**Yr Adran Plant, Addysg, Dysgu Gydol Oes a Sgiliau**
**Department for Children, Education, Lifelong Learning and Skills**

Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

# School support staff in Wales

Research report on the employment and deployment of support staff in schools in Wales

## Research

Research document No: 029/2008
Date of issue: August 2008

YMCHWIL GYMDEITHASOL Y LLYWODRAETH
GSR
GOVERNMENT SOCIAL RESEARCH

# School support staff in Wales

**Audience**

Local Education Authorities, Local Authorities and all partners concerned with education, lifelong learning and skills.

**Overview**

The One Wales policy programme (2007) of the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) included a commitment to 'develop a national structure for classroom assistants in Wales.' In order to develop its understanding of issues concerning the full range of support staff, the WAG commissioned research into the employment and deployment of all such personnel in schools in Wales.

**Action required**

No action required.

**Further information**

Any questions on the project should be addressed to:
Alison Rees
Research and Evaluation Team
Welsh Assembly Government
Ty'r Afon
Bedwas
Caerphilly, CF83 8WT
Tel: 01443 663808
E-mail: Research2@wales.gsi.gov.uk

**Additional copies**

Further copies may be obtained at the above address. This document can also be accessed from the Welsh Assembly Government website at:
http://new.wales.gov.uk/topics/educationandskills

**Related documents**

One Wales: A progressive agenda for Wales is available on the Welsh Assembly Government's website. Here is the link:
http://new.wales.gov.uk/about/strategy/1wales/?lang=en

© Crown copyright August 2008
D2330809

# Contents


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Acknowledgements | i |
| Glossary of Acronyms | ii |
| Executive Summary | iii |
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Project aims and objectives | 3 |
| 3. Numbers and roles of support staff – Primary schools | 8 |
| 4. Numbers and roles of support staff – Secondary schools | 18 |
| 5. Employment arrangements | 32 |
| 6. Recruitment | 81 |
| 7. Professional development and support | 94 |
| 8. Overall conclusions | 119 |
| Appendix 1 | 123 |
| Appendix 2 | 127 |

# Acknowledgements

The research team would like to thank all participants in this research who gave up their time to contribute to the project. The team would also like to express their gratitude to colleagues at the Welsh Assembly Government for their advice and support.

Thanks also go to NFER colleagues at the Statistics Research and Analysis Group (SRAG), in particular Palak Mehta and Tilaye Yeshanew, and to Lowri Randell and Elin Davies for their invaluable administrative and technical support.

# Glossary of acronyms

| | |
|---|---|
| ALN | Additional Learning Needs |
| BSL | British Sign Language |
| CPD | Continuing Professional Development |
| CRB | Criminal Records Bureau |
| DCELLS | Department for Children, Education, Lifelong Learning and Skills |
| DCSF | Department for Children, Schools and Families |
| DISS | Deployment and Impact of Support Staff |
| FTE | Full Time Equivalent |
| GCSE | General Certificate of Secondary Education |
| HLTA | Higher Level Teaching Assistant |
| ICT | Information Communication Technology |
| LEA | Local Education Authority |
| LSA | Learning Support Assistant |
| NFER | National Foundation for Educational Research |
| NJC | National Joint Council for Local Government Services |
| NVQ | National Vocational Qualification |
| PA | Personal Assistant |
| PGCE | Postgraduate Certificate in Education |
| PM | Performance Management |
| RAISE | Raising Attainment and Individual Standards in Education in Wales |
| SCRE | Scottish Council for Research in Education |
| SENCO | Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator |
| SMT | Senior Management Team |
| WAG | Welsh Assembly Government |

# Executive Summary

## 1. Introduction

The One Wales policy programme (2007) of the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) included a commitment to 'develop a national structure for classroom assistants in Wales.' In order to develop its understanding of issues concerning the full range of support staff, the WAG commissioned research into the employment and deployment of all such personnel in schools in Wales.

Published research on support staff in schools is limited, although the SCRE research (2004) on learning assistants in Scotland reported that their introduction after 1998 had been welcomed by schools, relieving teachers of many mundane tasks and contributing to better learning conditions for pupils.

The commitment from the WAG, however, included all categories of support staff. In order to inform this development the Department for Children, Education, Lifelong Learning and Skills (DCELLS) commissioned the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) in December 2007 to undertake a survey of the employment and deployment of school support staff in Wales. This Summary describes the conduct and findings of that research in concise form.

