by the Blair government were deliberately designed to change teacher professionalism.

Widespread education reform began in the 1980s in the UK with a strong push for accountability brought in by the 1988 Education Reform Act (Torrington, Earnshaw, Marchington, & Ritchie, 2003). The Act included the introduction of the National Curriculum, Standardised Attainment Tests, and Key Stages—at which a number of educational objectives were to be achieved. Local Management of Schools was introduced, which allowed schools to be taken out of the direct financial control of Local Authorities. Instead, the head teacher and school governors retained financial control and became accountable for the performance of schools. A degree of choice was introduced, allowing parents to choose the school their children would attend.

The reforms were designed to allow free market forces to function in schooling. The National Curriculum standardized the material taught in schools, enabling standardized assessments of students. The results of standardized assessments were compiled into league tables that provided information to parents choosing schools for their children.

In the late 1990s, the Blair government began introducing a new set of wide ranging education reforms. The Blair government made deliberate efforts to change the nature of teacher professionalism and “to harness that professionalism closely to the government’s own education reform agenda” (Furlong, 2013, p. 33). These reforms were designed to increase the supply and quality of new entrants into teaching; to create a more differentiated teacher workforce; to develop a new approach to continuing professional development; and to exert specific control over the content of teacher professionalism (Furlong, 2008). New teacher candidates were attracted by increasing the pay of newly qualified teachers, by providing bursaries to attract teachers into mathematics and science, and by adopting advertising and marketing techniques borrowed from the private sector. Initial teacher preparation was
modified to include standardized admission requirements and nationally defined standards for entry into the profession.

The teaching workforce was differentiated by developing an emphasis on leadership and opportunities for advancement. The responsibilities (and financial rewards) of head teachers were increased and new leadership roles were created, for example: Advanced Skills Teacher, Secondary Head of Department. Workforce differentiation also included making greater use of classroom assistants and other support workers; between 1997 and 2006, the number of support workers doubled (Furlong, 2008).

Continuing professional development was directed away from personal professional learning and became tightly tied to national strategies and performance targets. Schools were expected to determine their own professional development needs and goals, but these were to be based on their students’ performance data. Where students were failing to meet achievement targets, teachers were expected to seek professional development linked to the national strategies and standardized “best practices” for helping students reach those targets. These reforms were designed to ensure that teachers’ day-to-day practice and their professional goals and standards were linked to the reform agenda.

Workload issues arose in the late 1980s after the National Curriculum was introduced (Nuttall & Stobart, 1994). At the time, teacher workload was emerging as an issue in a number of countries outside of the UK. The International Labour Organization released a report in 1991 on the nature of teaching in over 40 countries: the report concluded that teachers’ overall workload had increased in most countries as a result of educational reforms. Actual teaching hours had not increased, but administrative duties associated with new accountability measures added to teacher workloads and preparation time had also increased. In a 1990 report, the OECD also noted that recent reforms had increased the demands made on teachers and that teachers were increasingly concerned about having sufficient time to respond to the challenges of recent reforms.

In the early 1990s, Campbell and Neil (1991, 1994a, 1994b) began investigating the impact of the Education Reform Act 1988 on teachers’ work and, especially, on their workload. Campbell and Neill found that teachers’ perceived lack of time as the main obstacle to their implementation of the National Curriculum. The workload data revealed that, in the early 1990s, primary teachers worked between 49 and 55 hours per week and secondary teachers worked an average of 54.4 hours per week. Campbell and Neill cited four other surveys conducted in 1990 and 1991 that estimated teacher workloads at 50 to 55 hours per week. In subsequent years, data on teacher workloads in the UK have been collected on a regular basis.
through the Teachers’ Workload Diary Survey. The survey was conducted in 1994, 1996, 2000, and annually between 2003 and 2010. The Diary Survey data indicate that teacher workloads fluctuate from year to year, but over time they remain within the 49 to 55 hours per week that Campbell and Neill first documented in the early 1990s (Figure 1 below).

Figure 1: Average number of hours per week worked by teachers in England and Wales
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Teacher perceptions of their workload and the workload data are not always in alignment. For example, Campbell & Neill reported that, in 1992, nearly two-thirds of primary school teachers perceived their workloads to have increased since the previous year. However, Campbell and Neill’s data indicate that primary teachers’ workloads decreased (from 54.6 to 52.4 hrs/wk) during that same period. In other cases, there is better alignment between teacher perceptions and workload data. In 2000, the School Teachers’ Review Body reported that teachers at all levels and in all schools had perceived an increase in their workload and an intensification of their working day. The Diary Survey data (see Figure 1 above) indicate that there had, in fact, been a workload increase between 1994 and 2000. Subsequently, the Blair government introduced the 2003 Schools Workforce Remodeling Act that was designed to reduce teacher workloads by increasing the supply of support staff. Although workforce remodeling was criticized for replacing trained teachers with untrained teaching assistants, teachers reported a decrease in their workloads (Blatchford et al., 2009). This perceived decrease was mirrored by a decrease in teacher working hours, as documented by the Diary Survey data (see Figure 1 above).

---

3 A new version of the survey was conducted in 2013 but the methodology differed from previous years, making longitudinal comparisons impossible.
Beyond the workload issues, many critics opposed the British reforms, arguing that their potential for success was limited by a vision that failed to include education that is meaningful to individuals and society, and that sacrificed the moral purposes of education in favour of strictly instrumental goals (Day, 2007). The reforms—both those included in the Education Reform Act 1988 and those enacted by the Blair government—were identified as a direct threat to teacher professionalism and morale (Day, 1997; 2000; Hargreaves, 1994; 1997; Gideonese, 1988; Grace, 1997; Seddon, 1997; Whitty, 1997). The accountability movement, it is argued, had squeezed teachers into a narrow pedagogical perspective dominated by test scores, achievement targets and league tables (Hargreaves, 2003). Government intervention—in the form of national curricula, national strategies, national tests and publication of test results—eroded teachers’ autonomy and challenged their professional identities (Apple, 2009). Others have argued that the reforms pushed teacher professionalism away from one based on principles and values and toward a professionalism based on efficiency and productivity (Day & Smethem, 2009).

The introduction of market forces (public accountability and parental choice) into the education system, it is argued, made space for the ethics of competition and performance at the expense of the older ethics of professional judgment and co-operation (Ball, 2003). It is further argued that, taken together, the reforms resulted in a recasting of teachers’ work, changing the nature of teacher professionalism in a manner that requires compliance with the demands of a succession of reforms and flexibility to adjust to ever changing government policy. In sum, critics argued that the reforms have led to a “proletarianisation” of teachers (Lawn, 1996; Robertson, 1996; Smyth, 1995; Smyth et al., 2000).

British teachers’ perceptions of the effects of reforms on their professionalism varied. Helsby (1996) found that many teachers felt that the reforms had impinged on their professional autonomy and that the decreased autonomy and control over their working lives had made it difficult to meet their own personal standards of professionalism. Many teachers felt that the prescribed National Curriculum undermined their professionalism and their professional judgment by requiring them to teach content with which they did not agree. However, other teachers felt that the challenge of adapting to the new curriculum had enhanced their professionalism. Some teachers reported that the introduction of the National Curriculum had prompted them to examine current practice and engage in genuine curriculum development. Some teachers reported that, over time, they became more familiar with the principles and practices of the National Curriculum and became adept at using their own professional judgments to work with the reform requirements.
Helsby noted that particular schools and departments—and the cultures they fostered—had a large effect on teachers’ confidence and their sense of professionalism. Cultures of heavy bureaucratic control posed a threat to teacher professionalism, whereas collaborative cultures in which teachers regularly discussed their work, shared their experiences, and took responsibility for curriculum development protected teacher professionalism. Teachers in schools and departments that responded to the National Curriculum by forming and working in professional learning communities reported increased collegiality and an enhanced sense of teacher professionalism. Teachers in schools that responded with a hierarchical and bureaucratic management reported a sense of isolation and frustration.

In a longitudinal study of the effects of reform on British teachers and their students, McNess, Broadfoot and Osborn (2003) found that some teachers described a feeling of “fragmented identity,” feeling caught between government policies that emphasize technical and managerial skills and their own personal beliefs in the importance of an emotional dimension to teaching. While some teachers expressed frustration with the constraints on their professional autonomy, others found sufficient room to maneuver in the space between official policies and the day-to-day implementation of those policies. The ability and confidence to move freely within that space depended on many variables, but a supportive and collaborative school culture emerged as a consistent factor.

Moore, Edwards, Halpin and George (2002) found that “compliance” was not an accurate description of teachers’ responses to reforms that infringed on their autonomy. They argued that a resistant-compliant perspective “masks a wide and complex variety of professional positionings” and that it is more accurate to consider post-reform teacher professionalism in terms of eclecticism and pragmatism. They found that most teachers merely modified their previous practices to accommodate current policy or found ways of incorporating current policy into their pedagogical practices while carrying on as usual with very few alterations. Moore and colleagues noted that teachers chose eclectically from prescribed practices representing a wide range of educational philosophies without attempting to maintain a coherent ideology. Although this eclecticism may have been interpreted as a response to government imposed reforms, Moore and colleagues note that there is no evidence that teachers are any more or less eclectic than they ever were.

Moore and colleagues describe the motivations for teachers’ eclectic selections as “pragmatic.” They observed that some teachers were principled pragmatists: their choices were guided by a clear professional plan and a sense of purpose. Such teachers expressed approval regarding some of the reforms, noting that for themselves and for the profession as a whole, the reforms had contributed to increased teacher effectiveness. These teachers accepted some of the local
and national policies without any sense of compromise, and they resisted policies with which they disagreed without any apparent repercussions. In contrast, other teachers were described as contingent pragmatists: these teachers exhibited an uncomfortable sense of compromise and a sense that they were making forced choices with respect to their pedagogical approaches.

Overall, the research suggests that teachers responded in various ways to the British school reforms. Some teachers described a loss of autonomy, while others responded as autonomous agents making their own choices regarding how to incorporate government policies into their practices. Two factors contribute to the maintenance of teachers’ professional autonomy: strong professional communities that foster collaboration and support continuous learning among teachers (Anderson, 2010); and supportive principals (or head teachers) who make accommodation for teachers’ professional autonomy.

Day (2005) studied British schools in challenging circumstances that had achieved success in the context of government reforms. The schools had demonstrated a steady upward trend in their achievement data over a period of four years and had been described as “excellent” or “outstanding” in their most recent OFSTED reports. All the schools were in neighbourhoods with relatively low socioeconomic status and all had above average numbers of students with special needs and/or qualifying for free school meals. In these schools, Day found the teachers and head teachers to be activist professionals, rather than the compliant proletariat anticipated by critics of the government reforms.

Day noted that the ability among head teachers to mediate the implementation of reforms using their professional judgment to ensure alignment with a broader improvement agenda was key to their success. These head teachers promoted care and social justice as integral components of schooling. They had not become primarily managerialist in response to the reform emphasis on testing, competition, external evaluation and entrepreneurship. They eschewed the imposition of market values in education, and were informed by their own core values. They fostered staff participation and collaboration and a sense of individual and collective ownership. Their teachers were not expected to compliantly implement the government reform agenda, but rather to be active participants in school improvement. Successful head teachers valued the individual knowledge, experience and professional judgment of their teachers and fostered collaboration to create a store of shared experiences and a collective capacity to respond to change. They nurtured the capacities of their teachers, treating them as equal partners in pursuit of successful teaching, learning and achievement.
School Reform in the United States
Large scale school reform in the United States has focused primarily on standards and high-stakes testing. This movement began with the release of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) by the Reagan administration, and became entrenched with the 1994 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which committed the U.S. to standards-based reform (Rudalevige, 2003). The reauthorization required states to develop performance standards for public schools and to show “adequate yearly progress,” but only a few states developed clear and specific standards. In response, the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act tied federal funding to the development and implementation of standards, testing and adequate yearly progress (AYP).

It was left to each state to develop their own standards, but they were required to test their students every year, and schools had to show steady progress toward the goal of every student meeting or exceeding state standards. Failing to make AYP engendered significant consequences. After two years of failure, schools were required to develop a 2-year improvement plan and offer students the opportunity to attend a better school (in the same district). After three years of failing to make AYP, schools were required to offer free tutoring to struggling students. Strong “corrective action” was to be taken after four consecutive years of AYP failure, including: staff replacement and/or the introduction of a new curriculum. A complete restructuring could result from a fifth consecutive year of failing to make AYP: schools could be closed, converted to charter schools, or taken over by the state office of education, which would run the school directly.

Before NCLB, many states had already implemented some form of test-based reform, but in the wake of NCLB the emphasis on high-stakes testing became more prevalent (Hursh, 2005; Linn, 2004). In the face of high-stakes testing regimes and the constant pressure to make Adequate Yearly Progress, school administrators increasingly came to view centralized curricula and prescribed instructional strategies as the most efficient means of increasing student performance (Dudley-Marling & Murphy, 2001; Posnick-Goodwin, 2002; Wills & Sandholtz, 2009). This standardization approach aims for uniformity. That is, in order to equalize educational opportunities for all students, standardization addresses disparities across classrooms with uniformity of goals, curriculum, teaching methods, and assessment. This approach centralizes efforts to improve curriculum and instruction, leaving only the technical core of teaching to teachers. A set curriculum is prescribed for each grade level that must be taught over the academic year. Pacing guides are used to monitor the scope and sequence of curriculum over the school year, and scripted lessons are used as a strategy for achieving uniformity of scope, sequence, and pedagogical approaches.
Some observers have argued that the standardization approach leads to an intensification of teachers’ work (e.g., Apple, 2009); however, there has been very little empirical research on the effects of NCLB on teacher workloads. Timperley and Robinson (2000) observed that teacher workload issues are not restricted to centralized reform. Teacher-initiated reforms can also have a tremendous impact on teacher workloads. They found that teachers working in locally managed schools and with a sense of professionalism that includes a high level of autonomy and supportive collegiality often create workload issues for themselves. Timperley and Robinson suggest that teachers’ reluctance to be critical of each other’s initiatives and their lack of attention to system level processes results in an uncoordinated proliferation of many different initiatives. The solution suggested by Timperley and Robinson is for principals to guide teachers toward a more systemic approach. Teachers must understand and agree on the overarching goals for reform, and they must ensure that their own efforts and initiatives are directed toward meeting those goals. Teacher collegiality has to include a critical analysis of everyone’s efforts to ensure that they are goal-directed and that there is no unnecessary overlap or duplication of effort.

With respect to teacher professionalism, the standardization approach undermines teacher autonomy, leaving little room for their own professional judgment. Teachers report that the emphasis on test preparation prevents them from pursuing their own classroom goals (Orelus, 2009) and forces them to discontinue teaching practices that are responsive to diverse students’ needs in order to deliver the mandated curriculum via prescribed instructional practices (Abrams, 2004; Lipman, 2004; Sleeter & Stillman, 2007). Other teachers report being pressured to focus their energy and attention on “bump kids”—the students performing close to the average and who have the greatest likelihood of improving their test scores (Atkinson, 2012). Teachers are frustrated by their inability to use the expertise they acquired through their professional preparation and the teaching experience acquired over the course of their teaching careers. They report that, in addition to deprofessionalizing their work, scripted lessons and mandated curricula interfere with their ability to form strong connections with their students (Crocco & Costigan, 2007). They resent being held accountable for student performance (on tests that they do not see as valid measures of their students’ abilities) without being given any voice or respect for their professional knowledge and experience (Atkinson, 2012).

A sense of deprofessionalization and constrained autonomy is clear among some teachers in the wake of the NCLB reforms, but this experience is not universal among teachers. Using four waves of the national Schools and Staffing survey, Grissom, Nicholson-Crotty, and Harrington (2014) observed an increase in feelings of classroom autonomy in the period following the implementation of NCLB. It is likely that this is because standardization is not the only approach
available to school administrators in the face of test-based school reform. Although in the context of a heightened focus on test-based accountability, many administrators are less comfortable relinquishing authority to individual teachers (Wills & Sandholtz, 2009), some administrators have chosen a professionalization approach that emphasizes teacher expertise and professional judgment.

Within the professionalization approach, administrators resist standardization, preserve teacher autonomy, and rely on teachers’ expertise. For example, Wills and Sandholtz (2009) report on the efforts of the principal of a “low performing” school (i.e., one at risk of suffering the consequences of failing to make AYP) to leverage his teachers’ expertise in order to reach the mandated performance targets. He provided copious opportunities for professional development: teachers participated in a constant stream of workshops, programs, and other professional development opportunities throughout the year, all directed at improving teaching and learning in language arts and mathematics, the areas that are subject to high-stakes testing. Professional development was focused on the implementation of specific programs and instructional strategies; however, teachers met to discuss the appropriate implementation of new strategies, and the details of this implementation often varied across classrooms as a result of individual teachers’ decisions. Teachers retained the autonomy to integrate new strategies into their pedagogical practice as they saw fit. The principal relied on teachers to work collaboratively and to use their professional judgment to make decisions about curriculum and instruction. The principal was concerned about teachers “teaching to the test” in order to prepare their students for high-stakes testing, so he engaged teachers in discussions about how to avoid that approach. Through those discussions, the faculty agreed as a group that teachers would develop their curricula based on state content standards in each subject, rather than focusing on the content and question types found on previous exams.

Although the teachers in the Will and Sandholtz (2009) study expressed a sense of constraint with respect to their professionalism—for example, the emphasis on preparing their students for assessments in language arts and mathematics forced them to curtail instruction in other subjects (e.g., social sciences)—their professional autonomy remained largely intact within the context of the constant pressure of high-stakes testing. This was facilitated by a culture of collaboration and collegiality among teachers and by a principal who provided support for teachers’ continuous professional development and made provision for them to work together to make decisions regarding the best way to help their students succeed.

In schools where teachers perceived administrators to be managerial and dogmatic (e.g., where district supervisors made surprise visits to ensure that desks were arranged in the prescribed manner, that blackboards and bulletin boards conformed to prescriptions, that the lessons were
the one mandated for that day and that it was being taught in the required manner), they described a strong sense of deprofessionalization. Elsewhere, teachers reported that administrators worked with them to override mandated curricula and to select only those elements of scripted lessons they found to be beneficial to their students. These teachers express frustration with the high-stakes testing regime, but their sense of professionalism remains intact (Crocco & Costigan, 2007).

**School Reform in Ontario**

In Ontario, large-scale school reform began in the 1990s when the Rae government introduced the Common Curriculum, announced de-streaming of the Grade 9 program, and established specific learning outcomes for Grades 3, 6, and 9, along with a set of cross-curricular learning outcomes. The Rae government also established the Royal Commission on Learning that recommended the creation of an arm’s length organization to develop and administer standardized provincial assessments.

When the Harris government replaced the Rae government in 1995, a new set of reforms was introduced. These included the creation of the Education Quality and Accountability Office (EQAO) and the subsequent introduction of standardized provincial assessments. The Harris government reforms also included: new curricula at both the elementary and secondary levels (along with prescribed learning activities, timelines, and methods of assessment); replacement of broad-based learning outcomes with tightly prescribed performance standards; the introduction of a mandatory standard provincial report card; a return to streaming in Grade 9; the replacement of the 5-year high school program with a 4-year program; amalgamation of school boards; the introduction of a mandatory entry-to-practice exam for teachers; large budget cuts; and new provisions mandating the amount of instructional time in a teacher’s day (Earl, Freeman, Lasky, Sutherland, & Torrance, 2002).

Teachers perceived a significant increase in their workloads under the Harris era reforms. The mandated instructional time amounted to an additional half course per teacher per school year. At the same time, many schools were squeezed by budget cuts and reduced their support staff. Teachers were left to juggle the demands of learning and teaching new curricula, increased administrative paperwork, and additional non-teaching duties to compensate for few support workers. Teachers reported having insufficient time to prepare lessons, to learn the new curriculum, and to mark student work. They reported having less time to spend with students and being unable to meet their own professional standards or their students’ needs (Earl et al., 2002).

The rigidity of the new programs and assessment systems were seen by some critics as “de-skilling and a threat to teacher professionalism (Majhanovich, 2002). But the issues deemed
deprofessionalizing by academics can be seen as professionalizing by teachers working in collegial environments (Bell, 2011). While many teachers did perceive the reforms as impinging on their professionalism, it was not the imposition of prescribed curricula, learning activities and assessment techniques that they identified as threatening to the professionalism. As the reforms were implemented, the Harris government frequently conveyed a negative political tone toward teachers and the teaching profession. This, in combination with a sense of not meeting their own professional standards, was what left many teachers feeling that their professionalism was under attack (Lasky, 2005).

In contrast to largely negative responses to government initiated reforms, Hargreaves (2004) found that teachers are “overwhelmingly enthusiastic and animated” with respect to reforms that they report as resulting from their own initiatives. Hargreaves examined these “self-initiated reforms” and found that a large number of them originated from government mandated or board initiated reforms. He concluded that reform processes that engage teachers’ knowledge and commitments are more likely to increase teachers’ professional involvement in school improvement and less likely to threaten their sense of professionalism.

Similarly, Hannay, Erb, and Ross (2001) found that teachers need opportunities to participate meaningfully in reform processes. Bell (2011) explored the sources and threats to professionalism among Ontario elementary school teachers and found that being trusted to make decisions and solve problems is commonly perceived by teachers as important to their sense of professionalism. Being micro-managed or treated as unable to fulfill their daily duties without direct intervention was perceived as deprofessionalizing. Many teachers indicated that a key feature of professionalism is being able to collaborate with their colleagues and solve problems in a collegial atmosphere with their fellow teachers and with administrators. Many teachers identified collaboration as a professionalizing aspect of their work, even when their participation in professional learning was mandatory.

In the context of reforms, it is not the reform policies (e.g., centralized curricula, standardized testing) that are perceived by teachers as impinging on their professionalism, but the manner in which reforms are locally implemented: whether teachers feel that school administrators continue to trust them to make decisions and solve problems as the policies are implemented.

When the McGuinty government replaced the Harris government in 2003, another new round of schools reforms was introduced. The McGuinty reforms were designed to change school and classroom practices while engaging teachers in a positive way and generating public support for public education in Ontario. To accomplish this, the approach to reform maintained respect for professional knowledge and practice, and emphasized professional capacity-building and strong
leadership (Levin, 2008). The McGuinty reforms focused on two key goals: to improve literacy and numeracy achievement among elementary school students and to increase graduation rates (which had been falling) among high school students. In 2008, The McGuinty government established as its key goals: High levels of student achievement, reduced gaps in student achievement and increased public confidence in publicly funded education (www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/energize/energize.pdf)

At the elementary level, the reforms were spearheaded by the Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat (LNS) established in 2004. A key goal of the LNS was to build capacity and support leadership and instructional effectiveness in Ontario school boards and schools. The LNS worked with school boards to set ambitious achievement targets—reflecting high expectations for every student—and to develop school improvement plans for achieving those targets. The LNS supported boards and school leaders with resources and professional development to implement best practices in literacy and numeracy instruction. Teachers received training on best teaching practices and the use of assessment data to guide instruction. The LNS also worked with schools to raise awareness regarding achievement issues for particular groups of students—including Aboriginal students, second language learners, students with special needs, and boys—and to implement targeted interventions for those groups. The LNS also worked with schools and boards to plan for continuous improvement while managing the local conditions facing individual schools.

The LNS created the Ontario Focused Intervention Partnership (OFIP) to provide additional support to schools that experienced particular difficulty in achieving continuous improvement. The OFIP program, although mandatory, was not designed to punish schools and teachers for poor student achievement, but to provide extra support and resources to schools with the largest proportions of struggling students. The LNS created three different levels of support for struggling schools: in OFIP 1 schools, fewer than 34% of students were meeting the provincial standard in reading; in OFIP 2 schools, between 34% and 50% of students were meeting the standard and achievement was either static or declining; in OFIP 3 schools, between 50% and 74% of students were meeting standard and achievement was either static or declining. The LNS provided funds and support for two years to OFIP 1 and 2 schools. They worked with schools and their boards to develop and implement improvement strategies tailored to their specific needs. Although the LNS provided guidance and support, principals’ discretion about the manner in which funds available to them would be used. OFIP 3 schools did not receive direct support from the LNS, but were eligible for board level support.

At the secondary level, the government pursued complementary education reforms under the ambit of its Student Success/Learning to 18 (SS/L18) strategy that had three main objectives: to
increase graduation rates to 85%; to diversify the learning opportunities available to students while ensuring that every student developed basic competencies in literacy and numeracy; and to ensure smooth transitions between every stage of schooling. The SS/L18 strategy included attention to the transition from elementary to secondary school, training and resources to build capacity for including literacy and numeracy instruction within the teaching of secondary school subjects, and increased opportunities and pathways for students to secondary school completion, (Zegarac & Franz, 2007).

The McGuinty reforms included provisions to manage teacher workloads while improving student outcomes. Thousands of new teachers and support workers were hired to decrease class sizes in the primary grades, to decrease high school teachers’ instructional time from 7 out of 8 to 6 out of 8 class periods, and to ensure that teachers had time to make use of instructional resources provided by the Ministry and by school boards. As well, two additional professional activity days were designated in the school year calendar to make time for the capacity building aspects of the reforms. Nonetheless, many teachers reported that the reforms had led to an increase in their workload.

A review of the LNS was conducted in 2008/2009. Many of the teachers who participated in the review raised concerns about the pace at which new initiatives were introduced (Audet et al., 2009). More than half of the teachers reported that new resources were being provided too quickly, and teachers at non-OFIP4 schools reported having insufficient support to implement new strategies. At OFIP schools, some teachers reported feeling overburdened by the demands of the OFIP program and noted the potential for teacher burnout. Increased workload was identified as a threat to the long term viability of the SS/L18 strategy in a 2007/2008 evaluation of the strategy (Ungerleider, 2008). Teachers who participated in the evaluation reported that the SS/L18 strategy had intensified their work. Teachers also indicated that the amount of mandated curriculum content was too large for the rigid timelines within which the content was expected to be taught. As well, a pan-Canadian survey of teachers conducted in 2006 revealed that 93% of Ontario teachers felt that their workload had increased as a result of recent reforms; however, a surprisingly large proportion (42%) of teachers indicated that they were satisfied with their current workload.

The Literacy and Numeracy and SS/L18 strategies were designed to leverage—rather than constrain—teacher professionalism. The strategies recognized professional knowledge and expertise, and were designed to build on existing successful practices by identifying teachers, programs, and schools achieving success and sharing their practices. Attending to student

---

4 OFIP: Ontario Focussed Intervention Program – a program to support schools with poor performance on the EQAO Grade 3 and Grade 6 tests.
success was mandatory for every schools board and every school, but there were no mandatory strategies imposed on schools or teachers. However, the teachers’ federations did express concern regarding teacher autonomy, and there were some areas in which teachers and principals may have felt constraints on their professional autonomy. For example, the Student Achievement Officers who worked with teachers at OFIP schools encouraged teachers to use specific strategies: differentiated instruction, shared reading, guided reading, formative assessment strategies, and dedicated blocks of instructional time for literacy. As well, there were a number of expectations common to all schools. The LNS worked with superintendents to ensure that all principals understood these expectations: articulating high expectations for all students; implementing blocks of uninterrupted literacy instruction; identifying and encouraging the use of a common literacy assessment instrument within each school board; assembling a School Improvement team to develop a school improvement plan aligned with the board improvement plan; using student data to inform teaching decisions; and ensuring that the instructional strategies advocated by the Student Achievement Officers were implemented (Klinger & Wade-Woolley, 2012). Nonetheless, teachers’ responses to the reforms were largely positive and suggested that they felt supported as professionals.

The LNS review concluded that a majority of teachers believed their knowledge and understanding of effective literacy practices had increased since the reforms were launched. The LNS strategy emphasized collaboration among teachers and the review indicated that most teachers found that collaboration to be highly influential on their teaching practice. The review also found that approximately half of teachers at OFIP schools believed that the LNS strategy had helped to improve student achievement (Audet et al., 2009). The evaluation of the SS/L18 strategy found that the strategy relied on teachers’ professional judgment and provided resources to support innovative approaches that teachers developed. The evaluation concluded that the strategy had encouraged professional autonomy and had led to an improved professional culture. Teacher comments to the evaluation team indicated that teachers felt increasingly valued and capable as professionals and as proactive agents of change (Ungerleider, 2008).

A pan-Canadian survey of teachers conducted in 2006 revealed that just over half (50.7%) of Ontario teachers believed that recent school reforms had had a positive effect on student learning, and a little under half (45%) believed that recent school reforms had had a positive effect on their professionalism. Nearly two-thirds (65.9%) felt that recent reforms had led to a decrease in their professional autonomy; however, nearly as many (63.3%) were satisfied with their professional autonomy.
Themes from the Literature
Some consistent themes emerge from the literature concerning the effects of centralized school reform on teacher workload and professionalism. Reforms of any type, whether government or teacher initiated, generally lead to an increase and/or a perceived increase in teacher workloads. Successful reform initiatives must include mechanisms to manage teacher workloads. But, even when serious attempts to manage teacher workload are made, teachers may still perceive an increase in their workload (as was the case in Ontario during the McGuinty era reforms). To address this issue, teachers must be personally involved in the management of their workload and principals must provide appropriate support and leadership. As suggested by Timperley and Robinson (2000), principals must guide teachers toward thinking systemically about their reform efforts, and teachers must work together in a critically collegial manner to hold each other accountable for ensuring that their efforts are directed toward agreed upon goals and that there is no unnecessary duplication of effort.

Centralized school reforms can have a negative impact on teacher professionalism, but the deskilling and deprofessionalization widely predicted to be an inevitable outcome of standards based reform have not been widely observed. With respect to their own professionalism, teachers are less concerned with the specifics of government policy and much more concerned with the nature of reform implementation as it occurs within their particular contexts. Principals play a critical role in mediating reform processes. When principals foster a culture of shared decision-making and of collegial collaboration among teachers, when teachers feel that they are trusted to use their professional judgment in conducting their daily work, then teachers retain a strong sense of professionalism.

The principal’s role in fostering a strong sense of professional collaboration among teachers is key to managing the workload and professionalism issues that can arise in the context of centralized school reform. It is also key to ensuring student success: the development of robust school-based professional communities are associated with several positive outcomes (Anderson, 2010), including successful reform implementation (Louis, Marks & Kruse, 1996), teacher learning (Grossman, Wineburg, & Woolworth, 2001), improved classroom practice (Elmore, Peterson, & McCarthey, 1996), and—most importantly—improved student learning (Louis & Marks, 1998).

The ETFO Teacher Workload and Professionalism Survey (ETFOTWPS)
The Elementary Teachers’ Federation of Ontario (ETFO) is an organization that represents approximately 76,000 teachers, occasional teachers, and education professionals employed in the public elementary schools of Ontario (http://www.etfo.ca/aboutetfo/pages/default.aspx).
Using as its basis the 2008 survey developed by the Organisation for International Co-operation and Development (OECD) for the Teaching and Learning International Survey, Directions developed the Elementary Teachers Federation of Ontario Teacher Workload and Professionalism Survey. The ETFOTWPS was developed to gather information about matters such as workload, professionalism, professional support, job and professional satisfaction, efficacy, the exercise of professional judgment and to explore relationships among these and related matters.

Prior to full implementation, Directions piloted the survey with five ETFO members from across the various regions of the province to ensure that the terminology employed in the survey was aligned with the terminology familiar to prospective respondents. The field test proved helpful in identifying problems with the intended flow of the survey and in clarifying the intention of questions and response categories. More than 25 modifications were made to the instrument on the basis of the feedback provided during the field test.

Directions made the electronic survey available to all active ETFO members (census approach) from February 10, 2014 to March 14, 2014. Directions elicited the assistance of ETFO in distributing the survey link to its members and sought ETFO’s assistance in encouraging its members to respond to the survey. The survey link was distributed through ETFO’s local association to 56,642 members, an unknown proportion of whom were occasional teachers, active full and part-time teachers, and teachers who were on leaves of absence of unknown duration.

Approximately 13.8% (7,841) of the 56,642 members for whom local associations had e-mail addresses responded to the survey. The average time spent on the survey was one hour and 10 minutes. Teachers were asked to indicate their employment status to identify those teachers employed on permanent full time contracts with no fixed end date, the group that, in this report is referred to as “respondents,” or “teachers” or “ETFO members.” Only 38% of those replying to the survey identified the school board with which they were affiliated. Directions weighted the responses so that the results accurately represent the characteristics of the population of which the respondents are a part, ensuring that the responses of all individuals were equivalent. Once weights were applied, the final data set included 2,774 weighted respondents.

**Survey Data Reduction**

The survey contained clusters of questions designed to identify such things as professionalism, classroom climate, satisfaction, disciplinary climate, academic climate, and the like. For example, the questions below are designed to determine the academic climate of the school.
Consider the school in which you worked last Tuesday and indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The primary mission of this school is that all students become proficient in core subjects.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers in this school emphasize that student performance can always be improved.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school supports all teachers in their efforts to improve student achievement.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the teachers in this school believe that students could reach standards and objectives.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school sets ambitious goals for student achievement.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff of this school value school improvement.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All teachers in this school assume responsibility for ensuring that all students learn.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school has an explicit statement of high expectations concerning student achievement.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rather than use the items individually, Directions employed exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to develop scales from the groups of questions intended to measure a particular topic and used the scales in its analyses. Fourteen scales were initially developed for use in the analyses (Table 1).

**Box 1: Factor Analysis**

Factor analysis is a method of data reduction that summarizes the data to make it easier to interpret. In a factor analysis, items are analyzed to determine if questions can be clustered together into coherent subgroups (e.g., for all the questions on professionalism, do multiple questions group together to measure a single underlying construct/concept on professionalism or a few different constructs?). For instance, for all the questions on professionalism, if they cohere into one group, that suggests that all the professionalism questions actually measure the same construct, but if they cohere into three groups, that suggests that the questions measure three independent aspects of professionalism. Exploratory factor analysis is a widely used statistical method for determining whether questions in a survey instrument can be grouped together, as well as determining how many groups of questions the instrument contains.
Table 1: Scales Developed for the Ontario Teacher Workload and Professionalism Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Name</th>
<th># of items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th># of factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Teaching Environment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Environment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Professionalism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Efficacy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Challenges</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Disciplinary Climate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Instruction</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Assessment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Shared Decision Making</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with the Profession</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Satisfaction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive use of Preparation Time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning Needs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsequent analyses determined that several of the scales were highly correlated with one another and, therefore, could be combined. For example, the correlation coefficient for the Satisfaction with the Profession Scale and the School Satisfaction Scale was .516. Those scales were combined in a single 14 item Satisfaction scale with a Cronbach’s Alpha of .84 and four factors. The Differentiated Instruction and the Differentiated Assessment scales were also highly correlated and, thus, were combined into a single Differentiated Practice Scale with 22 items, four factors and a Cronbach’s Alpha of .80. The Academic Environment and Student Orientation scales were correlated as well and were combined into a single Academic & Student Orientation Scale with 12 items, two factors, and a Cronbach’s Alpha of .88 (see Table 2).

---

5 Cronbach’s alpha is a commonly used psychometric technique to show the degree to which a set of survey questions measures the same concept/construct. Cronbach’s alpha ranges from .00 (indicating no consistency among survey questions) to 1.0 (indicating perfect consistency). An alpha value of .70 or higher is considered a satisfactory level of consistency (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).
## Table 2: Scales Combined to Create New Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Scales</th>
<th>New Scales</th>
<th># of items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th># of factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with the Profession</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Instruction</td>
<td>Differentiated Practice</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Environment</td>
<td>Academic &amp; Student Orientation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Box 2: Responses, Missing Data, Data imputation and Weighting Responses

### Survey Responses

6,973 teachers responded to the Ontario Teacher Workload and Professionalism Survey. 91% of the 6,973 respondents were teachers who indicated that they employed full-time on a permanent basis. The remaining respondents included teachers employed part time on permanent contracts (5.8%), teachers employed in long-term occasional assignments (2.4%) and teachers employed for daily occasional teaching assignments (1.2%).

### Missing Data

There was considerable variation among teachers in terms of the number of questions completed. As one might expect, there were fewer missing responses to questions at the beginning of the survey with the number of missing responses increasing as respondents worked their way through the questions. The proportion of missing responses ranged from 1-10% for demographic questions at the beginning of the survey, to 20-40% for questions about time spent on various professional activities, to approximately 60% for the questions at the end of the survey.

### Data Imputation

Missing data (i.e. when respondents answer some, but not all, of the questions) are problems that occur in many areas of research in general and in surveys in particular. Of the many ways of addressing missing data (e.g., list wise deletion, mean replacement, etc.), multiple imputation is one of the best procedures for preserving the relationships among the values in the data set and reducing bias (Allison, 2003; Collins, Schafer, & Kam, 2001; Enders, 2010; Graham, 2009; Schafer & Graham, 2002). Multiple imputation makes use of the computation of regressions lines of the variable with missing data with other observed variables.
Data imputation was applied to the dataset to determine whether and under what conditions it made sense to impute missing values. After extensive analyses, it was decided that, despite the fact that the distributions and means of the imputed and original data were very close, we were reluctant to use the former since many of the variables were missing data in half or more of the cases.

**Weighting Responses**

Weighting the responses helps to ensure that the results accurately represent the characteristics of the population of which the respondents are a part. To avoid bias or distortion of the results, it is desirable to ensure that the responses of all individuals are equivalent. We calculated the proportion of respondents in each board who responded to the survey as well as the proportion of ETFO members associated with each board. Because the number of respondents varied across school boards, weights were applied to individual responses to ensure equality among the views of teachers in different boards. Weights were calculated using the following formula: \[ \text{Weight} = \frac{(\text{ETFO members in the board} / \text{total ETFO members})}{(\text{ETFO members in the board responding to the survey} / \text{total ETFO members responding to the survey})}. \]

Only one third of respondents identified the school board with which they were associated. Once weights were applied, the final data set included 2,774 weighted respondents.

*Directions* restricted its analysis to teachers holding permanent, full-time teaching assignments to provide baseline information about the largest segment of the elementary teachers working in Ontario’s public school boards. As indicated earlier the survey canvassed a wide variety of issues and practices.

**Teacher Background Characteristics**

The survey asked teachers their gender, when they were born (age), and their prior education, including their major field of study.

There is approximately one male teacher for every five female teachers in that population. The average teacher in the population was born in 1970 and was 44 years of age when the survey was conducted (see Figure 2).
Less than one percent of the teachers have less than a 3- or 4-year university degree and almost 20% have a master’s or doctoral degree, 37% have a 5-year university degree and the remaining 43% have a 3 or 4-year university degree. Approximately one-third of the teachers majored in humanities disciplines, another 31% majored in the social sciences, 17% majored in education, nine percent majored in the sciences, and the remaining teachers majored in a smattering of disciplines (Figure 3).
The relationships between teacher background characteristics and teacher satisfaction were explored using regression analysis (see Box 2 for a description of multiple linear regression analyses used to examine relationships in this report). Gender, year of birth, level of education, and major field of study are not related to teacher satisfaction.

**Teaching Experience and Teacher Workload**

The average elementary teacher responding to the survey has taught for 15 years. They have had, on average, three years of experience working in other jobs after completing their university education and two years of experience working in other education roles (other than as a classroom teacher). The average teacher in the group has worked in the school in which s/he now teaches for 7.7 years (Table 3).
Table 3: Years of work experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of work experience</th>
<th>Mean Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years working in other jobs after completing your university education</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years working as a teacher in total</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years working in other education roles (not including years working as a classroom teacher)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years working as a teacher at this school</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elementary teachers spend, on average, 48 hours and 42 minutes in teaching related work each week, with the median teacher working 50 hours per week.\(^6\) Under the terms of their collective agreements, a daily instructional program is 300 minutes, excluding recesses and scheduled intervals between classes. In addition, teachers are typically entitled preparation time of 480 minutes per 10 day cycle during which they are free from classroom instruction and supervisory duties.

The average teacher responding to the survey spends 25 hours working on the tasks described in Table 4 below. Although very weakly correlated, all but three of these tasks exhibited an inverse relationship with satisfaction, meaning the more time teachers spent on the task, the less satisfied they were. The three exceptions were: team work and dialogue with teachers in this school, engaging in extra-curricular activities, and supervising a student teacher. The latter three activities were directly associated with satisfaction, meaning that the more time teachers spent on them, the higher their satisfaction. Though here, too, the relationships were also very weak.

---

\(^6\) The Teacher Workload and Professional Survey was available to ETFO members from February 7 to March 15, 2014. During this period, some of the teachers were preparing report cards.
Table 4: Distribution of Non-Instructional Teaching Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Mean hours : minutes</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual planning or preparation of lessons either at school or out of school</td>
<td>7:42</td>
<td>1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team work and dialogue with colleagues within this school</td>
<td>2:18</td>
<td>1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing, correcting, evaluating or marking student work</td>
<td>3:54</td>
<td>1793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling students (providing social or emotional support to students outside of the time devoted to teaching)</td>
<td>1:06</td>
<td>2164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student supervision outside of class (lunch room, hall or playground supervision, for example)</td>
<td>1:24</td>
<td>2032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General administrative work (including communication, paperwork, photocopying and other clerical duties you undertake in your job as a teacher)</td>
<td>2:36</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and co-operation with parents or guardians</td>
<td>1:18</td>
<td>2170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in extracurricular activities (e.g. sports, clubs, and cultural activities after school)</td>
<td>1:06</td>
<td>2154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing reports required by the principal, school board or ministry of education</td>
<td>2:12</td>
<td>2057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising a student teacher as the primary supervisor</td>
<td>0:30</td>
<td>2198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing extra help to students outside of class time</td>
<td>0:54</td>
<td>2165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classroom Challenges
To understand the composition of the classes for which respondents were responsible, teachers were asked to estimate the broad percentage of students who were low academic achievers, students with special needs (other than academically gifted), students with behaviour problems and student from socio-economically disadvantaged homes). For each category of students, teachers could indicate “none,” “10% or less,” “11-20%,” “21-40%,” “41-60%,” or “more than
Table 5: Classroom Challenges: Item Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of respondents (%)</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>10% or less</th>
<th>11-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>More than 60%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low academic achievers</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with special needs other than academically gifted.</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with behavioural problems</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from socio-economically disadvantaged homes</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses were combined in a scale that was labelled Classroom Challenges Scale (Figure 4). The scale ranged from a few if any classroom challenges (1.0) to an environment with many classroom challenges (6.0) with a mean of 3.2 and a median of 3.0 (SD = 1.02).

Figure 4: Classroom Challenges

Classroom Disciplinary Climate
Establishing and maintaining an orderly environment in which they can teach and students can learn is among the many challenging tasks facing teachers. Using a four-point Likert format ("strongly disagree," “disagree,” “agree,” or “strongly agree”), teachers responding to the survey were asked about their agreement with five statements about the disciplinary climate of the classrooms in which they worked:

- When the lesson begins, I have to wait quite a long time for students to quiet down. (reverse coded)
• Students in this class take care to create a pleasant learning atmosphere.
• I lose quite a lot of time because of students interrupting the lesson. (reverse coded)
• There is much disruptive noise in this classroom. (reverse coded)
• Students in this class know the routines and settle quickly to their learning (Table 6).

Despite the fact that 76.4% of the respondents said that students know the classroom routines and 73.2% said that students try to create a pleasant learning environment, slightly less than half of the teachers reported losing class time because of students interrupting lesson (44.6%). 38.3% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “there is much disruptive noise in this classroom” and 29.7% agreed or strongly agreed that “when the lesson begins, I have to wait a long time for students to quiet down.” These proportions suggest that it is likely that valuable instructional time is lost because some students are inattentive or disruptive for a variety of reasons.

**Table 6: Classroom Disciplinary Climate: Item Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Strongly disagree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Strongly agree</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When the lesson begins, I have to wait quite a long time for students to quiet down. (reversed)</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in this class take care to create a pleasant learning atmosphere.</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I lose quite a lot of time because of students interrupting the lesson. (reversed)</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is much disruptive noise in this classroom. (reversed)</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in this class know the routines and settle quickly to their learning.</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses to these five items were incorporated into a Classroom Disciplinary Climate Scale (Figure 5) that ranged from a low of 1.0 indicating a challenging disciplinary climate to a high of 4.0, indicating a classroom climate free of disciplinary challenges. The disciplinary climate in which the average and median teacher works ($M = 2.8; SD = .65$) is not entirely absent of disciplinary challenges.
Teachers' Feelings of Preparedness for Subject and Pedagogy
Teachers were asked to indicate how well prepared they felt in the content of the subjects that they teach and the pedagogy of the subjects they teach on a four-point Likert scale (not at all, somewhat, well, and very well).