## 2. Project aims, methodology and samples

### 2.1 Project aims

**The overarching aim of the research was to:**

- Produce a comprehensive profile of the current school support staff workforce in Wales in order to inform policy development around the employment and deployment of the workforce and to develop their role in helping to raise standards in schools in Wales.

**The objectives within this overarching aim were to collect data on the following research questions:**

- Who are school support staff?
- How are support staff employed and deployed?

- How is performance management conducted?
- What training and qualifications do support staff have?
- What arrangements exist for continuing professional development (CPD)?
- What are the consistencies and variations across the LEAs in Wales?

## 2.2 Project methodology and samples

### i) School and LEA questionnaire surveys

Two bilingual questionnaires, one each for schools and local authorities, were developed. The school questionnaire was distributed in February 2008 to all primary, secondary and special schools in Wales, accompanied by a letter from the Minister for CELLS urging schools to complete and return the instruments. Table 2.1 below shows the numbers of questionnaires distributed and returned in time for analysis.

| Target group | Sent | Returned for analysis | % received |
|---|---|---|---|
| Primary schools | 1472 | 399 | 27 |
| Secondary schools | 208 | 55 | 26 |
| Special schools | 45 | 15 | 33 |
| LEAs | 22 | 9 | 41 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey, 2008

To maximise the response, two reminder letters were sent and two telephone calls made to the samples, while the deadline for return was extended by two weeks. Despite this, the overall school response of 27 per cent was a little disappointing. However, analysis of the sample by the variables of local authority, region, free school meals and rurality showed that the obtained secondary and primary samples were still representative of the total school population in Wales. The response rate of 41 per cent from LEAs was also rather disappointing, despite the despatch of reminders to LEA officers.

### ii) Qualitative field interviews

In order to obtain supplementary evidence to illuminate the questionnaire responses, qualitative interviews were carried out in a sample of two primary and two secondary schools and one Special Unit attached to a secondary school. In each institution

interviews were conducted with the headteacher or a senior manager and with different categories of support staff.

Qualitative interviews were also undertaken in two local authorities with LEA officers having responsibility for support staff.

The perspective of trades union was captured through qualitative interviews with representatives of eight different unions.

## 3. Survey findings

### 3.1 Numbers and roles of support staff: primary schools

The support staff workforce in primary schools was overwhelmingly female at 95 per cent. The highest proportion of male staff (50 per cent) was identified in the technicians category although this whole category was numerically small. Males were only 1.5 per cent of the workforce in both the administrative and the teaching and learning assistant categories.

In general, primary school support staff tended towards the upper end of the age range. Some 57 per cent were aged 40 or over – 79 per cent of administrative staff - and only 12 per cent under 30.

The best-qualified categories were technicians and HLTAs. Just over half of teaching and learning assistants in primary schools were qualified at level 3 or above. The HLTA category had 22 per cent at level 4 and 50 per cent at level 3. Site and facilities staff had the lowest qualifications with 81 per cent at or below Level 1.

Classroom assistants were reported in 54 per cent of the primary schools as compared with 33 per cent for teaching assistants. The balance between full-time and part-time employment in these two groups was roughly even. Only 17 per cent of the primary sample reported having appointed HLTAs. Learning support assistants for pupils with additional learning needs (ALN) were the most numerous sub-category of teaching and learning assistants in primary schools.

The vast majority of primary schools reported employing a caretaker of whom 55 per cent worked part-time in the school. Most kitchen staff and cleaners (87 per cent) reported were employed on a part-time basis. The great majority, particularly the kitchen staff, were not employed by the school but by the LEA or external companies.

Around a third of school administrators/clerks worked full time and just over a quarter of school secretaries.

### 3.2 Number and roles of support staff: secondary schools

Overall, many more sub-categories of support staff were employed in the secondary sector than in primary schools. The gender balance was again strongly in favour of female staff, although not as overwhelmingly as in the primary sector; some 20 per cent of support staff overall were male, but this dropped to 11 per cent of administrative staff and 10 per cent of Teaching and Learning Assistants; the highest proportion of males was in the technicians category at 42 per cent. Analysis of support staff by age showed a slightly older profile than the primary sector with 62 per cent aged 40 or over; four sub-categories had around 70 per cent aged 40 or over; as in the primary schools, the youngest category were the Teaching and Learning Assistants with 52 per cent aged 39 or under and 24 per cent under 30.

On the whole, support staff in the secondary sector had lower average qualifications than those in primary schools. Teaching and Learning Assistants were less well-qualified in secondary schools with only 29 per cent at Level 3 or higher compared to 50 per cent in primary schools; welfare staff were better qualified but technicians and administrative staff less so than their primary counterparts. Facilities and site support staff were again the lowest qualified category with 91 per cent at or below Level 1.

The most numerous kind of Teaching and Learning Assistant, as in the primary sector, was the additional needs ALN learning assistant, of whom 63 per cent were part-time. 62 per cent of classroom assistants but only 29 per cent of teaching assistants worked full-time. HLTAs were only reported in 14 of the 55 sample secondary schools; only 30 per cent of these were employed full-time compared with two thirds in the primary sector.

Careers officers, pupil welfare officers and nurses were all predominantly working part-time in the schools and employed by the LEA or other agencies. ICT technicians (broadly defined those responsible for maintaining the system) were largely employed full-time and by the schools. Except for ICT assistants (broadly defined as those who supported the use of ICT), all kinds of technicians and librarian were found more widely than Teaching and Learning Assistants in the secondary sector.

In the ‘other’ support staff category, examination invigilators were by far the commonest group with an average of eight per school and almost all part-time; cover supervisors and language assistants were also reported widely. Caretakers were recorded at an average of two per secondary school and site managers were also widely employed.

Employment patterns for the very numerous midday and kitchen staff were similar to the primary sector, the great majority part-time and employed by the school, while cleaners were also mainly part-time but employed quite evenly between schools and external employers.

There was a greater diversification of administration roles, and all widespread throughout schools, than in the primary sample, although the balance between full-time and part-time work varied across the groups;  bursars and office managers were common and mainly full-time, while data managers, examination and finance officers were fairly equally full-time or part-time. A majority (56 per cent) of the secretaries were full-time, in contrast to about a quarter in primary schools, and about a third of the responding schools had PAs to the headteacher.

### 3.3 Employment arrangements

The pattern of the employment arrangements for full-time support staff varied considerably. In general, a lower proportion of part-time staff were paid 52 weeks a year than full-time staff.

Nearly two thirds of Teaching and Learning Assistants were employed from school budgets and a further quarter from LEA central budgets. Some seven per cent of all school Teaching and Learning Assistants were funded with the assistance of some form of external grant, such as RAISE.[1]

School budgets were the most common way of funding technicians.

The hours for which part time support staff were contracted varied considerably. Part-time Teaching and Learning Assistants were mostly contracted for more than 50 per cent of FTE and many were contracted for more than 75 per cent.

[1] The RAISE (Raising Attainment and Individual Standards in Education in Wales) programme was launched by the WAG to provide targeted support to disadvantaged pupils and to seek to raise their levels of performance.

Most part-time ICT network managers were employed 52 weeks each year. However, other part-time ICT staff (ICT technicians, ICT support staff) were usually employed during term time only. The same was true of technicians.

There were differences in the hours of facilities staff; caretakers were usually employed for the higher quartile of FTE.

Most schools said that the National Joint Council for Local Government Services (NJC) rates were used for teaching and learning assistants and administrative staff. Most also indicated that LEA advice was the usual method of calculating support staff wages where the NJC scales were not used. A slightly different view was offered by the LEAs who said that decisions about the wages of staff not employed on NJC scales were taken by schools or jointly by schools and LEAs.

More than four fifths of schools said that their LEAs had issued guidance about the scales which should be used to calculate the pay and conditions of different categories of support staff.

Nearly all schools said that their support staff were paid through the LEA payroll.

### 3.4 Recruitment

Newspaper advertisements, jobcentres and word of mouth were methods used to recruit teaching and learning assistants. Few schools had experience of recruiting HLTAs or pupil welfare support staff. Similar methods were used to recruit technicians, although newspaper advertising was rather more important for this category.

LEAs were more involved formally in recruiting catering and cleaning staff, although word of mouth around the school appeared to be an important means of recruiting midday supervision and kitchen staff. Trade union representatives felt with a little concern that the professional status of support staff could be enhanced by greater standardisation.

LEAs were important sources of advice and guidance to schools when they recruited support staff. This included support with personnel and contractual issues and in drawing up post and person specifications. In general, schools were satisfied with the support they received from their LEAs. However, there was a feeling in some areas that schools needed more support, especially

those seeking to recruit staff who could work through the medium of Welsh.