Figure 6: Teachers' Feelings of Preparedness for Subject and Pedagogy

Figure 6 contains the data about teachers’ feelings of preparedness. Approximately 82% of teachers felt they were well or very well prepared for addressing the content of the subjects they teach and the pedagogical demands of their teaching assignments. The remaining 18%
were less confident in their preparedness. Slightly greater than 8% of the teachers said they did not feel prepared for either the content or pedagogical demands of their assignments. 3.6% of the teachers indicated they felt prepared in pedagogy only and 6.5% feel prepared only for the subjects they teach.

Comparison of individuals with different degrees indicated that there was no significant difference in the level of preparedness among teachers with Masters/ PhDs, 5 year, and 3-4 year university degrees ($X^2=7.33; p = .603; df = 9$)[Table 7].

Table 7: Teacher Feelings of Preparedness by Academic Degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Not prepared in both areas</th>
<th>Prepared in pedagogy only</th>
<th>Prepared in content only</th>
<th>Prepared in both areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s or Doctoral degree</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-year University degree</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4-year University degree</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a 3 or 4-year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of teachers who felt to be prepared in both content and pedagogy was higher for teachers with major in education (85% compared to approximately 76%-82% in other areas) [Table 8].

Table 8: Teacher Feelings of Preparedness by Undergraduate Academic Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Not prepared in both areas</th>
<th>Prepared in pedagogy only</th>
<th>Prepared in content only</th>
<th>Prepared in both areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Mathematics</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the other category contained an assortment of different undergraduate majors, we eliminated that category in an analysis of the relationship between preparedness and under
There was a significant association between teachers’ feelings of preparedness and their undergraduate major ($X^2 = 28.71; p = .001; df = 9$). An examination of the raw data indicated that undergraduate social science majors were over-represented among those who said they were not prepared in both areas. Among those teachers who said they were prepared only in pedagogy education and humanities majors were over-represented and social science majors under-represented. Among teachers who said they were prepared only in content education majors were under-represented and mathematics and science undergraduate majors were over-represented. Only education majors were slightly over-represented among those teachers who said they were prepared in both pedagogy and content.

**Teaching Efficacy**

Teaching efficacy is a scale that measures teachers’ confidence in their abilities. Teaching confidence is important because it has been linked to student achievement and to teacher satisfaction (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Borgoni, & Steca, 2003; Caprara, Barbaranelli, Steca & Malone, 2006). Teachers responding to the survey were asked to what extent they could do the following:

- Get students to believe they can do well in school work
- Help my students value learning
- Craft good questions for my students
- Control disruptive behaviour in the classroom
- Motivate students who show low interest in school work
- Make my expectations about student behaviour clear
- Help students think critically
- Get students to follow classroom rules
- Calm a student who is disruptive or noisy
- Use a variety of assessment strategies
- Provide an alternative explanation for example when students are confused
- Implement alternative instructional strategies in my classroom

They were able to respond to each of the items by indicating “not at all,” “to some extent,” “quite a bit,” and “a lot.” The teachers’ responses to each of the items are summarized in Table 9.
### Table 9: Teacher Efficacy: Item Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>% Not at all</th>
<th>% To some extent</th>
<th>% Quite a bit</th>
<th>% A lot</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get students to believe they can do well in school work</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help my students value learning</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate students who show low interest in school work</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get students to follow classroom rules</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control disruptive behaviour in the classroom</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make my expectations about student behaviour clear</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm a student who is disruptive or noisy</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students think critically</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft good questions for my students</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a variety of assessment strategies</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide an alternative explanation for example when students are confused</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement alternative instructional strategies in my classroom</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domains: student motivation (M), classroom management (CM), and teaching practices (P).

ETFO teachers were most confident about getting students to follow school rules (91.7%), making expectations about behaviour clear (96.9%), providing an alternative explanation (96.4%), and using a variety of assessment strategies (90%). They were least confident about motivating students who show low interest in school work (68%) and helping students think critically (81.6%).

The scale constructed from the teachers’ responses ranged from 1.8, indicating a low level of confidence in their abilities, to 4.0, indicating a high level of confidence. The mean scale score, the median and the mode were each very close to 3.3 ($SD = .45$). The data for this scale are represented in Figure 7 below. The ETFO teachers responding to the survey exhibit high levels of confidence in their abilities.
Figure 7: Teacher Efficacy Scale
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**Teacher Professionalism**

Teachers were provided with a four point Likert-type scale and asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with the following statements:

- Teaching has a shared body of professional knowledge that should be common to all of us.
- I prefer to work alone. My classroom is uniquely mine and I do things my way whenever I can. (reversed scored)
- Having common professional standards in teaching is important.
- I enjoy working collaboratively with my colleagues on school improvement initiatives.
- I enjoy working collaboratively with my colleagues on professional learning.

Table 10 contains the responses to each of the items on the Teacher Professional Scale. There are very high levels of agreement among ETFO members that teaching has a shared body of professional knowledge that should be common to all teachers (95.4%); that having common professional standards in teaching is important (98%); that they enjoy working collaboratively with their colleagues on school improvement initiatives (83%), and with their colleagues on professional learning (91.4%). Less than 25% of the respondents say that they prefer to work alone, doing things their own way whenever they can (23.4%).
Table 10: Teacher Professionalism: Item Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>% Strongly disagree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Strongly agree</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching has a shared body of professional knowledge that should be common to all of us.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having common professional standards in teaching is important.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to work alone. My classroom is uniquely mine and I do things my way whenever I can.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy working collaboratively with my colleagues on school improvement initiatives.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy working collaboratively with my colleagues on professional learning.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domains: common standards in teaching (S); collaborative work (C).

A scale was constructed from the teachers’ responses to these items (Figure 8). As indicated earlier, the scale yielded a Chronbach’s Alpha of 0.67, less robust than many of the other scales employed but, nonetheless, regarded as acceptable. The lower Chronbach’s Alpha for this scale was likely a consequence of having relatively few items and less inter-relatedness among the items. Scores on the scale ranged from a low of 1.6 to a high of 4.0 with a mean of 3.17, a median of 3.2 and a mode of 3.0 ($SD = .42$).

Figure 8: Teacher Professionalism
The teachers responding to the teacher professionalism and workload survey exhibited high levels of professionalism, reflecting their beliefs in the value of common professional standards, common professional knowledge and collaborative work.

**Collaborative Teaching Environment**
Where Teacher Professionalism was designed to ascertain teacher beliefs, the Collaborative Teaching environment scale was designed to ascertain the frequency with which teachers collaborated. Teachers were presented with 12 items and asked how frequently they engaged in each practice (“never,” “once a year or less,” “2-4 times a year,” “5-10 times a year,” “1-3 times a month,” and “once a week or more”). The practices about which teachers were asked were:

- Teach jointly as a team in the same class
- Observe other teachers’ classes and provide feedback
- Engage in joint activities or projects that involve different classes or age groups.
- Exchange teaching materials with colleagues
- Engage in discussions about the learning development of specific students
- Work with other teachers in my school to ensure common standards in evaluations for assessing student progress
- Attend team conferences
- Take part in collaborative professional learning
- Share my teaching materials with others
- Review data from diagnostic assessments to improve instruction
- Review data from EQAO assessments to improve instruction
- Meet with colleagues to discuss instructional improvement

Table 11 contains the responses to the individual items that make up the scale which includes two clusters or groups of items. The majority of items fall into the cluster of items describing collaborative activities (C) and the rest into a cluster that describes sharing materials with colleagues.

More than 70% of the respondents indicate that they share materials (72.1%) or exchange materials (76.7%) with other teachers from one to three times per month or more. In fact, 53.2% said that the share teaching materials with others at least once a week and 47.3% said they exchange materials with other teachers at least once a week. Approximately 70% of respondents said that they are engaged in discussions about the learning development of specific students at least one to three times a week or more often with nearly half (49.2%) saying that do so once per week or more frequently. More than half of the respondents (62.2%) indicated that they had never observed other teacher’s classes and provided feedback. Slightly
less than half (45.2%) indicated that they had never taught jointly as a team with another teacher in the same class.

**Table 11: Collaborative Teaching Environment: Item Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>% Never</th>
<th>% Once a year of less</th>
<th>% 2-4 times a year</th>
<th>% 5-10 times a year</th>
<th>% 1-3 times a month</th>
<th>% Once a week or more</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teach jointly as a team in the same class</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe other teachers’ classes and provide feedback</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in joint activities or projects that involve different classes or age groups.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in discussions about the learning development of specific students</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with other teachers in my school to ensure common standards in evaluations for assessing student progress</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend team conferences</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take part in collaborative professional learning</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review data from diagnostic assessments to improve instruction</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review data from EQAO assessments to improve instruction</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with colleagues to discuss instructional improvement</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange teaching materials with colleagues</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share my teaching materials with others.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domains: sharing materials (S); collaborative activities (C).

The Collaborative Teaching Environment Scale had a range from 1.0 (little if any collaboration) to 6.0 (high levels of collaboration) [Figure 9]. Notwithstanding the fact that collaboration is limited by the opportunities available, teachers responding to the survey characterized the environments in which they worked as more collaborative than less, with a mean of 3.7 and a median of 3.7 (SD = .88).
Differentiated Practice
The survey gathered information about the instructional and assessment practices that teacher employed in the classroom throughout the year. Teachers were asked how often each of the following practices takes place during the year ("never or almost never," "occasionally," "frequently, or “In all or nearly all lessons”).

- I present a summary of recently learned content.
- Students work in small groups to come up with a joint solution to a problem or task.
- I give different work to the students who have difficulties learning and/or to those who can advance faster.
- I refer to a problem from everyday life or work to demonstrate why new knowledge is useful.
- I let students practice similar tasks until I know that every student has understood the subject matter.
- I check my students’ work.
- Students work on projects that require at least one week to complete.
- Students use Information and communication technology (ICT) for projects or class work.
- I encourage students to define problems and evaluate solutions to them.
- I encourage students to select the focus of their study.
- I review data from standardized assessments to improve instruction.
- I develop and administer my own assessments.
- I administer a standardized test.
- I have individual students answer questions
- I provide written feedback on student work in addition to a mark, i.e. numeric score or letter grade.
- I let students evaluate their own progress.
- I observe students when working on particular tasks and provide immediate feedback.
- I have students discuss and assess their work in pairs or small groups.
- I administer diagnostic assessments.
- I administer quizzes.
- I assign project work that I assess.
- I provide regular, oral feedback on student work in addition to a mark, i.e. numeric score or letter grade.

The scale addresses a wide range of practices: student-centered teaching, information feedback, standardized assessments, teacher-made assessment practices (e.g., quizzes), project-based teaching practices, etc. Teachers in the survey reported using quite a few of the practices with “frequently” or “in all or nearly all lessons” (Table 12). These included checking students’ work (94.8%), observing students and providing immediate feedback (84.1%), providing regular oral feedback in addition to a mark (88.8%), administering assessments created by the teacher (86.7%), and using everyday problems to demonstrate why new knowledge is useful (82.3%).

Since they are not administered at all grade levels, it is not surprising that nearly half (48.2%) of the respondents said they had never or almost never administered standardized assessments. However, more than a quarter of the respondents (28.5%) said they never or almost never review data from standardized assessments for the purpose of improving instruction. This implied to us that discussion of the implications of the results of standardized assessments for instructional improvement had not included all teachers regardless of their particular teaching assignment.
Table 12: Differentiated Practice Scale: Item Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>% Never or almost never</th>
<th>% Occasionally</th>
<th>% Frequently</th>
<th>% In all or nearly all lessons</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I present a summary of recently learned content.</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work in small groups to come up with a joint solution to a problem or task.</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give different work to the students who have difficulties learning and/or to those who can advance faster.</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I refer to a problem from everyday life or work to demonstrate why new knowledge is useful.</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I let students practice similar tasks until I know that every student has understood the subject matter.</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I check my students’ work.</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work on projects that require at least one week to complete.</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students use Information and communication technology (ICT) for projects or class work.</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage students to define problems and evaluate solutions to them.</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage students to select the focus of their study.</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I review data from standardized assessments to improve instruction.</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I develop and administer my own assessments.</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I administer a standardized test.</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have individual students answer questions</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide written feedback on student work in addition to a mark, i.e. numeric score or letter grade</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I let students evaluate their own progress.</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I observe students when working on particular tasks and provide immediate feedback.</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have students discuss and assess their work in pairs or small groups.</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I administer diagnostic assessments.</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I administer quizzes.</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I assign project work that I assess.</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide regular, oral feedback on student work in addition to a mark, i.e. numeric score or letter grade</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These 22 items formed the Differentiated Practice Scale with a range from 1 (low) to 4 (high) and a mean and median of 2.69 ($SD = .32$) [Figure 10].
Academic & Student Orientation
The survey inquired about the relative emphasis placed upon student academic achievement and an orientation to students in the schools in which they worked. Respondents to the survey were asked to indicate their agreement with the following statements about the school:

- The primary mission of this school is that all students become proficient in core subjects.
- Teachers in this school emphasize that student performance can always be improved.
- This school supports all teachers in their efforts to improve student achievement.
- All of the teachers in this school believe that students could reach standards and objectives.
- This school sets ambitious goals for student achievement.
- The staff of this school value school improvement.
- All teachers in this school assume responsibility for ensuring that all students learn.
- This school has an explicit statement of high expectations concerning student achievement.
- In this school, teachers and students usually work well with each other.
- Most teachers in this school believe that the students’ well-being is important.
- Most teachers in this school are interested in what students have to say.
- If a student from this school needs extra learning assistance, the school provides it.

Responses to the individual items making up the scale are presented in Table 13.
Table 13: Academic and Student Orientation: responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Strongly disagree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Strongly agree</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The primary mission of this school is that all students become proficient in core subjects.</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers in this school emphasize that student performance can always be improved.</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school supports all teachers in their efforts to improve student achievement.</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the teachers in this school believe that students could reach standards and objectives.</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school sets ambitious goals for student achievement.</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff of this school value school improvement.</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All teachers in this school assume responsibility for ensuring that all students learn.</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school has an explicit statement of high expectations concerning student achievement.</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this school, teachers and students usually work well with each other.</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most teachers in this school believe that the students’ well-being is important.</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most teachers in this school are interested in what students have to say.</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a student from this school needs extra learning assistance, the school provides it.</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents to the survey agree or strongly agree that the teachers in their school believe that student well-being is important (97.9%). In a similar manner, 92.7% of the teachers said that most teachers in the school were interested in what students have to say and that teachers and students usually work well with each other (92.0%).

Respondents believe that the staffs in their schools value school improvement (82.6%) and that the teachers in the school emphasize that student performance can be improved (81.6%). However only 60.7% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that “all of the teachers in this school believe that students could reach standards and objectives” regardless of the fact that 77.8% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that “if a student from this school needs extra learning assistance, the school provides it.”

Responses to the Academic and Student Orientation Scale ranged from 1.25 (low) to 4.00 (high) [Figure 11]. The mean and median were very near 3.00 . The majority of schools in which respondents were characterized by an environment in which students and teachers work
well together, where teachers are interested in what students have to say and in their well-being and where students who need extra help are able to obtain it. These schools are ones in which the majority of staff takes responsibility for student learning, achievement and improvement.

**Figure 11: Academic and Student Orientation**
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**Teacher Use of Preparation Time at School**

Teachers were asked to think about their use of preparation time at school and indicate the frequency (“never,” “seldom,” “sometimes,” “frequently,” “always”) with which they engage in the following activities:

- assessing and evaluating student work;
- meeting with other teachers or professionals to discuss student’s learning;
- meeting with other teachers to do collaborative planning;
- talking with other teachers about things that frustrate me;
- meeting with the principal or vice-principal to discuss my concerns about students;
- telephoning or emailing parents;
- looking for teaching resources;
- using social media to communicate with parents or guardians; and
- maintaining a web site for your classroom (Table 14).
Table 14: Teacher use of preparation time at school: Item Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>% Never</th>
<th>% Seldom</th>
<th>% Sometimes</th>
<th>% Frequently</th>
<th>% Always</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assess and evaluate student work</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with other teachers or professionals to discuss student’s learning</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with other teachers to do collaborative planning</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk with other teachers about things that frustrate me</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with the principal or vice-principal to discuss my concerns about students</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone or email parents</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look for teaching resources</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using social media to communicate with parents or guardians</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a web site for your classroom</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 contains the teachers’ responses to the question about how they use their preparation time at school. As might be expected, teachers said that they frequently or always use their preparation to at school to assess and evaluate student work (73.3%) and to look for teaching resources (72%). Slightly more than a third of the teachers responding to the survey said they frequently or always used their preparation time at school to talk with other teachers about the things that frustrated them (37.0%), meet with other teachers or professionals to discuss student learning (35.1%), or to telephone or e-mail parents (34.4%). Only about one fifth of the teachers said that they frequently or always used their preparation time at school to meet with other teachers to do collaborative planning (21.7%) or to meet with the principal of vice principal to discuss concerns about students (21.7%). Despite the attention devoted to social media, only 19.8% of teachers said they frequently or always used their preparation time to maintain a web site for their classrooms and less than 10% said they used social media to communicate with parents or guardians frequently or always during their at-school preparation time.

The teacher’s responses to these items were combined in a scale that ranged from 1.5 (low) to 4.9 (high), with mean and median of 3.1 (SD = .48) (Figure 12). Cronbach’s Alpha for this scale was .65, which is regarded as an acceptable level of reliability.
Figure 12: Productive Use of Planning Time Scale

Satisfaction
E.M. Skaalvik and S. Skaalvik (2010) define job satisfaction as “positive or negative evaluative judgements people make about their job” (p. 1061). In the teaching profession, satisfaction with job and profession significantly contributes to teachers’ level of motivation and occupational commitment, teachers’ enthusiasm, retention, and relationships with students, which in turn positively influence student motivation and achievement (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Canrinus, Helms-Lorenz, Beijaard, Buitink, & Hofman, 2012; Landsman, 2001; E.M. Skaalvik & S. Skaalvik, 2010).

This survey explored teachers’ satisfaction by asking the respondents to express their agreement with 14 statements about their satisfaction with the profession and work:

- The advantages of being a teacher clearly outweigh the disadvantages.
- If I could decide again, I would still choose to work as a teacher.
- I would like to change to another school if that were possible. (reversed)
- I regret that I decided to become a teacher. (reversed)
- I enjoy working at this school.
- I wonder whether it would have been better to choose another profession. (reversed)
- I would recommend my school as a good place to work.
- I think that the teaching profession is valued in society.
- I am satisfied with my performance in this school.
- All in all, I am satisfied with my job.
- I prefer to work alone in my classroom. (reversed)
- I welcome suggestions about teaching from my colleagues.
- I like working with my colleagues on teaching tasks such as planning and assessment.
- I think teachers are valued by parents in this school.

A four-point Likert format (“strongly disagree,” “disagree,” “agree,” or “strongly agree”) was used. Four of the 14 items were negatively worded. The items on the scale addressed: job satisfaction (JS), satisfaction with the current school as a place of employment (SS), relationships with colleagues (R), and the value assigned to the teaching profession by parents and society at large (V)(Table 15).

82.14% of the teachers surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that, if they were to make the decision again, they would still work as a teacher. This is consonant with the 79.2% of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that the advantages of being a teacher clearly outweigh the disadvantages. However, 34.0% of the respondents wondered whether it would have been better to choose another profession and 7.3% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “I regret that I decided to become a teacher.”

96.6% of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “I welcome suggestions about teaching from my colleagues.” This, too, is consonant with the 88.6% who said that they liked working with their colleagues on teaching tasks such as planning and assessment.

92.6% of the respondents agree or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their performance in the school in which they were currently teaching, and 88.6% indicated agreement with the statement “I enjoy working at this school.” 75.5% agreed or strongly agreed that they would describe the school in which they were working as a good place to work. However, 29.3% agreed or strongly agreed that they would like to change to another school if it were possible.

70.1% of the teachers surveyed agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “I think teachers are valued by parents in this school. However, only 31.7% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “I think that they teaching profession is valued in society.”
Table 15: Satisfaction: Item Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>% Strongly disagree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Strongly agree</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I wonder whether it would have been better to choose another profession. (reversed)</td>
<td>JS</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I could decide again, I would still choose to work as a teacher.</td>
<td>JS</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The advantages of being a teacher clearly outweigh the disadvantages.</td>
<td>JS</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I regret that I decided to become a teacher. (reversed)</td>
<td>JS</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in all, I am satisfied with my job.</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to change to another school if that were possible. (reversed)</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy working at this school.</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend my school as a good place to work.</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my performance in this school.</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to work alone in my classroom.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I welcome suggestions about teaching from my colleagues.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like working with my colleagues on teaching tasks such as planning and assessment.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that the teaching profession is valued in society.</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think teachers are valued by parents in this school.</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domains: job satisfaction (JS), satisfaction with the current school as a place of employment (SS), relationships with colleagues (R), the value assigned to the teaching profession by parents and society at large (V)

The responses were combined in a scale that was labelled Satisfaction and ranged from 1.2 to 4.0 with a mean of 2.98 and a median of 3.0 (SD = .43) (Figure 13). Cronbach’s Alpha for this scale was .84, which is regarded as a high level of reliability.
Shared or distributed leadership or shared or distributed decision making refer to contexts in which school decisions are made by the principal or vice principals as well as classroom teachers, parents and students (see, for example, Harris, 2008; Harris, 2012; Leithwood, Mascall, & Strauss, 2009; Smylie et al., 2007). Shared leadership, an alternative to transitional forms of school governance, involves expanding the decision-making roles to include staff, teachers, parents and students in the school decision making. According to Printy and Marks (2006), “where schools have the benefit of shared instructional leadership, faculty members offer students their best effort and students respond in kind; they are organizations that learn and perform at high levels” (p. 130)

The School Shared Decision Making Scale used in this project, included 5 questions, that used a four-point Likert format (with response option ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”) to measure teachers’ agreements with the statements regarding decision-making practices used in the school. These included:

- This school provides teachers with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions.
- This school provides parents or guardians with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions.
- This school provides students with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions.
• This school has a culture of shared responsibility for school issues.
• There is a collaborative school culture which is characterised by mutual support.

There was considerable variation in the responses to the items about “opportunities for participation in school decisions” contained in the School Shared Decision Making Scale (Table 16). 74.2% of the teachers responding to the survey agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that parents or guardians have such opportunities, but the level of agreement (agree or strongly agree responses) declines to 54.6% for teacher participation and to 43.0% for students. More than half of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed that their school had a culture of shared responsibility (52.5%) and a collaborative school culture based on mutual support (56.6%).

Table 16: School Shared Decision Making Scale: Item Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>% Strongly disagree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Strongly Agree</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This school provides teachers with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions.</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school provides parents or guardians with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions.</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school provides students with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions.</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school has a culture of shared responsibility for school issues.</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a collaborative school culture which is characterised by mutual support.</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The School Shared Decision Making Scale scores ranged from 1 (low) to 4 (high), with a mean of 2.5 and median of 2.6 ($SD = .61$) (Figure 14). Cronbach’s alpha for this Scale was .85, indicating its high internal consistency.
Teacher Professional Learning
Teacher professional learning is seen as one of the factors influencing student learning and success (Broad & Evans, 2006; Schmoker, 2006). Evidence suggests that teacher performance improves when the quality of their peers improves within the same school and that less experienced teachers are more sensitive to the impact of improvements in peer quality. Such improvement is likely related to teachers learning from their peers or learning as a consequence of peer pressure (Jackson & Bruegmann, 2009).

Teachers have different professional learning needs throughout their careers as their understanding of teaching, learning and students, practices and tools changes (Feiman-Nemser 2001; Huberman, 1995). Moreover, as the practice of teaching becomes more complex, teachers need to continue develop new pedagogical and content competencies (Broad & Evans, 2006).

Induction
Ministries of education and school boards are becoming increasingly attuned to the importance of helping those recently employed adjust to their responsibilities. Often these take the form of formal or informal induction programs. Ontario’s New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP), begun on September 2006, is designed to support the professional growth of new teachers by providing for their initial orientation to the school and school boards in which they are employed, providing mentoring by experienced teachers, and offering professional development in such areas as literacy and numeracy, safe school, and classroom management (see for example http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/teacher/induction.html). However, the
majority of teachers participating in the survey indicated that they did not have the benefit of participating in either a formal or informal introduction program; only 12.2% said that they were taking or had taken part in an induction program (Figure 15). This, of course, reflects that fact that the vast majority of teachers were employed prior to the establishment of the NTIP.

**Figure 15: Percentage of teachers participated in an induction program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I took part or am currently taking part in an induction program.</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I took part or am taking part in informal induction activities not part of an induction program.</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I took part or am taking part in a general and/or administrative introduction to the school.</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mentoring and supervision**

Mentoring and supervisory relationships involve more experienced and more knowledgeable practitioners helping to guide the practice of less experienced and less knowledgeable practitioners. Of the 2519 teachers who completed questions about mentoring and coaching, 19.5% reported serving as a mentor/coach to one or more teachers at the time of the survey and 5% of respondents reported having an assigned mentor who supported them. Slightly less than a third of the respondents served as a student teacher supervisor in the past 12 months, either as sole supervisor (27.3%) or as a co-supervisor who shared that responsibility with one or more teachers (3.6%).

**Professional learning activities**

Professional learning typically refers to opportunities for broadening and deepening one’s professional practice. Over the course of the year, teachers tend to participate in a wide range of professional activities both during the school day as well as outside of their working hours. In the 12 months prior to the survey, the teachers participated in a number of professional learning activities during the school day, including courses and workshops (85.2%), education conferences (36.9%), and various observation visits (31.3%) (Figure 16).
Teachers also participate in professional learning activities on their own time. To explore the topic further, teachers were provided with a list of six activities and were invited to identify the activities in which they had been engaged during the 12 months prior to the survey:

- Course work provided by a college or university (not including AQ courses)
- Additional Qualification program (AQ)
- Mentoring and/or peer observation and coaching as part of a formal school arrangement
- Collaborative research on a topic of professional interest.
- Participation in a network of teachers formed specifically for the professional learning of teachers
- Individual research on a topic of professional interest

Teachers had been engaged in a wide variety of activities. 55.2% of teachers had conducted individual research on a topic of professional interest, 49.9% had participated in a professional learning network, and slightly less than one quarter of the respondents had been enrolled in additional qualification program (21.9%) (Figure 17).
Figure 17: Professional Learning Activities in which Teachers Were Engaged on their own Time during the 12 months prior to the Survey

The number of professional learning activities in which teachers had engaged ranged from none to six (Figure 18). The majority of teachers focused on one or two activities during the year.

Figure 18: Number of Activities Attended by Teachers During the Year
Teachers were asked to consider all of the professional learning activities in which they had been engaged during the current school year and indicate what percentage of time they had spent was initiated by the ministry, the school board, the union, a collective decision of staff, principal or vice principal, themselves, etc. As can be seen in Figure 19, on average, 32.7% of teachers’ professional learning time was spent on activities initiated by school boards, 24.8% of the professional learning time was self-initiated, 19.6% was school principal or vice-principal initiated, 14.9% was initiated by the ministry, 6.5% was initiated by a collective decision of the staff, and 5.4% was initiated by their union, etc.

**Figure 19: Percentage of Professional Learning Time Spent by Source**

Teachers were also invited to identify the topical foci of their professional learning activities in the past 12 months by selecting them from a list provided in the survey:

- Knowledge and understanding of my subject field(s)
- Pedagogical competencies in teaching my subject field(s)
- Knowledge of the curriculum
- Student evaluation and assessment practices
- Information and communication technology (ICT) skills for teaching
- Student behaviour and classroom management
- School management and administration
- Approaches to individualized learning
- Teaching students with special needs
- Teaching in a diverse setting
- Teaching cross-curricular skills

Teachers were asked to indicate if they had participated in a professional learning activity on the topic and to indicate the magnitude of its impact on their teaching using a scale that included “none,” “small,” “medium,” and “large.” The number of topics ranged from 1 (3.2% of teachers) to 11 (4.2%) with an average of 5.6 (median = 5, mode = 5) (Figure 20).

**Figure 20: Number of Professional Learning Topics in which Teachers Were Engaged**

The topics most frequently addressed were subject-specific knowledge (77.8%), subject-specific pedagogical competencies (74.6%), and student evaluation and assessment (72.2%). School management and administration were among the topics addressed least frequently (15.5%).

Figure 21 represents the percentage of teachers engaged with each of the topics and the percentage of the teachers engaged with the topic that report that their engagement had no impact on their teaching. Activities devoted to subject-specific knowledge, pedagogical competencies and assessment were attended by the majority of respondents and had the smallest proportions of teachers who said that the topic had no impact on their teaching. On the other hand, of the 26.6% of respondents engaged with the topic of classroom management, nearly two-thirds (63.3%) said that their engagement with the topic had no impact on their teaching.
Figure 21: Percentage of Teachers Engaged with Topic and Percentage of Teachers Engaged who Report that the Topic had not Impact on Their teaching

The teachers’ appraisal of the impact of the professional learning activities on their teaching ranged from 1 (no impact) to 4 (large impact), with a mean impact rating of 2.2 and median of 2.1 ($SD = .67$), suggesting that the overall impact of these activities was considered small (Figure 22).
The primary support for professional learning comes in the form of scheduled time for activities during the school day. Most of the support comes from the school board employing the teacher (Figure 23), but the Ministry of Education and ETFO also provide support. In the 12 months preceding the survey, 80.3% of teachers reported receiving such scheduled time from their school board while 19.5% and 21.2% of respondents received such time from the Ministry of Education and ETFO, respectively. Teacher received much more limited support in the form of reimbursement for transportation and meals. The majority of this support came from ETFO (21.7%) and school boards (16%). Small percentages of teachers reported receiving non-monetary support for activities outside their working hours including reduced teaching load, days off, and study leave. Full or partial reimbursement for participation in AQ courses and other course fees was received primarily from ETFO (12%) with some support from boards (3.1%) and the Ministry (0.2%).

Range: 1 = none; 4 = large
Figure 23: Sources of Support for Professional Learning Activities

Of the professional learning activities in which teachers participated during the previous 12 months, 92.3% involved their colleagues, 87.6% active learning, and 82.9% opportunities for collaboration with colleagues (Figure 24). 73.0% of the activities were distributed over an extended period of time. Less than 20% of the activities were demonstrations, presentations, or seminars held via video-conferencing.
Figure 24: Logistics of Professional Learning Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Learning Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A group of colleagues from my school or subject group</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for active learning methods (not only listening to a lecturer)</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative learning activities or research with other teachers</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An extended time-period (several occasions spread out over several weeks or months)</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars or discussions held via teleconference or video conference</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrations or presentations held via videoconference</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers were asked to undertake a self-appraisal and indicate the degree to which they desired professional learning in areas indicated below on a four point Likert scale (ranging from “no need at present” to “high level or need”):

- Knowledge and understanding of my subject field(s)
- Pedagogical competencies in the subjects I teach
- Knowledge of the curriculum
- Student evaluation and assessment practices
- Information and communication technology (ICT) skills for teaching
- Student behaviour and classroom management
- School management and administration
- Approaches to individualised learning
- Teaching students with special needs
- Teaching in a diverse setting
- Teaching cross-curricular skills (e.g. problem solving, learning-to-learn, critical thinking)
- New technologies in the workplace
- Student career guidance and counselling.
The professional learning needs of ETFO members are varied (Figure 25). Information technology was an area receiving moderate or high need ratings. Teachers were interested in learning about new technologies in the workplace (70.1%) and information and communication skills (ICT) for teaching (67.7%). Nearly half of the respondents indicated moderate or high needs for teaching cross-curricular skills (47.5%), teaching students with special needs (46.0%), and student evaluation and assessment practices (44.5%).

**Figure 25: Professional Learning Needs (moderate and high ratings combined)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School management and administration</th>
<th>16.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student career guidance and counselling</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student behaviour and classroom management</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and understanding of my subject field(s)</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical competencies in the subjects I teach</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching in a diverse setting</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the curriculum</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluation and assessment practices</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches to individualised learning</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching students with special needs</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching cross-curricular skills</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT skills for teaching</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New technologies in the workplace</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey also asked teachers about their perception of the barriers that prevented them from participating in professional learning activities. Teachers were provided with the list of the common potential barriers to professional learning and asked to express their agreement with the statements with a four-point Likert format (with response options ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”):

- I do not have the pre-requisites (e.g., qualifications, experience, seniority).
- Professional learning/development is too expensive/ unaffordable.
- There is a lack of employer support.
- Professional learning/development conflicts with my work schedule.
- I do not have time because of family responsibilities.
There are no relevant professional learning activities offered.

There are no incentives for participating in such activities.

Of the 2536 respondents to the survey, only 6.3% indicated that they did not have the pre-requisites such as qualifications, experience or seniority (Figure 26). Time, money, work schedules and the lack of incentives were identified as the top four barriers by more than 60% of teachers.

Figure 26: Barriers to Teachers’ Participation in Professional Learning

- There are no incentives for participating in such activities. 67.3%
- I do not have time because of family responsibilities. 66.4%
- Professional learning/development conflicts with my work schedule. 64.1%
- Professional learning/development is too expensive/affordable. 63.6%
- There is a lack of employer support. 45.1%
- There are no relevant professional learning activities offered. 31.1%
- I do not have the pre-requisites (e.g. qualifications, experience, seniority). 6.3%
Box 3: Logistic regression

Logistic regression is a statistical technique used to test whether independent variables can predict the outcome of a dependent variable that has two binary categories (yes or no; high or low; right or wrong). In addition to indicating whether the differences detected are significant, logistic regression produces an odds ratio for each of the predictor variables. The odds ratio indicates how much of a difference in the outcome is produced by the predictor variable. The difference is expressed as a numerical value less than or greater than 1.

Imagine that a school is interested to know whether gender and participation on a school team will predict whether students will earn a scholarship (yes or no). Suppose both gender (male or female) and participation on a school team (yes or no) are significant predictors and the values assigned to each are .5 and 2.5. In this example the value for gender (.5) is for males compared to females, indicating that males are half as likely as females to earn a scholarship. The values for participation on a school team is 2.5 indicating that those who participate are 2.5 times as likely to earn a scholarship than those who do not.

Calculating the probability of male and female participants and non-participants earning a scholarship would be:

Male (.5) non-participant (1) = .5
Male (.5) participant (2.5) = 1.25
Female (1) non-participant (1) = 1.0
Female (1) participant (2.5) = 2.5

Exploring Relationships

As explained earlier, the teacher workload and professionalism study was designed to gather information about matters such as workload, professionalism, professional support, job and professional satisfaction, efficacy, and the exercise of professional judgment and to explore relationships among these and related matters. The word explore is used intentionally because the study was not designed to test theories or to test specific hypotheses. Directions phrased its explorations as questions to signal the exploratory nature of the analyses.

This section compares two groups of teachers; those who, relative to their peers, expressed high levels of satisfaction and those who expressed low levels of satisfaction. Directions identified these two categories of teachers based upon their responses to the questions on the Teacher Satisfaction Scale. The mean score on the Satisfaction Scale was 2.98 with scores that ranged from 1.0 to 4.0. 68% of the teachers fall between a score of 2.55 and 3.41. One group
was made up of teachers whose total scale score placed them one standard deviation below the mean on the Teacher Satisfaction Scale (low satisfaction = <2.55). The other group was made up of those teachers whose score placed them one standard deviation above the mean (high satisfaction = >3.41).

**Does a teacher’s gender, age, degree, undergraduate major or feelings of preparedness predict high satisfaction?**
Logistic regression was employed to determine whether any of these variables would predict high satisfaction. Four of the variables were significant predictors. Males were approximately half as likely as females to be in the high satisfaction group ($p = .000; \text{Exp}(B) = .459$) in contrast to the low satisfaction group. Younger teachers were less likely to be in the high satisfaction group than older teachers ($p = .000; \text{Exp}(B) = .963$). Teachers who feel they are prepared in the subjects they teach and in pedagogy are more than nine times as likely to be in the high satisfaction group ($p = .000; \text{Exp}(B) = 9.785$) than the low satisfaction group when compared with teachers who do not feel prepared in either area. Teachers who only feel prepared in the subjects they teach (not the pedagogy) are five times as likely to be in the high satisfaction category ($p = .000; \text{Exp}(B) = 5.084$) than those teachers who do not feel prepared in either area. Although teachers who felt prepared in pedagogy were more than twice as likely to be in the high satisfaction category than the low satisfaction category compared with teachers who did not feel prepared in either area, the difference was not significant ($p = .105; \text{Exp}(B) = 2.356$).

**Does a teacher’s work experience predict teacher satisfaction?**
Respondents to the survey were asked how many years of experience they had working as a teacher in the school where they were working at the time they completed the survey, working as a teacher, working in other education roles (other than as a classroom teacher), and working in other jobs after completing their university education. Responses to these questions were used in a logistic regression to predict high levels of satisfaction. Two of the four variables were significant predictors of high versus low teacher satisfaction. Every additional year of teaching increases the chances that a teacher will be in the high satisfaction as opposed to the low satisfaction category by a factor of 1.032 ($p = .009$). With every additional year of teaching in the same school, a teacher is 1.034 times more likely to be highly satisfied than dissatisfied ($p = .044$).

**Does a teacher’s mean score on any of the scales predict high satisfaction?**
Logistic regression was also used to determine whether high satisfaction can be predicted by any of the scales. Eight of the ten scales (boldfaced below) predicted high satisfaction:

- **Academic & Student Orientation** ($p < .000; \text{Exp}(B) = 3.564$)
- **Classroom Challenges** ($p = .739; \text{Exp}(B) = 1.04$)
- Classroom Disciplinary Climate ($p < .000; \text{Exp}(B) = 2.793$)
- Collaborative Teaching Environment ($p = .002; \text{Exp}(B) = 1.56$)
- Differentiated Instruction & Assessment ($p = .003; \text{Exp}(B) = .272$)
- Productive use of Preparation Time ($p = .009; \text{Exp}(B) = 1.99$)
- Professional Learning Needs ($p = .314; \text{Exp}(B) = .784$)
- School Shared Decision Making ($p < .000; \text{Exp}(B) = 3.889$)
- Teacher Professionalism ($p < .000; \text{Exp}(B) = 12.885$)
- Teaching Efficacy ($p = .029; \text{Exp}(B) = 1.954$)

In some cases, the results were dramatic. For example, for each point of increase on the Teacher Professionalism Scale, a teacher is 12.8 times more likely to be in the high satisfaction category than the low satisfaction category. A one point increase on the School Shared Decision Making and Academic & Student Orientation scales indicates that a teacher is 3.8 times and 3.5 times more likely to be in the high satisfaction group than the low satisfaction group, respectively.

**Does the time teachers spend on their work predict teachers that exhibit high satisfaction?**

Logistic regression was employed to determine whether the following variables would predict high-satisfaction group membership:

- Total working time: the sum of 60 minute hours that teachers spent in the week prior to the survey in all aspects of teacher work.
- Total task time: the sum of the time teachers spent on the tasks enumerated in Table 11
- Percentage of in-class time spent on administrative tasks such as recording attendance, handing out school information/forms, etc.
- Percentage of class time spent on keeping order in the classroom (maintaining discipline)

Three of the relationships were significant (boldfaced below):

- **Total working time:** the sum of 60-minute hours teachers spent in all aspects of teacher work ($p = .014; \text{Exp}(B) = .974$).
- **Percentage of in-class time spent on administrative tasks such as recording attendance, handing out school information/forms, etc.** ($p < .000; \text{Exp}(B) = .926$).
- **Percentage of class time spent on keeping order in the classroom (maintaining discipline)** ($p < .000; \text{Exp}(B) = .956$).

Each of the variables has a small negative impact on the likelihood that a teacher will be in the high- as opposed to the low-satisfaction group. Each additional hour of total working time reduces the probability that a teacher will be among those in the high satisfaction category by
2.6%. For each percentage point increase in class time spent on administrative tasks and on keeping order in the classroom, the probability that a teacher will be among those reporting high satisfaction diminishes by 7.4% and 4.44% respectively.

Does the time that teachers spend on various aspects of their work predict high satisfaction? Teachers were asked how many 60 minute hours they spent on various tasks. The relationship between two of the following tasks and satisfaction were significant (boldfaced below).

- Individual planning or preparation of lessons either at school or out of school ($p < .027; \text{Exp}(B) = .927$).
- Team work and dialogue with colleagues within this school ($p = .221; \text{Exp}(B) = 1.111$).
- Assessing, correcting, evaluating or marking student work ($p = .127; \text{Exp}(B) = .924$).
- Counselling students (providing social or emotional support to students outside of the time devoted to teaching) ($p = .220; \text{Exp}(B) = .838$).
- Student supervision outside of class (lunch room, hall or playground supervision, for example) ($p = .068; \text{Exp}(B) = 1.436$).
- General administrative work (including communication, paperwork, photocopying and other clerical duties you undertake in your job as a teacher) ($p = .088; \text{Exp}(B) = .941$).
- Communication and co-operation with parents or guardians ($p = .074; \text{Exp}(B) = .792$).
- Engaging in extracurricular activities (e.g. sports, clubs, and cultural activities after school) ($p = .052; \text{Exp}(B) = 1.259$).
- Completing reports required by the principal, school board or ministry of education ($p < .032; \text{Exp}(B) = .908$).
- Supervising a student teacher as the primary supervisor ($p = .843; \text{Exp}(B) = .973$).
- Providing extra help to students outside of class time ($p = .613; \text{Exp}(B) = .923$).

While the predictive relationships were small, every additional hour of planning or report writing reduced the likelihood that teachers would be among those in the high satisfaction category.

The Impact of Feedback

Timely feedback is one of the factors that can improve teacher instructional practices. Teachers reported receiving feedback from multiple sources in response to the question “In this school who uses the following methods to provide feedback to you?”

- direct observation of your classroom teaching,
- an assessment of your content knowledge,
- an analysis of your students’ test scores,
- self-assessment of your work (e.g. presentation of a portfolio assessment), and
- discussions with parents or guardians.

The feedback might be provided by external individuals such as curriculum or instructional personnel from the school board, school principal or vice-principal, assigned mentors, or other teachers. The majority of teachers have received feedback after direct observations of their classroom teaching from at least one of these sources (only 20.7% of respondents report receiving no feedback in this area).

### Table 17: Sources of feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback following direct observation of your classroom teaching</th>
<th>% External individuals</th>
<th>% School principal</th>
<th>% School vice-principal</th>
<th>% Assigned mentors or coaches</th>
<th>% Teacher colleagues who are not part of the school management team</th>
<th>% I have never received this feedback in this school</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback following direct observation of your classroom teaching</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>2512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback following an assessment of your content knowledge</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>2499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback following an analysis of your students' test scores</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>2501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback following your self-assessment of your work (e.g. presentation of a portfolio assessment)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>2502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback following discussions with parents or guardians</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>2502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The impact of principals’ and vice-principals’ direct observation of teaching

Principals and vice principals are the most frequent source of feedback to teachers. To explore the impact of direct observation by the principal or vice principal we created two categories of teachers. One category was made of up teachers whose classroom teaching had been directly observed by the principal and vice principal; the other was made up of those teachers who classroom teaching had not been directly observed by either the principal or the vice principal. We statistically compared the mean scores of each of the two categories on each of the scales. (please see the technical report for the detailed comparisons). Direct observation by the principal or vice principal had a demonstrable impact upon teachers’ perceptions of academic and student orientation (d = .41), school shared decision making (d = .49), and satisfaction (d = .36)
Box 4: Effect Size Interpretation

While there are variations in how effect sizes are interpreted depending on the topic of investigation or the particular effect size statistic, they estimate the magnitude of relationships between variables, ranging from small (~0.2) to medium (~0.5) to large (~0.8) (Cohen, 1988). Effect sizes can also be understood as a standardized method of quantifying the differences between groups (those who are in a program or category versus those who are not). It is helpful to think of the magnitude of effect sizes in terms of the proportion of group members affected. For example, an effect size of 0.4 indicates that students in a mathematics tutoring program would achieve higher average outcome scores than 66% of those not in that program; an effect size of 0.6 indicates that students in a program or category would achieve higher average outcome scores than 73% of those who were not; and an effect size of 0.8 indicates that students in a program or category would achieve higher average outcome scores than 79% of those who were not. In other words the larger the effect size, the larger the impact. It should be noted that in the social sciences, effect sizes are typically small.