There is a growing demand for support staff, particularly to accommodate the Foundation Phase, and schools reported some difficulties in recruitment. This was often attributed to low remuneration and the terms and conditions of support staff.

There was some concern in schools about the gender imbalance among support staff and the high percentage of females.

Schools had mixed views about the minimum qualifications levels which should be required for recruitment to support staff posts. A range of qualifications were found amongst support staff, and expectations about the required level of qualifications for many categories varied considerably. Headteachers believed that for Teaching and Learning Assistants basic qualifications such as GCSEs in maths and English/Welsh were required but that it was not always necessary to insist on higher level qualifications.

The great majority of schools felt that the qualifications of their support staff met the school's needs but some were concerned about the qualifications levels of classroom assistants.

There was concern in the Welsh-medium sector about insufficient numbers of Welsh-speaking support staff.

### 3.5 Professional development and support

Performance management arrangements for support staff varied. More schools had them in place than did not. However, there were variations according to category of support staff. Those working in classrooms were most likely to have some form of performance management system.

In general, schools were satisfied with the performance management arrangements. The importance of informal procedures were emphasised. There was some opposition by school leaders to any proposal to introduce a mandatory formalised appraisal system for support staff.

The headteacher or a designated member of a school's SMT was normally responsible for the performance management of classroom-based support staff. There was greater LEA involvement in some other categories, such as facilities/site personnel.

Professional development and promotion opportunities were said to be limited for most support staff, especially facilities/site personnel. Funding was perceived as a major obstacle. Some support staff were unable to pursue professional development opportunities because of family or other commitments. In general, it was considered that the quality of those training opportunities currently available to support staff were adequate.

In most schools support staff and teachers were able to undertake some training together, particularly Early Years and Health and Safety. The Foundation Phase, behaviour management, and ICT were identified as areas which should be the priorities for future professional training.

Schools felt that the opportunities for teaching and learning assistants to obtain HLTA status were adequate. There were differing views about the extent to which there were adequate opportunities for specialisation.

Periodic release was the most common way of enabling support staff to take part in professional development activities. Most schools thought that the take-up of training opportunities by support staff was adequate or better than adequate. Suitable training was fairly or very easy to find for most categories of support staff.

Low pay for all categories of support staff was a major concern for the staff themselves, but also for headteachers who saw this as a factor inhibiting recruitment.

## 4. Overall conclusions

### 4.1 Characteristics of the support staff workforce

The largely female nature of the workforce in both the primary and secondary sectors has implications for the general ambience of schools. It reinforces the growing lack of gender balance amongst the teaching workforce, particularly in primary schools, and its lack of male role models. Teenage boys might particularly find it easier to relate to male support staff.

Although the age profile of support staff is weighted towards the older end of the spectrum, this need not impact on the effectiveness of the workforce or its relationship with teachers and pupils. The concern is that as many support staff approach retirement age together, current recruitment issues could make it difficult to replace them adequately.

The general low pay earned by support staff in most categories means that they are inadequately rewarded for their contribution in schools and this affects recruitment. There are probably links between the low remuneration and female preponderance in the workforce as support staff jobs are often perceived as merely a 'second wage' inadequate to maintain a family by itself and therefore seen as unattractive by many men.

Qualifications held by support staff vary very widely according to needs of the particular role but staff with Level 4 qualifications are a clear minority. The low pay does not help to attract recruits with degrees, even to the more technical support roles.

### 4.2 Conditions of work

The provision of training is generally adequate and relevant for all types of support roles and these staff are usually able to maintain their levels of necessary skills and knowledge. Support staff especially appreciate opportunities to share training events with teaching staff and this aspect could be further developed.

However, possibilities for professional development and promotion are on the whole limited for all categories of support staff, except in larger schools where there may be different grades of administrative personnel, for example. These constraints can affect the motivation of staff to undertake training as there is then no recognition for their improved skills.

Inadequate funding in schools can mean that higher-level roles cannot be made available for staff. It causes frustration when staff have studied to acquire higher qualifications but the school cannot afford to advertise a higher-level post, such as an HLTA position.

Arrangements for the appraisal and development of support staff vary considerably across schools. Approaches which are too informal and infrequent can reinforce the impression that support staff form a largely casual workforce and do not help their motivation for self-improvement.