Teachers were also asked “when you receive this feedback, what emphasis is placed on the following areas by the person or persons providing the feedback?” Participants were provided with a list of 12 areas and asked to rate these using a four-point Likert format with response options ranging from “not considered at all” to “considered with high importance”. The areas considered with high importance included student performance (47.8%) and student assessment practices (33.9%). On the other hand, 38% of teachers indicated that no emphasis is placed on teaching in a multicultural or multilingual setting. Furthermore, half of the teachers indicated that people providing feedback do not consider how teachers themselves provide feedback to their colleagues to improve their teaching practices (48.5%).
Table 18: Feedback emphasis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Not considered at all</th>
<th>% Considered with low importance</th>
<th>% Considered with moderate importance</th>
<th>% Considered with high importance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student performance</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>2461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and understanding of my subject field(s)</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>2461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical competencies in teaching my subject field(s)</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>2464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student assessment practices</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>2462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student behaviour and classroom management</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>2465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching students with special needs</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>2464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching in a multicultural or multilingual setting</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>2458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The feedback I provide to other teachers to improve their teaching</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>2444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from parents or guardians</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>2462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student feedback</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>2455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration or working with other teachers</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>2463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The composition of your class</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>2447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers were also asked to comment on whether the feedback they have received at their school directly led to positive changes. Approximately 70% of teachers reported a positive change (small, moderate or large) in their teaching practices, their use of assessments, and their confidence as a teacher. However, the feedback seemed to have little impact on teacher advancement (with 68.2% of teachers reporting no change in that area).
Teachers were also asked to express their agreement with eight statements regarding feedback in their schools. Less than one third of the teachers thought that the best performing teachers in their school received the greatest recognition. Furthermore, 85.9% of teachers felt that teacher appraisal and feedback are largely done to fulfill administrative requirements.
Table 19: Consequences of Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Strongly disagree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Strongly agree</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The best performing teachers in this school receive the greatest</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognition (e.g. rewards, additional learning opportunities or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibilities).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher appraisal and feedback have little impact upon the way</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers teach in the classroom. (reversed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher appraisal and feedback are largely done to fulfill</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A development or training plan is established for teachers to</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improve their work as a teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback is provided to teachers based on a thorough assessment</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of their teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures to remedy any weaknesses in teaching are discussed</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance is provided by board program staff to help the</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher improve his/her teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher appraisal provides one with valuable information and</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Impact of Feedback Emphasis on Teacher Perceptions

It was interesting, however, to learn from further exploratory analysis that the particular emphasis of the feedback teachers received had an impact on teacher perception. These analyses were conducted by creating two categories from the responses to the question “when you receive this feedback, what emphasis is placed on the following areas by the person or persons providing the feedback?” Teachers responding that the topic was “not considered at all” or “considered with low importance” were included in one group and those who responding “considered with moderate importance” or “considered with high importance” in the other. Statistical comparisons were made of the mean scores on each of the scales (please see the technical appendix for the detailed comparisons).

Receiving feedback that emphasizes student performance has a demonstrable impact on teachers’ perceptions of a collaborative teaching environment (d = .43), academic press and student orientation (d = .41), school shared decision making (d = .44) differentiated practice (d = .30) and satisfaction (d = .30).

- Receiving feedback that emphasizes knowledge and understanding of one’s subject field(s) has an impact on teachers’ perceptions of academic and student orientation (d = .47), school shared decision making (d = .43) and collaborative teaching environment (d = .38).
• Receiving feedback that emphasizes pedagogical competencies in teaching one’s subject field(s) has an impact on teachers’ perceptions of collaborative teaching environment (d = .41), academic and student orientation (d = .41), and school shared decision making (d = .36).
• Receiving feedback that emphasizes student behavior and classroom management has an impact on teachers’ perceptions of academic and student orientation (d = .40), school shared decision making (d = .43) and satisfaction (d = .30).
• Receiving feedback that emphasizes teaching students with special needs has an impact on teachers’ perception of academic and student orientation (d = .30) and school shared decision making (d = .38).
• Receiving feedback about teaching in a multicultural setting has an impact on teachers’ perceptions of collaborative teaching environment (d = .32), academic and student orientation (d = .35), and school shared decision making (d = .30)
• Receiving feedback that emphasizes student feedback has an impact on teachers’ perceptions of collaborative teaching environment (d = .32), academic and student orientation (d = .30) differentiated practice (d = .38) and school shared decision making (d = .46).
• Receiving feedback that emphasizes the composition of their classes has an impact on teachers’ perceptions of academic and student orientation (d = .43), school shared decision making (d = .47) and satisfaction (d = .32).

In addition to these noteworthy relationships, there were two that merit mention. Receiving feedback that emphasizes collaboration or working with other teachers has a strong impact on teachers’ perceptions of collaborative teaching environment (d = .61), academic and student orientation (d = .39), school shared decision making (d = .47) and satisfaction (d = .37).
Moreover, receiving feedback that emphasizes the feedback that the teacher provides to other teachers to improve their teaching has a demonstrable impact on teachers’ perceptions of almost all of the dimension: collaborative teaching environment (d = .55), teacher professionalism (d = .31), teaching efficacy (d = .31), differentiated practice (d = .32), school share decision making (d = .31), satisfaction (d = .32) and productive use of preparation time (d = .35).
Semi-Structured Interviews

Directions identified fifteen school boards based on the prioritized positive responses to the Collaborative Teaching Environment, Teacher Professionalism, School Shared Decision Making, Satisfaction with Profession, and School Satisfaction scales. Readers should keep in mind that the selection process was challenging as the differences among boards were very small.

Board level interviews were conducted with the director or designated supervisory officer most knowledgeable about large scale board and ministry initiatives and an elected school trustee most knowledgeable about large scale board and ministry initiatives. From among the schools in which teachers responded to the survey, Directions selected at random two schools in each board; in each school, Directions conducted interviews with either a principal or vice-principal who had served in that school for no less than two years. Directions also conducted interviews with two teachers with five or more years of classroom teaching experience and two years of classroom teaching experience in the school. Interviews were conducted with all 15 directors of education or their designates, 13 trustees (of a possible 15), 30 principals, and 52 teachers (out of a possible 60). Copies of the interview guides are included in Appendix B.

The interviews were conducted by telephone by experienced facilitators possessing in-depth knowledge of the education system in Ontario. Facilitators followed the written protocols designed to address the evaluation questions. The interviews took approximately 30-40 minutes each. With the explicit and documented permission of each respondent, interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed for subsequent analysis. After each interview, facilitator completed summary notes that were also available to the analysts.

Interviews with Teachers

Factors that influence how teachers work together

Teacher interviewees identified a number of factors that have an impact on how teachers work together within the school. First among all of these is a willingness to collaborate and share: resources, lessons, knowledge and experience, accompanied by openness to the ideas of others. Where the school is engaged in deliberate efforts to increase teacher collaboration through professional learning, there is generally a positive response. This is moderated, however, by the approach of the school administration: where teachers have active input in the choice of content or focus for the professional learning, enthusiasm and engagement are much greater than when the focus or choice of content are predetermined by the board or administration.
The second factor is opportunity – times and places to meet with one another and do work of relevance to their teaching responsibilities. In a number of the schools encompassed by the interviews, grade partners (teachers teaching the same grade) were scheduled to have at least some of their planning time in common. A number of schools within the interview group had made intentional efforts not only to provide time for collaboration among grade partners, but to encourage shared planning and team teaching across the classes. Teachers engaged in these activities reported a strong sense of support from colleagues and relief that they weren’t individually having to “reinvent the wheel” at every turn. In some schools, the administration had carefully paired early career teachers with more experienced teachers in grade assignments – teachers who reported this practice indicated that it provided the newer teachers with good advice and modelling of instructional practice. In schools that were too small for grade level partnership, efforts were often made to provide teachers in the same division with some common planning time. This too was seen as particularly helpful. When (some) shared planning time was combined with professional learning focussed on goals and outcomes that were understood and embraced by the participants, collaboration appears to increase further and to be more satisfying.

The arrangement of classrooms, workspaces and staff rooms within the physical plant can have a positive or negative effect on teacher collaboration. Those who teach in portable classrooms report more difficulty in collaborating with others because of their increased physical isolation. Some schools place grade partner teachers in adjacent classrooms, sometimes with connecting doors, to allow for shared teaching opportunities. However, teachers report that there is less cross-division communication and collaboration when there is more than one staff room and classrooms are spread out over more than one level or wing. One teacher of core French said, “My workspace is a shared space with two other teachers. It’s not always the most ideal space for me to do co-planning or meet with another teacher. If they (the other teacher) have students in their classrooms, the challenge is finding a space to work together professionally and get the work done.” Well-organized shared spaces with shared teaching resources (levelled reading materials, mathematics manipulatives, etc.) further strengthen sharing and collaboration among teachers.

Engaging special education resource teachers, core French teachers, teacher-librarians, and other specialty teachers in collaborative work with grade teachers is a tangible challenge. It also emerged from the interviews that in many schools there are “prep teachers” – teachers whose assignments, though constant, consist of fragments of many grades as they take the grade teacher’s pupils for a specific subject in order that the grade teacher has his/her planning time. These individuals (special education, specialty and “prep teachers) find themselves at the same time members of every grade/divisional professional family and members of none
because it is difficult for them to engage collaboratively with so many teaching partners, or to find their place in some of the professional learning opportunities available.

**How principals and vice-principals influence collaboration among teachers.**

When asked about the role that school administrators play in teacher collaboration, teacher interviewees identified a number of positive factors:

- A sense of clear purpose for the school’s work, understood and shared by administrators and teachers alike (and sometimes the students);
- The provision of opportunities to work with other teachers – to observe other classrooms, to co-plan and to co-teach, to share information and understanding about assessment and marking in each other’s classes;
- Attention to the use of physical space – ensuring that teachers worked in proximity to those with whom they shared programs, and ensuring that there were reasonable workspaces;
- Ensuring that there were opportunities for teachers to work together across divisional lines, or across English/French Immersion lines in dual-track schools;
- An understanding and recognition of what the teacher’s daily work is – an appreciation of what is involved and where the stresses are;
- Consulting with and listening to the teachers in determining what the focus of collaboration and professional learning will be;
- Visibility in and around the classrooms of the school, including the observation of teaching and co-teaching;
- Active support for teachers, whether helping to set the tone and the management of discipline issues for the school, or assisting with parent communication and problem-solving;
- An invitational approach, encouraging and supporting teachers to participate, but not insisting that every teacher must pursue the same path to collaboration or professional learning, and
- Showing confidence in and belief in the importance of teachers’ professional judgment.

Interviewees who identified administrative practices that had a negative impact on teacher collaboration cited approaches that were top down (“voluntelling” rather than invitational), driven by the latest memo received from the board or the Ministry, or administrators who would tell them how good collaboration and professional learning were going to be without attending to the organizational necessities (time, space and opportunity).
There is a genuine appreciation among teachers for administrators who are willing to come into a classroom and take over a class so that the teacher can observe a colleague and who know how much work goes into planning, marking and communication that is rarely seen during the school day.

**Students’ attitudes to learning**

Interviewees reported that students enrolled from Kindergarten to Grades 3 and 4 were generally very enthusiastic about learning. Beginning in Grade 5 (sometimes earlier), peer influences become more important and students are less open to wholehearted engagement in learning. Student engagement is most challenging in Grades 7 and 8. When asked what factors contribute most to students’ attitudes toward learning, parental expectations and experience were cited frequently. Teachers from schools in communities where parents were seen to hold high expectations of their children and to be supportive of the school reported positive student attitudes to learning. Teachers from schools in low income communities where parents’ own experiences with school were sometimes less successful report greater challenges in engaging students positively in learning, particularly as they get older.

One school in a low income community reported that its students who were recent immigrants had very positive attitudes toward schooling, while the students from low income Canadian families were less positive. This school had also identified (through a student attitude survey) that students were not very willing to take risks (in learning). The staff worked intentionally to increase the comfort of the students to try new strategies, offer answers and commentary about which they were unsure, and engage in other kinds of positive risk taking for learning.

**Factors in Teacher Workload**

Interviewees were asked about the primary factors in their workload as a teacher. The factors most frequently identified were planning, marking and assessing, communication with parents and participation in extra-curricular programs. Many interviewees talked about planning, marking and assessment, writing report cards and attending to parent communication through newsletters, email and class websites and blogs as work that was important but largely invisible to others. One teacher said, “You’re constantly assessing what they (the students are doing while they are working. I love that part because I’m with the kids and I’m helping. [However] You have so many different levels of kids and there’s not enough support in schools any more for those kids that need it. ..Some kids need different things – that’s difficult to manage within a classroom.”

There is a sense among teachers that parents and the public only see the teacher’s work as what happens with students in the classroom, and don’t fully appreciate what it takes to make it all come together there.
The number of students in a class, the range of learning needs within the class, and the number of identified special education students in the class are all additional factors perceived to affect teacher workload. For example, it is not unusual in a Grade 4 class to have students whose literacy and numeracy skills range from Grade 1 to Grade 8. “When you have a five-year spread from Grade 3 to Grade 8 in a classroom, that sometimes definitely affects your workload making sure that things are planned for (the) different learning needs.” According to those interviewed (and according to Ministry policy), teachers are expected to differentiate instruction for learners and to individualize programs more than at any time in the past. Some interviewees said that children’s mental health issues were a challenge in the classroom, and that this challenge was aggravated by a lack of trained counsellors and support staff.

**Workload as a construct**

Some of those interviewed seemed slightly disconcerted by the question: “What are the primary factors in your workload?” and required some prompting as to what factors might be. This seems to be connected to the notion that “My work is what it is. When I am overwhelmed, it’s too heavy.” Some teachers were able to identify the parts of their work that they find frustrating or overwhelming: report card preparation, special education reporting, or preparing for a subject in the elementary curriculum (e.g. Art) for which they have had no formal preparation.

Reporting requirements for special education are seen as very demanding. From the interviews, practice seems to vary from board to board regarding who is responsible for the preparation of individual education plans (IEPs) and related reporting for identified special education students. In some schools the grade teacher is responsible for the IEPs, in others these are the responsibility of the Special Education Resource Teacher. Special education resource teachers report an enormous increase in the number of reports being required – individual education plans, individual transportation plans, safe school reports and plans, and more. One special education resource teacher said, “Paperwork is a big part of it (workload). I can have 50 to 80 kids that I’m trying to serve and do all the paperwork associated with Individual Education Plans, Individual Placement and Review Committees, team meetings, recording of team meeting minutes – the list goes on and on. The pressure from superintendents is ‘You need to be in the classroom, you need to be working with the kids’ and I agree. However, there are all these other things... they just came up with a bus transportation plan that now, instead of one form that required a signature from a principal, a line from me, has to have a support plan and a safety plan – it’s like five forms to indicate why the student might need a special arrangement on the bus.”
Preparing report cards is reported almost universally as very time intensive. Some school boards have provided some release time for report card preparation; where this occurs, teachers report that the reporting part of the workload becomes much more manageable.

Teachers of core French and teachers in French immersion programs report the need to create appropriate learning resources for their students as a factor affecting their workloads.

**Ministry and Board Initiatives and Teacher Workload**

Interviewees were asked if they were aware of board and Ministry of Education initiatives over the past few years. Here is a list of some of the initiatives identified by the teachers interviewed:

- Education for All
- Financial Literacy
- Collaborative Inquiry in Learning Mathematics
- Full Day Kindergarten
- Restorative practice/justice
- Three part math lesson
- Aboriginal education/FNMI policy
- School Effectiveness Framework
- 4 Cs: co-plan, co-teach, co-debrief, co-reflect
- Well-being and mental health
- EQAO testing
- Daily Physical Activity
- Literacy and Numeracy coaching
- OFIP
- Safe Schools/anti-bullying
- Student Work Study Teacher
- Assessments: PRIME, CASI, PM Benchmarks, DRA
- The Leader in Me
- Professional learning communities
- Teaching Learning Critical Pathways
- Technology (bring your own device, iPad, etc.)

Not all of the things identified by teachers as “initiatives” would be described that way by school board or ministry personnel. EQAO testing has been part of the educational landscape in Ontario for more than 15 years – it is external, but not new. What may be different is a school-based focus on instruction to improve the EQAO scores. Not all teachers see a connection between the EQAO processes and the collaborative inquiry model: “I’m an EQAO leader (in my school) and I’ve done EQAO for the last 16 years. EQAO is so opposite to the inquiry method. There is a lot of contradiction.”

There is a general acknowledgement that the things called *initiatives* change the way teachers work, and often add additional work for teachers. If involvement in the activity requires release time, the teacher must prepare lessons for the occasional teacher, and may have to gather and analyze data from his/her classroom to use in the professional learning activity.
From some teachers, there is a sense of “too many new things, not enough time to process and reflect on each of them”. However, according to other teachers some initiatives (like those that involve collaborative planning and teaching) can lay the foundation for improved and streamlined modes of work for collaborating teachers, making workload more manageable in the end. According to one teacher, “…in many ways it’s increased my workload, but in other ways I think just more redirected or altered or fine-tuned my workload because it’s tying in what I’m doing and it’s changing my program. I’m not sure it (my workload) has increased or just changed.”

Many teachers interviewed said that their professional practice had changed and improved as the result of some of the professional learning initiatives, but some of these also felt the need to consolidate the newly learned pedagogy before tackling the next “new” thing. At other times, an initiative feels like an unnecessary shift in focus, without a clear connection to the ongoing work and goals of the classroom. Teachers interviewed whose view of some of the initiatives was positive, often spoke about the role of the school’s administration in helping to provide context about what the initiative was intended to achieve and why it should be important to the teachers’ work.

The impact of workload on teacher professionalism

When asked how their workload affects their sense of professionalism, teachers who were interviewed provided a wide range of responses. Some said that their workload had no effect on their professionalism, while others acknowledged that at times they felt overwhelmed, and worried that they were not meeting their own professional standards. On further probing, those who said that their workload had no effect on their professionalism were teachers who understood that there are limits to what is possible. These teachers regularly assessed what they were doing and what to do when they were overloaded – how to prioritize and determine which tasks were most essential at that moment.

Several interviewees said that their younger colleagues struggled with their perceived inability to meet the highest standard of practice, every day. One experienced teacher said “You must develop a sense of your own professional standard, and understand what can be done with the time and resources available.” From the interviews, it is clear that even experienced teachers struggle sometimes to maintain a balance between their expectations of themselves and what is possible. One teacher cited her annual involvement in the school’s musical play and said “While we are rehearsing and producing the play, I try to keep the day-to-day classroom work manageable. But having said that, it is still an enormous amount of work, and while I am involved with the play I am more tired, and have less energy for other teaching tasks.”
Sometimes Ministry or board initiatives had an impact on workload that in turn had an impact on the teacher’s professionalism – “I feel like we’re doing too much, too fast (in the professional learning) and that my daily teaching is being shortchanged.”

Another teacher said that when teachers don’t feel respected, cared for and supported by their peers and the administration, their sense of professionalism is undermined. “It brings out the worst in us – staffroom venting and (unnecessary) disputes among colleagues.” She went on to say that she “feels most unprofessional if I find myself venting in the staffroom”, because she believes that “an ‘exquisite respectfulness’ by staff for students is very important.”

Interviews with Principals

What principals say about how teachers work together

Most principals interviewed reported that the teachers in their schools were collegial and worked together in teams. Many emphasized the work of the teachers in collaborative planning, teacher professional learning (including collaborative inquiry), and other kinds of shared work. Those who spoke about collaboration said that they began with a staff who were caring and sharing, and that they helped them to grow into effective collaboration. A few principals mentioned that they and the staff were working to develop consistent approaches across the school. These ranged from the alignment of the teaching of specific parts of the curriculum (e.g. writing) to the development and application of consistent messages about respect and behaviour. Some principals qualified their comments about collaboration and collegiality and indicated that not all teachers in the school willingly participated in collaborative work; in most cases these were permitted to continue to work alone.

According to the principals, the factors that affect the way in which teachers work together include organizing teachers into grade or division teams, providing common planning time and/or additional release time for those teams to work together, the availability of professional learning opportunities that have teacher collaboration as a component, and the active inclusion of the “teacher voice” in decision making about professional learning. The provision of time during the school day for co-planning and for professional learning is seen generally by the principals as essential to the success of the professional learning and to the development of ongoing collaborative processes for instruction and assessment.

Invitational approaches seem to work well for many principals. One reported that as part of their OFIP engagement, there was a lesson study component. The principal said: “We introduced lesson study and teachers volunteered – that’s been a big piece all along is very little of what we’ve done has been mandatory. We start with volunteers and then others get on board at their own pace. Teachers are just like students – they are at different places on the learning continuum.” Teachers who have the opportunity to observe others and to be observed
learn to see the value in that kind of collaboration. The same principal said: “When we finished (the lesson study project) the thing that the staff found most powerful was the opportunity to observe others teaching and the opportunity of the teacher to hear other teachers’ perspectives of what they had observed about the students.”

These activities help to develop common instructional approaches and shared instructional goals focussed on the needs of the students.

There were some differences in the principals’ response to questions about the role of administration in how teachers work together. Some said clearly that the administration sets the direction for collaboration and professional learning, while others emphasized the need for the teachers’ input and leadership in this work. Some principals also see themselves as the facilitators of professional learning, and introducers of new ideas. Others identified themselves as co-learners and stress managers, whose role was to help teachers feel safe to make mistakes. Once principal said: “you have to model the fact that you need help, that you’re interested in learning, and that you’re willing to be vulnerable.”

Many of the principals identified as key to their role in promoting collaboration between teachers purposefully planning the distribution of preparation time to allow grade partners to work together, and consciously respecting the teachers’ own professionalism and professional judgement about how they went about their collaborative work.

**What principals say about student attitudes to learning**

Principals, like teachers, report a range of student attitudes toward learning. Student attitudes to learning are generally very positive in the primary years, mixed in the junior years and more challenging in Grades 7 and 8. Both principals and teachers identify a relationship between parental expectations of their children and the school and student attitudes to learning – the more engaged and committed the family is to education, the more positive student attitudes are.

Some principals and their staffs have engaged more proactively in monitoring and influencing student attitudes than others. “The EQAO attitudinal data (for our school showed) that students didn’t perceive themselves as learners – weren’t willing to take risks, not willing to show what they know. Now every class has an anchor chart on the profile of a learner. We pulled out ideas from students and used them to make a Wordle that we turned into a professional looking poster. Students now see themselves as learners, can describe their strategies and take risks.” Another principal whose staff had really worked at engaging students reported “I’ve tracked attendance over the last three years and we’ve gone from 11 pages of students being absent to barely one”.
Factors identified by principals as having a positive impact on student attitudes include: teachers who value and respect students, and for whom students are willing to work hard; empowering students to be leaders within the school; building a strong parent voice (in schools where that is a challenge) and engaging families; teaching self-regulation and collaboration in an intentional way and having happy teachers who feel good about their work.

Respondents said that factors contributing to less than positive student attitudes include poverty, families who don’t value education, student transience, and a lack of shared expectations between parents and the school.

**What principals identify as the issues in teacher workload**

Principals identified a number of factors of teacher workload affecting their staffs:

- The intensity of needs and the number of students receiving special education support and individualized plans;
- Class size (particular in the higher grades) and the range of learning needs within the classroom;
- The paperwork associated with special education, safe schools, field trips and more;
- Changes and the teachers’ response to changes, such as increased curriculum demands, the next “new” thing, and their need to keep balance both on the job and between work and home;
- Teachers’ high expectations of themselves – many teachers are perfectionists;
- The increase in behaviour and self-regulation issues is challenging;
- Teachers feel overwhelmed by the sheer volume of curriculum and related expectations;
- The pressure of the constant stream of new initiatives: financial literacy, healthy schools, safe schools, eco-schools, etc;
- Parent engagement and communication – communicating through agendas, emails and face to face meetings;
- New assessment practices (Growing Success) that require more documentation of student learning by teachers;
- Time for the planning of integrated instruction and assessment;
- Extracurricular activities;
- Finding time for reflection about what is happening in the classroom;
- Job embedded professional learning requires additional work to prepare for the occasional teacher who will cover during the absence;
- Insufficient numbers of educational assistants, learning or special education resource teachers;
- Paperwork – “I think there are massive amounts of redundant, repetitive and unnecessary paperwork that our administrative (people) and our school board love to bury people with. It’s the collecting of data for no (visible) purpose.”

How principals help teachers manage workload and initiatives

Principals identified a broad variety of strategies that they use to help teachers manage their daily workload and the workload associated with Ministry and board initiatives.

Many of these strategies were holistic and involved paying careful attention to the teachers’ readiness and providing support tailored to the individual teacher’s age and stage of career. A few principals provided a more traditional operational approach, focussed more on the mechanics: use the staff meeting for some professional learning, balance the school calendar, provide professional learning communities and be flexible with due dates.

In contrast were those principals who also work to reassure teachers about the teachers’ own professional judgement and to assist teachers in understanding what an initiative is about – why is it happening, is it a big change, how much of what is suggested to change is already in place? Several principals said that giving teachers time “to figure it out, make sense of it and then reflect on it” was important. Some spoke very clearly of giving teachers permission not to do everything. In the words of one principal: “You teach children, not the curriculum. Deal with the overall expectations and target the gaps!” Including teachers in decision-making, and working with teachers to filter the priorities makes a big difference. According to principals, younger and less experienced teachers need more help with this – they want to do it all, and perfectly.

Some principals identified helping teachers keep work and family life in balance as part of the development of professional judgement. They said that it is important for teachers to be able to hold both priorities, and to balance both against the time and resources available, and that it was important to demonstrate to teachers that their non-school roles as parents (and sometimes as adult children) were understood and supported.

A few principals explicitly referred to using the School Improvement Plan and the school goals as a way of keeping things in focus and filtering competing priorities.

Interviews with Directors or their Designates

What is the working environment in the board and what contributes to it?

Interviews with Directors or their designates in the fifteen school boards produced a broad range of responses to this question. Many focussed on relationships within the board: administration to trustee, administration to principal, administration to teachers’ unions or
other employee groups. Most emphasized the need to actively attend to and foster the relationships with school leaders and teachers’ organizations. These relationships were seen as essential to the development of a sense of common purpose for the board, and in communicating the context and reasons for the changes and expectations placed on those working in the system.

In smaller boards, the directors focussed immediately on the advantages of their relative size: people know each other, teachers often live in the communities in which they work, administrators are seen as approachable and known entities.

Directors of other (often larger) boards indicated a strong need to develop a common sense of purpose across the board and to pay very close attention to the board/school relationship. One director spoke of seeking a change in mindset for teachers from an individual sense of responsibility to a collective sense of responsibility for student outcomes. The director of a board with a high needs student population spread over a large geographic area said that his intention is for that board to become “the poster child for intervention for really, really at risk kids”. This corresponds with his three priorities for the board – good teaching, closing the achievement gap, and good assessment.

A corollary to a strong common sense of purpose is the existence of a clear set of policies and procedures, understood and communicated to all in the system.

Some directors were very cognizant of a strong sense of collective identity within the board. One director said “It’s a fiercely loyal culture (in this board). It has a feisty loyalty that I’ve never experienced before. It’s always edgy. [The teachers] are fiercely committed to students but I always have to keep them focused on being a learning organization, not a social service organization. I say the greatest social justice is to provide these kids with a brilliant education. Another said that within that board there was a strong sense of collective confidence, based on the high achievement record of its schools and the high expectations of its communities.

A clear commitment to supporting active professional learning was part of the working environment for many of the directors. Some spoke of “professional development for all” – teachers, custodians, educational assistants, ECEs - as essential to the board’s working environment.

**What is the professional atmosphere in this board? How do teachers work with one another?**

Most of the directors interviewed emphasized collegial and collaborative relationships among staff. Several mentioned that teachers “keep their doors open” and welcome interactions with their colleagues. One superintendent was very frank in saying regarding collaboration, “They
do or they don’t. There is no middle ground. Those who don’t (collaborate) are isolated, and becoming rarer.”

Asking about the professional atmosphere often led the conversation to the board’s approach to professional learning. Many of the directors or designates emphasized the role of teachers at the school level in determining what their professional learning needs were. Among these a number emphasized expanded for roles for teachers in leading or facilitating the professional learning activities. Other board administrators described more traditional board-designed, program-staff-led professional learning programs.

Some boards indicated that they had taken an invitational approach to the job-embedded professional learning – not forcing the participation of any unwilling to make a commitment to the project. Likely related to this is the sense that the administration of the board supports teachers in risk-taking – one director said in the board’s annual survey teaching staff say “that they agree or strongly agree that the culture of the board permits one to say you don’t know something, ask for help and be supported.” This is a board that previously had taken a very directive, top down approach to teachers’ professional improvement, and where the director had been proactive in fostering a leadership culture with principals designed to emphasize asking good questions, facilitating and coaching, honouring the professionalism of the teachers and using principles of adult learning.

Those boards reporting an invitational approach to collaborative work reported that there was a snowball effect as the participating teachers had successful and professionally satisfying experiences with collaborative work, whether that was a professional learning/collaborative inquiry project or co-planning and co-teaching, leading to increased participation by other teachers.

Interviewees were asked what the board administration’s contribution to the professional atmosphere was. Responses included the following:

- modelling the professional relationships and engagement that they wanted to see, and being seen themselves as risk-takers and life-long professional learners;
- providing the time and resources for teachers to be engaged in collaborative and professional learning work;
- providing leadership programs that were open to teacher and union participation;
- ensuring that schools had within their buildings places that teachers could meet to do collaborative work;
- listening to teachers about what they needed to succeed in their classrooms;
- having an active presence of superintendents/director in the schools, seen to be interested and participating;
• ensuring that the demands of ministry and board initiatives were aligned with the board’s strategic plan, board and school improvement plans; and
• providing context and making sense of new initiatives and demands to teachers whose work will be affected.

What are the primary factors in teachers’ workload?

The Directors/designates were quite clear about what they considered to be the primary factors in teachers’ workload. One immediately identified the actual work of day to day teaching: planning, instruction, marking, diagnostic work, administration (reports, meetings) and parental communication. Several of the directors/designates identified the number of students with special needs as a factor in teacher workload, as well as the general emphasis on the individualization or differentiation of instruction for all students. Student mental health issues were frequently identified as a workload factor for teachers – more problems that the schools are more aware of, combined with insufficient community resources. An extension of this is the potential for teachers (particularly new teachers) to be overwhelmed by the stress and trauma in students’ lives outside of school.

Job embedded professional learning was identified as a workload factor for a few – the time required to prepare lessons for the occasional teacher – but was also cited as part of the solution to increased demands. The stress of new learning and changing practice were identified as workload issues for some. However, much of the professional development focussed on improved instructional practice has resulted in greater individual efficacy and higher degrees of sharing and collaboration, both of which lend to making a teacher’s work more productive and satisfying.

One director/designate stated that the primary factor in teacher workload was “many educators’ Type A personalities – they are high achievers, who want to do everything exceptionally well. People take things on in education without letting go of something.” These teachers may have difficulty bringing their professional judgement to the task of prioritizing what can be done when time and resources are finite. Interviewees identified the overload of curriculum expectations in the present documents, combined with the persistent belief on the part of some teachers that every expectation must be taught and that there is no room for professional judgement about which topics and expectations are most important.

Those teachers who are not collaborative were identified as having greater workload issues because of their inability or unwillingness to share the work with their colleagues.

According to interviewees, teachers with highly diverse assignments, such as prep time coverage, these assignments posed particular challenges. These correspond to the challenges
identified by some of these teachers about participating in collaborative or shared teaching activities. Their workload can be greater because of the fragmentation of assignments and the increased total number of students being taught in a cycle and requiring reporting for different subjects.

Parental expectations, and the increased demands for quick communication with parents, are cited by many board administrators as a factor. These are often accompanied by community expectations – for extracurricular programs and other community engagement. In the boards with a number of small communities, the close community relationship is a two-way proposition: greater support for the schools and teachers accompanied by a higher level of scrutiny and expectation.

Finally, there are administrative issues and external demands and initiatives. One interviewee spoke of the terrible frustration of teachers when the board changed its internal email system. “With the change, people don’t know where to go to get things, which is chewing into time and then making them feel burdened.” As they struggled to learn how to use the new system, they felt that precious time was being wasted. Another director spoke of communications from the Ministry that were superfluous or distracting – the example cited was an activity booklet sent to the board for every child to engage them in the buildup to the 2015 Pan Am Games.

**What has been the impact of Ministry and board initiatives on teacher workload?**

Interpretations of what is a Ministry initiative vary considerably across those interviewed, and would appear to be at some odds with the understanding of the Ministry of Education. Certainly many of the Ministry’s professional learning initiatives were recognized by the directors and designates interviewed. Other Ministry activity was also identified as “initiatives” such as a Pan Am Games engagement booklet and Program Policy Memorandum 155. PPM 155 is a good example of a Ministry directive that has an impact on the work of senior board officials, but would not have been identified as an initiative by teachers.

Several of the interviewees seemed to struggle with the question of the impact of Ministry and board initiatives on teacher workload, preferring to discuss the challenges they themselves faced because of the number or scope of initiatives, or the challenges in scheduling job-embedded professional learning. One interviewee questioned the need for so much release time for collaboration and professional learning. Other interviewees from the board administration believe that the initiatives have improved instruction, teacher effectiveness and student achievement, but required the perceived increase in work to be successful. These were also the interviewees who said that when teachers had increased their efficacy and could share work (planning, teaching, reflection) effectively with others, there was a payoff in satisfaction and even in time.
As initiatives have continued to roll forward from the Ministry, teachers who have been reluctant to participate in collaborative work and professional learning are increasingly overwhelmed, in the view of some of the board administrators. Those teachers who have participated, stayed abreast of changes in instructional strategies and approaches and seen the benefits are more likely to welcome continuing work of that sort. Those who have resisted find themselves further and further behind the changes.

More than one director emphasized the importance of board and school leadership in helping teachers understand what an initiative means – why it is happening, what its intended goals are, and why it’s appropriate. Some initiatives (those having to do with teaching) are a reflection of more acute expectations of the system (and of teachers) than existed 10 or 15 years ago. Those increased and more focussed expectations are often perceived as increased workload by the teacher – h/she is being asked to do more and to be more accountable for what h/she does.

The directors and designates interviewed were asked about the alignment of the Ministry and board initiatives with the board strategic plans. Almost all said that they were attentive to emerging initiatives as they dealt with their year by year operational plans, the Board Improvement Plan for Student Achievement and the School Improvement Plans. One or two said that their boards were struggling with this alignment – that their strategic planning process was not designed to be sufficiently flexible to deal well with emerging issues and initiatives.

**How does the board administration help teachers to manage the demands of provincial and board initiatives?**

First and foremost, according to the directors and their designates, the board administration must provide the context for initiatives, and mediate and moderate the demands that the initiatives will place on teachers. As one director put it, “It’s important that it doesn’t feel like 17 separate things are happening. Our job is to interpret, to alleviate anxiety.” Listening to teachers’ concerns is an important part of that process. It is the board administration that must demonstrate purpose and alignment, and make the strategic allocation of human and financial resources. Release time for the work of the initiative is an important part of the support provided as well as instructional leadership from board program staff. Underlying these is the respect shown by the administration for teachers and their unions, enabling shared understanding of the task and problem-solving approach to issues that arise.

One board moved the cycle for its Board Improvement Plan for Student Achievement from September to September to January to January, and found that this significantly alleviated some of the stress in the system. When school began in September, everyone knew what was expected, and there was time to communicate what would begin in January. Another board
ensures that every school is visited at least once a month by a member of the senior administration – to celebrate their work, hear about their challenges and provide feedback.

Several boards do yearly surveys of their teachers – checking on what their schools need, what (initiative or other) is presenting challenges, and what support would be valued. In one board, the key questions are: “What does your school need? What inquiry would support that need?”

Several directors and their designates said that sometimes they say “No” to a Ministry initiative, when they are of the opinion that it is not aligned with their strategic and other plans, or that it’s too soon to start a new project. One associate director said “some of these initiatives need some longevity; the board needs to do some gatekeeping.”

**Interviews with Trustees**

**How trustees describe the professional atmosphere in the board**

When speaking of the professional atmosphere within the school board, trustees emphasized collegiality, cooperation and collaboration. A sense of common purpose was emphasized by some, while others talked about positive and respectful relationships at all levels of the board’s operation. One trustee described the board as “earnestly committed to doing the best for its students”. Another spoke of “Keeping students first”.

This professional atmosphere is supported by a number of key ingredients, according to the trustees. These include:

- An awareness of roles, and role distinctions (including trustees);
- Good communications and active listening;
- Mutual respect across role lines;
- Good working relationships, especially with the unions;
- The encouragement of innovation;
- A strategic plan that is clear about mission, vision and values, supported by operational and board improvement plans; and
- Paying close attention to student progress.

One trustee said that the board’s emphasis on the character traits of caring, cooperation, honesty, integrity and humour helped build a common professional atmosphere.

**What trustees said about how teachers work with another**

Trustees were asked to describe how they see teachers working with one another in their board, what factors affect that, and what the role of the board administration is supporting teachers’ collaborative work.
There was a strong focus in their responses on the role that teachers’ professional learning plays in their ability to work collaboratively with one another. Many spoke of teachers’ professionalism, and their commitment to collegial and collaborative relationships. “They’re not afraid to share, and they’re open to innovation.” Some emphasized the degree to which teachers worked together in planning and in some cases in teaching.

Factors affecting this collaborative, professional approach to working with others included principals who include teachers in their planning process, the role of principals in making expectations clear, support (through professional learning and release time) for collaborative work, a clear teacher voice in the determination of priorities, and clear communication from all levels of the board about the sense of common purpose and the priorities.

Board administration was seen to contribute through modelling the collegial and collaborative behaviour being sought, by being co-learners with teachers and partners in the constant professional growth, by helping to find additional resources and by recognizing achievements. The strategic plan of the board was seen by some as central to supporting this work, others saw it as more in the background of the work. Modelling and participating in the professional learning with staff were emphasized by several trustees.

**How trustees see the primary factors in teacher workload**

In the interviews with school trustees, some emphasized the more traditional pieces of teachers’ work: planning, instructing, assessment, supervision (lunch and playground) and extracurricular activities, while others emphasized increased parental demands and expectations, the need to be alert to socio-economic and mental health pressures faced by families and the greater emphasis on continual improvement of teaching practice. “The days of packing your books and heading home to prepare your lessons for tomorrow and working in isolation with the classroom door closed are gone. This is not a vision that most of us have for our schools today.”

The wide variation in student needs within a class was identified as a workload factor, as was the number of special needs students in a class. The expectations for individualization and differentiated instruction are high and seen as a demanding part of teachers’ work.

Parental expectations are seen by trustees as having increased on several fronts: increased expectations for the school success of their children, increased expectations regarding individualization to meet their child’s needs, and increased expectations of the communication between teachers and parents. One trustee said, “Parents now have no hesitation in emailing or phoning the teacher and expect instantaneous responses. Teachers can’t do that (give instantaneous responses) – they need to be able to give thoughtful replies.”
A few trustees said that a teacher’s workload depends on the teacher’s own efficacy and ability to deal with change and uncertainty. The teacher who sees new ideas and strategies as adaptive and integrative rather than as add-ons has a real advantage. Other trustees spoke of workload issues as they relate to the teacher’s own stage of life – those with young families or elderly parents often have increased demands and stresses on their time away from school that can affect their ability to address the demands of the job.

Trustees see principals as playing a key role in helping teachers manage these demands – in helping to prioritize what is possible when time and resources are finite.

**How trustees view the impact of Ministry and board initiatives on teachers workload**

One trustee cited Ministry of Education initiatives as the primary factor in teacher workload, and said that part of the workload for the teacher is figuring out how to balance the many demands. Some others said that addressing new initiatives was just part of the job, that any job has “new stuff”. Trustees spoke of the initiatives increasing the teachers’ learning curve, and that the initiatives have helped focus the work of the whole school system. Initiatives are seen as creating a focus for professional learning, and helping teachers learn to live in an environment of change: “The tools of the trade in the past were very different from what teachers are required to use now. It (the initiatives) have certainly changed the work that elementary teachers do. At the same time I think it has given them some consistent tools.”

Some Ministry initiatives are seen as creating important cultural shifts in the way the teacher, school and system view their collective work. The focus now is on a profession that is actively assessing the progress of students (individually and collectively) and adjusting teaching and learning strategies to improve outcomes on a continuing basis.

**The alignment of initiatives with the board’s strategic plan**

Trustees described working actively to keep alignment between proposed initiatives and the board’s strategic plan and its Board Improvement Plan for Student Achievement. Some trustees said that if an initiative proposed by the Ministry does not enhance the direction the board is already committed to, they will drop the initiative. Others indicated that there is a thoughtful triage undertaken about which initiatives to implement.

**The role of trustees in helping to manage the demands of initiatives**

One board, after experiences with new Ministry directives that had very little time between announcement and implementation, has made all of its new policies in response to those directives temporary, and subject to change after consultation with teachers, principals and
others in the system. Another board actively involves teachers (and their unions) in board committees considering policy issues.

Board members identified the provision of resources (budget for time release, instructional support and teacher learning resources) as a pivotal support to help manage the demands of initiatives. Support for invitational and self-directed approaches to professional learning was mentioned by some.

Most of the trustees interviewed emphasized the importance of consistent messaging, working with community partners, keeping the big picture in mind, and communicating clearly the priorities of the system as part of the support for managing emerging demands.

**Key Questions Addressed**

As part of its study of teacher workload and professionalism, Directions was asked by the Ministry of Education to specifically address key questions. Those questions are addressed in the sections below that conclude the study.

**How should teacher workload and professionalism be defined?**

Rather than define teacher workload, Directions asked teachers a series of questions about the amount of time, during the most recent complete calendar week prior to the survey, spent in total teaching (planning lessons, marking student work, collaborating with other teachers, participating in staff meetings and on other tasks related to their job, including tasks that occurred during weekends, evenings or other out of classroom hours that were related to their employment at the school to which they had been assigned. They were also asked about the total amount of time they spent on teaching during the most recent complete calendar week and about the number of hours spent on a list of tasks:

- Individual planning or preparation of lessons either at school or out of school.
- Team work and dialogue with colleagues within this school.
- Assessing, correcting, evaluating or marking student work.
- Counselling students (providing social or emotional support to students outside of the time devoted to teaching).
- Student supervision outside of class (lunch room, hall or playground supervision, for example).
- General administrative work (including communication, paperwork, photocopying and other clerical duties you undertake in your job as a teacher).
- Communication and co-operation with parents or guardians.
- Engaging in extracurricular activities (e.g. sports, clubs, and cultural activities after school).
- Completing reports required by the principal, school board or ministry of education.
- Supervising a student teacher as the primary supervisor.
- Providing extra help to students outside of class time.

Teacher workload can be considered to be the sum of all the tasks related to the teacher’s professional practice.

The survey did not ask teachers to characterize their workloads. It was evident from the interview data that ETFO members do not typically think of workload, unless the demands upon them become overwhelming, prompting them to regard the workload as “too heavy.”

Teacher professionalism was determined by teachers’ responses to the following statements adopted from the 2008 Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS):

- Teaching has a shared body of professional knowledge that should be common to all of us.
- I prefer to work alone. My classroom is uniquely mine and I do things my way whenever I can. (reversed scored)
- Having common professional standards in teaching is important.
- I enjoy working collaboratively with my colleagues on school improvement initiatives.
- I enjoy working collaboratively with my colleagues on professional learning.

Teachers were provided with a four point Likert-type scale and asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with the statements. There was very high levels of agreement among ETFO members that teaching had a shared body of professional knowledge that should be common to all teachers (95.4%); that having common professional standards in teaching was important (98%); that they enjoyed working collaboratively with their colleagues on school improvement initiatives (83%), and with their colleagues on professional learning (91.4%). Less than 25% of the respondents said that they prefer to work alone, doing things their own way whenever they can (23.4%). That the teachers who responded to the survey agreed with such statements was not surprising in light of the fact that similar sentiments are expressed in the Standards of Practice for the Teaching Profession, the collective vision of professionalism that guides the daily practices of the members of the Ontario College of Teachers.

What does the research literature say about effective teaching and learning practices, conditions that support effective teaching and learning, and how these conditions can best be implemented?

The literature reviewed for this study indicated that, while centralized school reforms can have a negative impact on teacher professionalism, the deskilling and deprofessionalization widely predicted to be an inevitable outcome of standards based reform have not been widely
observed. With regard to their professionalism, teachers are less concerned with the specifics of government policy and much more concerned with the nature of reform implementation as it occurs within their particular contexts. Principals play a critical role in mediating reform processes. When principals foster a culture of shared decision-making and of collegial collaboration among teachers, when teachers feel that they are trusted to use their professional judgment in conducting their daily work, then teachers retain a strong sense of professionalism. Moreover, the principal’s role in fostering a strong sense of professional collaboration among teachers is key to managing the workload and professionalism issues that can arise in the context of centralized school reform.

How have professional teaching practices evolved in relation to school, district and system improvement initiatives in Ontario over the past decade?

Over the course of the past ten years, Ontario pursued reforms designed to change school and classroom practices while engaging teachers in a positive way and generating public support for public education in Ontario. To accomplish this, the approach to reform maintained respect for professional knowledge and practice, and emphasized professional capacity-building and strong leadership. Allied with the focus on improved student achievement and outcomes has been an intention to build a professional culture that is not static, but continuously developing and improving.

At the elementary level, the reforms were spearheaded by the Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat (LNS) established in 2004. A key goal of the LNS was to build capacity and support leadership and instructional effectiveness in Ontario school boards and schools. The LNS worked with school boards to set ambitious achievement targets—reflecting high expectations for every student—and to develop school improvement plans for achieving those targets. The LNS supported boards and school leaders with resources and professional development to implement best practices in literacy and numeracy instruction. Teachers received training on best teaching practices and the use of assessment data to guide instruction. The LNS also worked with schools to raise awareness regarding achievement issues for particular groups of students—including Aboriginal students, second language learners, students with special needs, and boys—and to implement targeted interventions for those groups. The LNS also worked with schools and boards to plan for continuous improvement while managing the local conditions facing individual schools.

The Ontario reforms included provisions to manage teacher workloads (such as the provision of more planning time) while improving student outcomes. New teachers and support workers were hired to decrease class sizes in the primary grades, and two additional professional activity days were designated within added to the school year calendar to make time for the capacity building aspects of the reforms. Nonetheless, many teachers reported that the reforms had led to an increase in their workload.
What factors contribute to teacher workload?
ETFO members indicate that workload is more a mental construct than a quantifiable entity. Teachers do not typically think of workload, unless the demands upon them become overwhelming, prompting them to regard the workload as “too heavy.” In fact, when asked, “What are the primary factors in your workload?” a number of respondents required prompting. This does not mean that workload has no external referents. Nonetheless, some of the interviewees were able to identify the parts of their work that they find particularly frustrating or overwhelming: report card preparation, special education reporting, or preparing for a subject in the elementary curriculum (e.g. Art) for which they have had no formal preparation.

The tasks teachers perform in addition to their instructional responsibilities are many and varied. The average teacher responding to the survey spent 25 hours during the week most proximate to the survey administration, including 7 hours and 42 minutes planning and preparing lessons and nearly four additional hours assessing, correcting, evaluating or marking student work. Together, the time spent in the classroom and preparing for and supporting the classroom instruction occupy nearly 50 hours per week, a figure, according to the available literature, that is relatively consistent over time and across jurisdictions.

Correlations between these tasks and teacher satisfaction were very weak, but all of the tasks except three exhibited an inverse relationship with satisfaction. In other words, the more time teachers spent on the task, the less satisfied they were. The three exceptions were: team work and dialogue with teachers in this school, engaging in extra-curricular activities, and supervising a student teacher. These three activities were directly associated with satisfaction, meaning that the more time teachers spent on them, the higher their satisfaction.

Two of the activities are significantly related to the likelihood that a teacher will be among those whose responses fall one standard deviation above the mean on satisfaction (what we refer to as high satisfaction) as opposed to one standard deviation below the mean on satisfaction (what we refer to as low satisfaction). Each additional hour a teacher spends planning or preparing lessons or completing reports required by the principal, school board or ministry of education diminishes the likelihood that she will be among the high satisfaction category.

The amount of time teachers spend on their work predicts whether they are among those teachers who regard themselves as highly satisfied. Each additional hour teachers spend in all aspects of their work diminishes the likelihood that they will be among those highly satisfied. Each additional percent of in-class time spent on administrative tasks such as recording attendance, handing out school information/forms and on keeping order in the classroom diminishes the likelihood of being in the high satisfaction category.
The factors most frequently identified by interviewees as affecting a teacher’s workload were planning, marking and assessing, communication with parents and participation in extracurricular programs. The number of students in a class, the range of their learning needs, and the number of identified special education students in the class, factors often referred to as class size and composition, were also perceived to affect teacher workload.

Experience matters. Every additional year of teaching increases the chances that a teacher will be highly satisfied as opposed to being in a group expressing low satisfaction. Every additional year of teaching in the same school increase the probability of being highly satisfied. This suggests that as teachers acquire more experience, they likely work more efficiently and are better able to prioritize their work.

**What factors help or hinder the impact of workload on individual teachers?**

Directions’ study identified a number of factors that predict high satisfaction among teachers some of which are very powerful. These factors likely mitigate the impact that workload has on teachers. These factors are: teacher professionalism, school shared decision-making, a positive academic and student orientation, a positive classroom disciplinary climate, feelings of teaching efficacy, and a collaborative teaching environment. The impact of these factors is often substantial. For example, for each point of increase on the Teacher Professionalism Scale, a teacher is 12.8 times more likely to be in the high satisfaction category than the low satisfaction category. A one point increase on the School Shared Decision Making and Academic & Student Orientation scales indicates that, respectively, a teacher is 3.8 times and 3.5 times more likely to be in the high satisfaction group than the low satisfaction group, respectively.

It is not surprising that a teacher’s frame of reference is the context in which s/he works and the colleagues with whom s/he works. Consistent with the literature reviewed, what administrators do affects teachers’ perceptions of their work, their workloads, their satisfaction, their collaboration with others, and their sense of professionalism. Factors identified by teachers as having a positive impact were:

- A sense of clear purpose for the school’s work, understood and shared by administrators and teachers alike (and sometimes the students);
- The provision of opportunities to work with other teachers – to observe other classrooms, to co-plan and to co-teach, to share information and understanding about assessment and marking in each other’s classes;
- Attention to the use of physical space – ensuring that teachers worked in proximity to those with whom they shared programs, and ensuring that there were reasonable workspaces;
- Ensuring that there were opportunities for teachers to work together across divisional lines, or across English/French Immersion lines in dual-track schools;
• An understanding and recognition of what the teacher’s daily work is – an appreciation of what is involved and where the stresses are;
• Consulting with and listening to the teachers in determining what the focus of collaboration and professional learning will be;
• Visibility in and around the classrooms of the school, including the observation of teaching and co-teaching;
• Active support for teachers, whether helping to set the tone and the management of discipline issues for the school, or assisting with parent communication and problem-solving;
• An invitational approach, encouraging and supporting teachers to participate, but not insisting that every teacher must pursue the same path to collaboration or professional learning, and
• Showing confidence in and belief in the importance of teachers’ professional judgment.

Among the most important influences upon teacher perceptions is direct observation by the school’s principal or vice-principal. Direct observation by the principal or vice principal had a demonstrable impact upon teachers’ perceptions of academic and student orientation, school shared decision making, and satisfaction. Moreover, the nature of the feedback received affects teachers’ perceptions. For example, feedback that emphasizes student performance has a demonstrable impact on teachers’ perceptions of a collaborative teaching environment, academic and student orientation, school shared decision making, differentiated practice and satisfaction.

Administrative practices that were perceived to have a negative impact included “command and control” approaches that paid little attention to the provision of support (time, space and opportunity) or to teacher voice and professional judgement.

Interview data from principals corroborates teacher perceptions. According to the principals, the factors that affect the way in which teachers work together include organizing teachers into grade or division teams, providing common planning time and/or additional release time for those teams to work together, the availability of professional learning opportunities that have teacher collaboration as a component, and the active inclusion of the “teacher voice” in decision making about professional learning. Principals see the provision of time during the school day for co-planning and for professional learning as essential to the success of the professional learning and to the development of on-going collaborative processes for instruction and assessment.

Collaboration establishes the opportunity for teachers to give and receive feedback about collaboration or working with others that, in turn, has a strong impact on teachers’ perceptions
of collaborative teaching environment, academic and student orientation, school shared decision making and satisfaction. Moreover, receiving feedback about one’s interaction with other teachers about teaching has a demonstrable impact on teachers’ perceptions of almost all of the dimensions: collaborative teaching environment, teacher professionalism, teaching efficacy, differentiated practice, school share decision making, satisfaction and productive use of preparation time.

These findings are consistent with the growing literature indicating that a school’s success is mediated by the impact that principals have on the organisation of teachers’ work, school organisation and relationships between the school and the wider community (Aydin, Sarier, & Uysal, 2013; Lucas et al., 2012; Chin, 2007; Bell, Bolam, & Cubillo, 2003; Hallinger, Bickman, & Davis, 1996). Principals exert influence by establishing a climate conducive to teaching and learning and fostering community support for the efforts of the teaching staff. Principals exert leadership through engaging the school’s staff in planning the school’s goals and program (Grissom, Loeb, & Master, 2013) and its professional development (OECD, 2013); working with teachers to solve classroom discipline problems (MacNeil & Prater, 1999); observing instruction (Veenman, Visser, & Wijkamp, 1998); encouraging teachers to improve their teaching and encouraging them to take responsibility for student learning; and by providing information about the school and about student performance to the parents and guardians of the students who attend the school (Jeynes, 2011).

School board directors interviewed identified a range of practices that a school board’s administration contributes to the development and maintenance of a professional atmosphere, including:

- modelling the professional relationships and engagement that they want to see, and being seen themselves as risk-takers and life-long professional learners;
- mediating and moderating the new demands and expectations;
- providing the time and resources for teachers to be engaged in collaborative and professional learning work;
- providing leadership programs that were open to teacher and union participation;
- ensuring that schools have within their buildings places that teachers could meet to do collaborative work;
- listening to teachers about what they need to succeed in their classrooms;
- having an active presence of superintendents/director in the schools, seen to be interested and participating;
- ensuring that the demands of ministry and board initiatives are aligned with the board’s strategic plan, board and school improvement plans; and
• providing context and making sense of new initiatives and demands to teachers whose work will be affected.

Interviews with trustees identified key factors that they contribute to a professional focus and atmosphere:

• An awareness of roles, and role distinctions (including trustees);
• Good communications and active listening;
• Mutual respect across role lines;
• Good working relationships, especially with the unions;
• The encouragement of innovation;
• A strategic plan that is clear about mission, vision and values, supported by operational and board improvement plans; and
• Paying close attention to student progress.

Based upon what we learned from the survey and interviews, while most teachers on their own will act professionally, teacher professionalism is reinforced by a collaborative and professional school culture to which principals can make a substantial contribution. And while most principals on their own will act professionally, their professionalism is enhanced when their efforts are complemented by those of board staff and trustees. Together teachers, principals, board administrative staff and trustees can help to create and sustain a culture that encourages and strengthens professionalism.

**What individual professional learning might help teachers to manage their workloads?**

The teachers responding to the survey indicated moderate to high levels of need for their own professional learning in regarding new technologies in the workplace and professional learning about information and communication skills (ICT) for teaching. Nearly half of the respondents indicated moderate or high needs for teaching cross-curricular skills, teaching students with special needs, and student evaluation and assessment practices, knowledge and understanding of their subject field(s), pedagogical competencies in the subjects they teach, and teaching in diverse settings. Approximately one-quarter indicated the need for learning about the curriculum and student behaviour and classroom management.

More than 60% of the respondents indicated that time, money, work schedules and the lack of incentives were barriers to their professional learning. Thus, if further professional learning is to have an impact on teacher workloads, it will be desirable to find creative and cost effective ways to overcome these barriers.
What changes in ministry or district practices and expectations might help teachers to manage their workload?

Interviewees identified quite a few initiatives that they perceive had emanated from their school boards or the Ministry of Education initiatives over the past few years. Regardless of whether they are described by board or ministry personnel as explicit and distinct initiatives, the things called initiatives or the things that teachers call initiatives change the way teachers work, and are often perceived to add work to a teacher’s responsibilities. While many teacher welcome initiatives that involve collaborative planning and teaching, some express the view that there are “too many new things, not enough time to process and reflect on each of them”. It is especially noticeable and irritating when an initiative appears to shift the teacher’s focus without a clear connection to the work and goals of the classroom.

In as much as “things with names” take on a disproportionate significance in the minds of teachers and signal a major change, it seems prudent to avoid unnecessary labelling of minor modification or enhancements to existing policies or practices. People are able to accommodate to changes more easily when the changes are perceived to be similar to existing policy or practice or connected in a logical, developmental way. If the policy or practice appears to be strikingly different, it will engender more resistance and be more difficult to incorporate into one’s repertoire. School boards and the ministry should consider how policy and program changes can be linked to existing policies and programs where it makes sense to do so, avoiding the unnecessary appearance of difference.

The challenge of building acceptance for changes perceived to be very different from existing practice also suggests that boards and the ministry should evaluate the necessity of each change in policy or practice and attempt to answer the question what would be the consequences of failing to adopt the new policy or practice.

Some changes to policy and practice are necessary and inevitable. When these occur, it is desirable to determine what steps boards and the ministry might take to create a climate that sees the changes as evolutionary and adaptive. It is also prudent to determine when and over what period of time the policy or program change should be implemented, allowing those implementing the change(s) and affected by the implementation to consider how the policy or practice can be accommodated without unnecessary disruption. For example, policy and program changes should be made at times during the school year that are, comparatively, less demanding and well in advance of the period during which they must be implemented.

Both boards and the ministry might consider conducting a review of reporting requirements with an eye to eliminating duplicative or unnecessary reports, reducing the number of reports, and making reporting itself easier.
We conclude this multi-faceted study of teacher workload and professionalism with the observation that some initiatives can take the educational system beyond the day to day operational business – the initiative can focus the work on bigger shared goals regarding student achievement, and help build a sense of collective responsibility. The school improvements and student successes achieved in Ontario over the past decade would not have occurred in the absence of such initiatives.

**What are the opportunities and barriers to effective implementation of Ministry and school board initiatives to improve student achievement within the context of teacher workload and professionalism?**

Based on its review of the survey and interview data, Directions believes that if changes (regardless of their magnitude) are clearly articulated and related to the overall goals of the Ontario education system, introduced when the necessary supports have been established, and supported during the implementation phase there should be no barriers to effective implementation. Over the past ten years, Ontario has successfully pursued significant changes because it has had a small number of goals, provided support for the professionals responsible for the implementation of those changes, respected their professional judgement, and was tolerant of failure so long as failure led to further attempts at innovation, improvement and eventual success.

Sustaining a focus on student achievement and well-being is the primary challenge facing Ontario. Each year brings a new generation of students, some of whom will face significant challenges to their success. Thus, despite the significant improvements in student achievement achieved in Ontario, there will be a continuing need for improvement. It is fortunate that, given the evidence from the survey, Ontario has a cadre of highly professional elementary teachers who are disposed to work collaboratively with their peers to enhance student success and well-being. Unless the reasons for change become unclear or seem unrelated to the overall goals Ontario is pursuing, the pace of change becomes too rapid for teachers to successfully incorporate into their repertoires, or teachers are discouraged from using their professional judgement, the successes Ontario has achieved are likely to be sustained.
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Appendix A: Ontario Teacher Professionalism and Workload Study Survey

About the Ontario Teacher Professionalism and Workload Study

The Government of Ontario, in consultation with the Elementary Teachers’ Federation of Ontario (ETFO), has engaged Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group to conduct a study of the impact of educational initiatives and student assessment at the provincial and school board level on student achievement, teacher workload, and teacher professionalism.

Your participation in the survey is entirely voluntary, but strongly encouraged. The survey is anonymous; none of the information collected will be linked to any individual. In fact, no names or other identifying information will be collected at all.

Knowing the demands on your time, we have made it possible for you to save your answers and return to the survey before the survey closes on March 7, 2014. Please click on SAVE and CONTINUE LATER and follow the instructions provided.

Should you wish to discuss this survey with someone at Directions, please send an e-mail to info@directions-eprg.ca with the following subject line: Ontario Teacher Work Load & Professionalism Study. You may indicate the nature of your concern in the e-mail.

Thank you,

Charles Ungerleider & Ruth Baumann
Background Information

These questions are about you, your education and the time you have spent in teaching. In responding to the questions, please mark the appropriate choice(s) or provide figures where necessary.

What is your gender?

☐ Female

☐ Male

In what year were you born?

☐ 2000

☐ 1999

☐ 1998

☐ 1997

☐ 1996

☐ 1995

☐ 1994

☐ 1993

☐ 1992

☐ 1991

... 40 additional choices hidden ...

☐ 1949

☐ 1948

☐ 1947

☐ 1946

☐ 1945

☐ 1944
What is your current employment status as a teacher?

Please consider your employment status. Please select the one choice that best represents your current employment status.

- Permanent full time contract (a contract with no fixed end date)
- Permanent part time contract
- Long term occasional teaching assignment (fixed term contract)
- Daily occasional teaching assignment

If you presently hold a permanent part time contract, please indicate the percentage of a full-time teaching assignment for which you are contracted. Please use the format 1.0 for full time or .75 for 3/4 time


If you work part-time, please tell us why.

Please select one choice.

- I chose to work part-time.
- There was no possibility to work full-time.

How many years of work experience do you have, including the current school year?

Please round up to whole years.

Year(s) working as a teacher at this school

Year(s) working as a teacher in total
Year(s) working in other education roles (do not include years working as a teacher)

Year(s) working in other jobs after completing your university education

Do you currently work at more than one school?
Please select one choice.
○ Yes
○ No

Please indicate in how many other schools you currently work at?
Please write a number.
School(s)

What is the highest level of education you have completed (including teacher preparation)?
○ Master's or Doctorate degree
○ 5-year University degree
○ 3 or 4-year University degree
○ Less than a 3 or 4-year University degree

To what extent do you feel prepared for the following?
Please select one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content of the subject(s) I teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy of the subject(s) I teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What was your major field of study as an undergraduate student?
Please select the one field of study that best represents your preparation.

○ Humanities (for example, History, Linguistics, Literature, Performing Arts, Philosophy, Religion, Visual Arts)
During your most recent complete calendar week, approximately how many 60-minute hours did you spend in total teaching, planning lessons, marking student work, collaborating with other teachers, participating in staff meetings and on other tasks related to your job at this school?

A 'complete' calendar week is one that was not shortened by breaks, public holidays, sick leave, professional development for which release time was provided, etc. Also include tasks that took place during weekends, evenings or other out of classroom hours that were related to your job at this school. Round to the nearest whole hour.

Hours

Of this total, how many 60-minute hours did you spend on teaching during your most recent complete calendar week?

Please only count actual in-class teaching time. Time spent on preparation, marking, etc. will be recorded in another question.

Hours

As a teacher of this school, during your most recent complete calendar week, how many 60-minute hours did you spend on the following tasks?
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Include tasks that took place during weekends, evenings or other off classroom hours. Please exclude all time spent teaching as this was recorded in a previous question. If you did not perform the task during the most recent complete calendar week, write 0 (zero).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Blank Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual planning or preparation of lessons either at school or out of school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team work and dialogue with colleagues within this school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing, correcting, evaluating or marking student work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling students (providing social or emotional support to students outside of the time devoted to teaching)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student supervision outside of class (lunch room, hall or playground supervision, for example)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General administrative work (including communication, paperwork, photocopying and other clerical duties you undertake in your job as a teacher)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and co-operation with parents or guardians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in extracurricular activities (e.g. sports, clubs, and cultural activities after school)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing reports required by the principal, school board or ministry of education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising a student teacher as the primary supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing extra help to students outside of class time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Professional Learning

In this section, 'professional learning' refers to activities in which you are engaged designed to improve your skill, knowledge, expertise and other characteristics as a teacher. Please only consider professional learning in which you were engaged after your initial preparation as a teacher.

During the current school year, did you take part in an induction (e.g., NTIP) program?
An 'induction program' is defined as a range of structured activities to support your introduction into the teaching profession, for example peer work with other new teachers, mentoring by experienced teachers, etc. Please select one choice in each row.

I took part or am currently taking part in an induction program.  

I took part or am taking part in informal induction activities not part of an induction program.  

I took part or am taking part in a general and/or administrative introduction to the school.  

Are you currently involved in any formal or informal mentoring or coaching activities?  
This question refers to mentoring by or for teachers at your school. It does not refer to student teachers who are doing their student teaching. Please select one choice in each row.

I presently have an assigned mentor/coach to support me.  

I serve as an assigned mentor/coach for one or more teachers.  

Did you supervise a student teacher during the past 12 months?  

○ Yes, as the sole supervisor  

○ Yes, sharing responsibility with one or more teachers  

○ No, I did not  

During the last 12 months, did you participate in any of the following professional activities during the regular school day, and if yes, for how many days did they last?  
One day is the equivalent of eight (8) hours.

(A) Participation  

B) Duration in days  

Courses/workshops (e.g. on subject matter or methods and/or other education-related topics)  

○ Yes  

○ No
Education conferences or seminars (where teachers and/or researchers present their research results and discuss educational issues)  
- Yes
- No

Observation visits to other schools  
- Yes
- No

Other Observation opportunities  
- Yes
- No

During the last 12 months, did you participate in any of these activities on your own time?

Please indicate 'Yes' or 'No' for each of the activities listed below.

- Additional Qualification program (AQ)
- Participation in a network of teachers formed specifically for the professional learning of teachers
- Individual research on a topic of professional interest
- Mentoring and/or peer observation and coaching as part of a formal school arrangement
- Collaborative research on a topic of professional interest.
- Course work provided by a college or university (not including AQ courses)

Considering all of the professional learning activities in which you were personally engaged during the current school year, what percentage of the time was spent in activities that were:

Percentages should add to 100%. Please enter 0 (zero) where appropriate.

- Ministry initiated
- Board initiated
- Union initiated
Initiated by a collective decision of the staff

Principal or vice-principal initiated

Self-initiated

Initiated by a professional group other than the union (e.g. a subject or divisional association or a educational organization such as the Learning Partnership

Parent initiated

**Did the professional learning activities in which you participated in during the last 12 months address the following topics? If so, what positive impact did these have on your teaching?**

For each specified alternative please indicate 'Yes' or 'No' in part (A). If 'Yes' in part (A), please estimate the impact in part (B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Topic</th>
<th>(B) Positive impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and understanding of my subject field(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical competencies in teaching my subject field(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluation and assessment practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and communication technology (ICT) skills for teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student behaviour and classroom management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School management and administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches to individualized learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching students with special needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Directions**
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---

**Teaching in a diverse setting**

- Yes
- No
- None
- Small
- Medium
- Large

**Teaching cross-curricular skills (e.g. problem solving, learning-to-learn)**

- Yes
- No
- None
- Small
- Medium
- Large

---

**For any of the professional learning activities in which you participated in the last 12 months, did you receive any of the following support?**

Please select one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Description</th>
<th>From the school board</th>
<th>From the Ministry of Education</th>
<th>From ETFO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I received scheduled time for activities that took place during regular working hours at this school.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received non-monetary support for activities outside working hours (reduced teaching, days off, study leave, etc.).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received reimbursement for transportation or meals connected with my participation in activities away from my school.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full or partial reimbursement for AQ or other course fees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Considering the professional learning activities in which you took part during the last 12 months, to what extent have they included the following?**
Please select one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Not in any activities</th>
<th>Yes, in some activities</th>
<th>Yes, in most activities</th>
<th>Yes, in all activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A group of colleagues from my school or subject group</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for active learning methods (not only listening to a lecturer)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative learning activities or research with other teachers</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An extended time-period (several occasions spread out over several weeks or months)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars or discussions held via teleconference or video conference</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrations or presentations held via videoconference</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please describe any additional learning activities in which you took part during the last 12 months.

____________________________________________________

Based upon your own self-appraisal, please indicate the degree to which you desire professional learning in the area named.

Please select one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No need at present</th>
<th>Low level of need</th>
<th>Moderate level of need</th>
<th>High level of need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and understanding of my subject field(s)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical competencies in the</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
subjects I teach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of the curriculum</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluation and assessment practices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and communication technology (ICT) skills for teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student behaviour and classroom management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School management and administration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches to individualised learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching students with special needs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching in a diverse setting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching cross-curricular skills (e.g. problem solving, learning-to-learn, critical thinking)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New technologies in the workplace</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student career guidance and counselling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there barriers to your participation in professional learning?

Please select one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I do not have the pre-requisites (e.g. qualifications, experience, seniority).</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional learning/development is too expensive/unaffordable.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lack of employer support.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional learning/development conflicts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with my work schedule.

I do not have time because of family responsibilities.

There are no relevant professional learning activities offered.

There are no incentives for participating in such activities.

Teacher Support

We would like to ask you about the support you receive about your work in this school. ‘Support’ is defined broadly as including any communication or assistance you receive about your teaching, based on some form of interaction with your work (e.g. observing you teach students, discussing your curriculum or students' results). Support can be provided through informal discussions with you or as part of a more formal and structured arrangement.

In this school, who uses the following methods to provide feedback to you?

'External individuals or bodies' as used below refer to supervisory personnel or other persons from outside the school. Please select as many choices as appropriate in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback following direct observation of your classroom teaching</th>
<th>External individuals (curriculum or instructional personnel from the school board)</th>
<th>School principal</th>
<th>School vice-principal</th>
<th>Assigned mentors or coaches</th>
<th>Teacher colleagues who are not part of the school management team</th>
<th>I have never received this feedback in this school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Feedback following an assessment of
Feedback following an analysis of your students' test scores

Feedback following your self-assessment of your work (e.g. presentation of a portfolio assessment)

Feedback following discussions with parents or guardians

In your opinion, when you receive this feedback, what emphasis is placed on the following areas by the person or persons providing the feedback?

Please select one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Not considered at all</th>
<th>Considered with low importance</th>
<th>Considered with moderate importance</th>
<th>Considered with high importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student performance</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and understanding of my subject field(s)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical competencies in teaching my subject</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
field(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student assessment practices</th>
<th>No positive change</th>
<th>A small positive change</th>
<th>A moderate positive change</th>
<th>A large positive change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student behaviour and classroom management</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching students with special needs</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching in a multicultural or multilingual setting</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The feedback I provide to other teachers to improve their teaching</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from parents or guardians</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student feedback</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration or working with other teachers</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The composition of your class</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent has the feedback you received at this school directly led to a positive change in any of the following?

Please select one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public recognition for you from the principal and/or your colleagues</th>
<th>No positive change</th>
<th>A small positive change</th>
<th>A moderate positive change</th>
<th>A large positive change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your role in school development initiatives (e.g. curriculum development)</th>
<th>No positive change</th>
<th>A small positive change</th>
<th>A moderate positive change</th>
<th>A large positive change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
group, development of school objectives, professional learning communities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The likelihood of your career advancement (e.g. promotion)</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The amount of professional learning you undertake</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your responsibilities at this school</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your confidence as a teacher</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your classroom management practices</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your knowledge and understanding of your main subject field(s)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your teaching practices</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your methods for teaching students with special needs</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your use of student assessments to improve student learning</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your job satisfaction</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your motivation</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You methods for teaching in a multicultural or multilingual setting</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listed below are some recent educational initiatives. Please select one response from each row that is the best description of your situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Education initiatives to teach students about</th>
<th>I am not familiar with the initiative.</th>
<th>I am familiar with the initiative, but did not participate directly during the past 12 months</th>
<th>I am familiar with the initiative and was an active participant during the past 12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
how the planet's physical and biological systems work, and how we can create a more sustainable future.

Full-day Kindergarten initiatives to establish full day kindergarten programs

Healthy Schools initiatives to help students develop the knowledge and skills related to leading a healthy life

Literacy and Numeracy initiatives to improve our students' reading, writing and math skills.

New Teacher Induction Program initiatives to support the growth and professional development of new teachers.

Ontario Curriculum Review initiatives to ensure that the curriculum remains current, relevant and age appropriate in all subjects.

Ontario Equity and Inclusive Education Strategy initiatives to help educators identify and remove discriminatory biases and systemic barriers to student achievement.

Safe and Accepting Schools initiatives to build positive and inclusive school climate.

Schools on the Move initiatives
for improving student achievement by helping schools share effective strategies and learn from one another.

Student Success – Learning to 18 initiatives designed to maintain student engagement in school through successful high school completion

Please list below any other Ministry or school board initiatives in which you took an active part during the last twelve months

Teacher appraisal and feedback in this school

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about this school?

Here, 'appraisal' is defined as review of teachers' work. This approach can be conducted in a range of ways from a more formal approach (e.g. as part of a formal performance management system, involving set procedures and criteria) to a more informal approach (e.g. through informal discussions). When a statement does not apply in your context, please omit the item. Please select one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The best performing teachers in this school receive the greatest recognition (e.g. rewards, additional learning opportunities or responsibilities).</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher appraisal and feedback have little impact upon the way teachers teach in the classroom.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher appraisal and feedback are largely done to fulfill administrative requirements.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A development or training plan is established for teachers to improve their work as a teacher.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback is provided to teachers based on a thorough assessment of their teaching.

Measures to remedy any weaknesses in teaching are discussed with the teacher.

Assistance is provided by board program staff to help the teacher improve his/her teaching.

Teacher appraisal provides one with valuable information and advice.

Your Teaching

Personal beliefs about teaching and learning.

On average, how often do you do the following in this school?

Please select one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once a year or less</th>
<th>2-4 times a year</th>
<th>5-10 times a year</th>
<th>1-3 times a month</th>
<th>Once a week or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teach jointly as a team in the same class</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe other teachers' classes and provide feedback</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in joint activities or projects that involve different classes or age groups.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange teaching materials with colleagues</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in discussions about the learning development of specific students</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with other teachers in my school to ensure common standards in evaluations for</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
assessing student progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend team conferences</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take part in collaborative professional learning</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share my teaching materials with others.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review data from diagnostic assessments to improve instruction</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review data from EQAO assessments to improve instruction</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with colleagues to discuss instructional improvement</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consider the school in which you worked last Tuesday and indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The primary mission of this school is that all students become proficient in core subjects.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers in this school emphasize that student performance can always be improved.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school supports all teachers in their efforts to improve student achievement.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the teachers in this school believe that students could reach standards and objectives.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school sets ambitious goals for student achievement.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff of this school value school improvement.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All teachers in this school assume responsibility for ensuring that all students learn.

This school has an explicit statement of high expectations concerning student achievement.

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the statements below.

Teaching has a shared body of professional knowledge that should be common to all of us.

As a teacher, I feel like I’m part of a group effort with my colleagues to ensure that our students do well.

I prefer to work alone. My classroom is uniquely mine and I do things my way whenever I can.

Having common professional standards in teaching is important.

I enjoy working collaboratively with my colleagues on school improvement initiatives.

I enjoy working collaboratively with my colleagues on professional learning.

Every time I’m out of my classroom for professional learning, it creates extra work for me.

I work more closely with others now than I did early in my career.

You can’t expect all students to be successful.

Having high expectations of students helps me to be a better, more focused teacher.

In your teaching, to what extent can you do the following?
Please select one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get students to believe they can do well in school work</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help my students value learning</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft good questions for my students</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control disruptive behaviour in the classroom</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate students who show low interest in school work</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make my expectations about student behaviour clear</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students think critically</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get students to follow classroom rules</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm a student who is disruptive or noisy</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a variety of assessment strategies</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide an alternative explanation for example when students are confused</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement alternative instructional strategies in my classroom</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your Classroom

In the following, we want to get into more detail about your teaching practices. Within this questionnaire, we cannot cover the whole scope of your teaching. The following questions ask you about the specific class that you taught in this school at 11 a.m. last Tuesday. Please note that if you do not teach on Tuesday, this can be the first class taught on a day following the last Tuesday.

Please supply the following information about the school and classroom in which you worked last Tuesday

If you do not have complete information, please provide your best estimate.
The total number of students in the school

The total number of students in the class you were teaching at 11:00 AM

We would like to understand the composition of the class. Please estimate the broad percentage of students in the class who have the following characteristics.

This question asks about your personal perception of student background. It is acceptable to base your replies on rough estimates. Students may fall into multiple categories. Please select one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>10% or less</th>
<th>11-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>More than 60%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students whose first language is neither French nor English</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low academic achievers</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with special needs other than academically gifted.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with behavioural problems</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from socio-economically disadvantaged homes</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academically gifted students</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this class, what percentage of in-class time is typically spent on each of the following activities?

Write a percentage for each activity. Write 0 (zero) if none. Please ensure that responses add up to 100%.

% of time in administrative tasks (e.g. recording attendance, handing out school information/forms, administering provincial examinations)

% of time keeping order in the classroom (maintaining discipline)

% of time engaged in actual teaching and learning
How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about this class?

Please select one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When the lesson begins, I have to wait quite a long time for</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students to quiet down.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in this class take care to create a pleasant learning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atmosphere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I lose quite a lot of time because of students interrupting</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is much disruptive noise in this classroom.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in this class know the routines and settle quickly to</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often does each of the following happen in the class throughout the school year?

Please select one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never or almost</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>In all or nearly all lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I present a summary of recently learned content.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work in small groups to come up with a joint solution</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to a problem or task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give different work to the students who have difficulties</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning and/or to those who can advance faster.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I refer to a problem from everyday life or work to demonstrate</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>why new knowledge is useful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I let students practice similar tasks until I know that every student has understood the subject matter.

I check my students' work.

Students work on projects that require at least one week to complete.

Students use Information and communication technology (ICT) for projects or class work.

I encourage students to define problems and evaluate solutions to them.

I encourage students to select the focus of their study.

I review data from standardized assessments to improve instruction.

**How often do you use the following methods of assessing student learning in the class?**

Please select one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Never or almost never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>In all or nearly all lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I develop and administer my own assessments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I administer a standardized test.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have individual students answer questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide written feedback on student work in addition to a mark, i.e. numeric score or letter grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I let students evaluate their own progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I observe students when working on particular tasks and provide immediate feedback.

I have students discuss and assess their work in pairs or small groups.

I administer diagnostic assessments.

I administer quizzes.

I assign project work that I assess.

I provide regular, oral feedback on student work in addition to a mark, i.e. numeric score or letter grade

School Climate and Job Satisfaction

How strongly do you agree or disagree with these statements as applied to the school in which you worked last Tuesday?

Please select one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This school provides teachers with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school provides parents or guardians with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school provides students with opportunities to actively participate in school decisions.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school has a culture of shared responsibility for school issues.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a collaborative school culture which is characterised by mutual support.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about what happens in the school in which you worked last Tuesday?

Please select one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this school, teachers and students usually work well with each other.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most teachers in this school believe that the students’ well-being is important.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most teachers in this school are interested in what students have to say.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a student from this school needs extra learning assistance, the school provides it.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How you feel about your job.

**How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements?**

Please select one choice in each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The advantages of being a teacher clearly outweigh the disadvantages.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I could decide again, I would still choose to work as a teacher.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to change to another school if that were possible.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I regret that I decided to become a teacher.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy working at this school.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wonder whether it would have been better to choose another profession.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would recommend my school as a good place to work.  
I think that the teaching profession is valued in society.  
I am satisfied with my performance in this school.  
All in all, I am satisfied with my job.  
I prefer to work alone in my classroom.  
I welcome suggestions about teaching from my colleagues.  
I like working with my colleagues on teaching tasks such as planning and assessment.  
I think teachers are valued by parents in this school.

Use of preparation time at school

**Thinking about your use of planning time at school, please indicate the frequency with which you engage in the following activities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess and evaluate student work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with other teachers or professionals to discuss student learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with other teachers to do collaborative planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk with other teachers about things that frustrate me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find a few quiet minutes to restore my energy before going back to teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meet with the principal or vice-principal
to discuss my concerns about students

Telephone or email parents

Look for teaching resources

Using social media to communicate with
parents or guardians

Maintain a web site for your classroom

Planning and marking during your scheduled preparation time.

Please select the statement that best describes your usual practice regarding lesson
preparation and marking during your scheduled preparation time at school.

I work at my desk in my classroom

I work in the staff lounge

I work in a workroom or resource room

I do not have a place at school where I can plan and mark comfortably

I do my planning and marking at home

The School Day

Please think about a typical school day as you respond to the items below. Please use the
format XX:YY

Students at my school begin their formal school day at: 

Students at my school end their formal school day at: 

I typically arrive at school at: 

I typically leave school at: 

Recent research on decision making shows that a person's choices are influenced by how they
are feeling at the time they are asked to complete a survey of this kind. To help us
understand how people make decisions, we want to understand how you approached the
questions in this survey. In particular, we want to know whether you have read the directions for each of the questions; if not, some of the results may not tell us very much about your workload or any of the other topics addressed in the survey. To show that you have read the instructions, please ignore the instruction and response options below about how you were feeling and instead check only the “none of the above” check box as your answer to this question.

Please check **all** of the words that describe how you are currently feeling

- Amused
- Anxious
- Bored
- Calm
- Delighted
- Embarrassed
- Engaged
- Excited
- Elated
- Friendly
- Happy
- Interested
- Joyful
- Lively
- Pleased
- Relaxed
- Satisfied
- Tense
- Unhappy
☐ None of the above

Please recall that the information on this survey is confidential. The information on this survey will be seen only by the Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group and not shared with any other group or individual. The question below is designed to enable us to determine whether the survey has reached all of the schools in which ETFO has members. Please select from the lists below, the name of the School Board for which you were working last Tuesday at 11:00 AM and then the name of the School in which you were working last Tuesday at 11:00 AM.

[Response Options Removed to Save Paper]

Thank you! Your response to this survey is very much appreciated.

Charles Ungerleider & Ruth Baumann, Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group
Appendix B: Interview Guide

Teacher Interview Guide
As you know, Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group was commissioned to conduct a study of teacher professionalism and workload among ETFO members.

Directions is interviewing teachers, administrators, board officials and trustees in 15 selected school boards as part of the project. The identities of those who are interviewed, the names of school and school boards will NOT be disclosed to anyone. Moreover, the responses of all of those whom we interview are anonymous and confidential.

May I have your permission to proceed with the interview and to make an audio recording so that I can focus on what you say? The audio recording will be transcribed and the audio files and transcription seen only by Directions staff members. Six months after our report is submitted, the audio and transcription files will be destroyed. Do I have your agreement to proceed? Thank you.

1. How long have you been a teacher? How long have you been teaching in this school?
   a. Have you taught at other schools during your career?
   b. What makes this school different from others at which you have worked?
2. What is your present assignment?
3. Most workplaces have an atmosphere that those who work there can describe. How would you describe the working environment of this school?
   a. What are the key ingredients that help to create that environment?
4. I’d like to learn more about the professional atmosphere in this school?
   a. How would you describe the way that teachers work with one another in this school?
   b. What factors influence the way that teachers work with one another?
   c. What contribution does the schools administration play in the way that teachers work with one another?
5. How would you characterize the students’ attitude toward learning in this school?
   a. What factors do you think contribute most to the students' attitude toward learning in this school?
6. What are the primary factors in your workload as a teacher?
7. For the past ten years, Ontario and Ontario's school boards have been pursuing a variety of initiatives designed to improve outcomes for students.
   a. Are you aware of any of those initiatives?
   b. What initiatives are you aware of?
   c. How have these initiatives affected your workload?
8. Some teachers, but not all, feel their work is demanding but satisfying. How would you describe your work?
   a. Do you find your work rewarding or unrewarding?
   b. What makes it (rewarding or unrewarding)?
   c. What impact, if any, does your workload have on your professionalism?
**Principal/Vice-Principal Interview Guide**

As you know, *Directions* Evidence and Policy Research Group was commissioned to conduct a study of teacher professionalism and workload among ETFO members.

*Directions* is interviewing teachers, administrators, board officials and trustees in 15 selected school boards as part of the project. The identities of those who are interviewed, the names of school and school boards will NOT be disclosed to anyone. Moreover, the responses of all of those whom we interview are anonymous and confidential.

May I have your permission to proceed with the interview and to make an audio recording so that I can focus on what you say? The audio recording will be transcribed and the audio files and transcription seen only by *Directions* staff members. Six months after our report is submitted, the audio and transcription files will be destroyed. Do I have your agreement to proceed? Thank you.

1. How long have you been an administrator? How long have you been an administrator in this school?
   a. Have you been an administrator at other schools during your career?
   b. What makes this school different from others at which you were an administrator?
2. Most workplaces have an atmosphere that those who work there can describe. How would you describe the working environment of this school?
   a. What are the key ingredients that help to create that environment?
3. I'd like to learn more about the professional atmosphere in this school?
   a. How would you describe the way that teachers work with one another in this school?
   b. What factors influence the way that teachers work with one another?
   c. What contribution does the school’s administration play in the way that teachers work with one another?
4. How would you characterize the students' attitude toward learning in this school?
   a. What factors do you think contribute most to the students' attitude toward learning in this school?
5. In your view, what are the primary factors in the workload of elementary teachers?
6. For the past ten years, Ontario and Ontario's school boards have been pursuing a variety of initiatives designed to improve outcomes for students.
   a. Are you aware of any of those initiatives?
   b. What initiatives are you aware of?
   c. How have these initiatives affected this school?
7. Many teachers feel their work is demanding. In what ways has the administration of this school helped the teaching staff to manage the demands that provincial and board initiatives have placed upon them?
**Director Interview Guide**

As you know, Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group was commissioned to conduct a study of teacher professionalism and workload among ETFO members. Directions is interviewing teachers, administrators, board officials and trustees in 15 selected school boards as part of the project. The identities of those who are interviewed, the names of school and school boards will NOT be disclosed to anyone. Moreover, the responses of all of those whom we will interview are anonymous.

May I have your permission to proceed with the interview and to make an audio recording so that I can focus on what you say? The audio recording will be transcribed and the audio files and transcription seen only by Directions staff members. Six month after our report is submitted, the audio and transcription files will be destroyed. Are you comfortable with me recording this interview? Thank you.

1. How long have you been a Director or Supervisory Officer? How long have you been a Director or Supervisory Officer in this board?
   a. Have you been a Director or Supervisory Officer in other boards?
   b. What makes this Board different from others at which you were a Director or Supervisory Officer?
2. Most boards have an atmosphere that those who work there can describe. How would you describe the working environment in this board?
   a. What are the key ingredients that help to create that environment?
3. I'd like to learn more about the professional atmosphere in this school?
   a. How would you describe the way that teachers work with one another in this board?
   b. What factors influence the way that teachers work with one another?
   c. What contribution does the school's administration play in the way that teachers work with one another?
4. In your view, what are the primary factors in the workload of elementary teachers?
5. For the past ten years, Ontario and Ontario's school boards have been pursuing a variety of initiatives designed to improve outcomes for students.
   a. What impact have these initiatives had on the work of elementary teachers in your board?
   b. How have these initiatives been aligned with the strategic plans developed by boards?
6. In what ways has this school board administration helped the teaching staff to manage the demands that provincial and board initiatives have placed upon them?
Trustee Interview Guide

As you know, Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group was commissioned to conduct a study of teacher professionalism and workload among ETFO members.

Directions is interviewing teachers, administrators, board officials and trustees in 15 selected school boards as part of the project. The identities of those who are interviewed, the names of school and school boards will NOT be disclosed to anyone. Moreover, the responses of all of those whom we interview are anonymous and confidential.

May I have your permission to proceed with the interview and to make an audio recording so that I can focus on what you say? The audio recording will be transcribed and the audio files and transcription seen only by Directions staff members. Six months after our report is submitted, the audio and transcription files will be destroyed. Do I have your agreement to proceed? Thank you.

1. How long have you been a school trustee in this board?
2. Most boards have an atmosphere that those who work there can describe. How would you describe the working environment in this board?
   a. What are the key ingredients that help to create that environment?
3. I’d like to learn more about the professional atmosphere in this school?
   a. How would you describe the way that teachers work with one another in this board?
   b. What factors influence the way that teachers work with one another?
   c. What contribution does the school’s administration play in the way that teachers work with one another?
4. In your view, what are the primary factors in the workload of elementary teachers?
5. For the past ten years, Ontario and Ontario’s school boards have been pursuing a variety of initiatives designed to improve outcomes for students.
   a. What impact if any have these initiatives had on the work of elementary teachers at the school level?
   b. How have these initiatives been aligned with the strategic plans developed by your board?
6. In what ways have the school board trustees helped the teaching staff to manage the demands that provincial and board initiatives have placed upon them?