The importance of support staff to the success of schools is widely recognised by teaching staff and by many of the staff themselves. Although difficult to quantify, their impact can be seen in improved academic results as their support improves pupils' basic skills and teachers are released by contractual changes arising from the workforce agreement from more mundane tasks to focus on raising pupil performance. Their potential impact is also considerable in

terms of pupil behaviour and attitudes around the school where support staff have contact with them. In Welsh-medium schools, support staff can increase contact time with the language for pupils from non Welsh-speaking homes and offer more informal linguistic models than teachers.

The impact of support staff could be enhanced through a widening of certain roles they undertake, although that would need to be underpinned by training and properly recognised.

Generally, support staff enjoy their work, especially their contact with children and the opportunity to help them develop. They bring considerable goodwill to their roles. The element of 'convenience' is important to many of them as the great majority live close to the workplace and the hours of work fit with demands of childcare and other family responsibilities.

However, there is also a feeling of slight injustice that they carry out many of the tasks attributed to teachers but for a fraction of the salary.

Recruitment of support staff depends on several factors. The logistical convenience of many of the jobs can be attractive, but aspects such as the very limited hours of midday supervisors and catering staff and the generally poor remuneration create problems for recruitment for many schools. Well-qualified applicants may only see a support staff post as a temporary measure until a better-paid opportunity arrives. The shortage of Welsh-speaking applicants in many areas is also creating difficulties of recruitment in the Welsh-medium sector, particularly for roles with a teaching requirement such as Teaching and Learning Assistants.

### 4.3 A National Structure for support staff

The proposal for a National Structure for support staff was generally found interesting, although some uncertainty was encountered regarding its possible content and status. It was felt that any development of a National Structure should keep the following considerations in view:

- A Structure should allow for flexibility according to local conditions and history.

- There is a case for more formal and standardised arrangements for appraisal and performance management.

- The development of career paths would raise staff motivation and could be linked to the gaining of qualifications.
- Pay levels should be addressed, possibly through comparison with similar roles in other sectors of the economy; national pay scales for certain roles could be considered.
- There is a pressing need to address the gender imbalance.
- Compulsory unionisation of certain roles could help improve pay and conditions for staff.
- Job re-evaluations should be carried out regularly, particularly in view of technological change and school reorganisation.
- Entitlements for initial training and continuous professional development would enhance conditions of employment.
- There is a need for good marketing to aid recruitment to some support staff roles.
- A National Structure should not impact on the conditions of work of teachers or other professions.

# 1. Introduction

Many different categories of non-teaching support staff are now employed in schools in Wales. They play an increasingly important role within schools which is likely to continue to develop in the years ahead. In Wales, the approach developed by the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) and outlined in *The Learning Country* (2001) and *The Learning Country: Vision into Action* (2006) recognised the contribution made by support staff and the input they make to effective schools.

The role and potential of support staff has been recognised further in the strategies for workforce remodelling and schools' response to the requirements of the workforce agreement, as they have been allocated an increasingly diverse range of tasks, some of which had previously been undertaken by teachers[2]. These tasks include administrative and managerial work, providing aspects of pastoral care, and some para-pedagogical responsibilities. The effective and appropriate deployment of support staff is also an important element in school improvement policies in specific areas such as Early Years and the Foundation Stage, 14-19 Learning Pathways agenda and health promotion.

Promotion and career development opportunities may have been restricted for support staff, but the introduction of Higher Level Teaching Assistant (HLTA) status has created opportunities for career development for Teaching and Learning Assistants.

However, it has also been noted that the role of support staff has developed piecemeal and has lacked the coherence of a standardised, national approach. Consequently, considerable variations exist in the nature of the work which support staff undertake, their terms and conditions of work, the duration of contracts, and the extent to which they have autonomy over their own work. These often reflect schools' own priorities and the way individual headteachers and governing bodies have responded to challenges arising from workforce remodelling and the workforce agreement.

Published research on support staff in schools is limited, although the SCRE research (2004) on learning assistants in Scotland reported that their introduction after 1998 had been welcomed by schools, had relieved teachers of many mundane tasks and had

[2] The National Agreement on Raising Standards and Tackling Workload

contributed to better learning conditions for pupils. The role and impact of support staff have, however, gained greater prominence more recently. For example, Blatchford et al (2007) undertook a survey on behalf of the DCSF (the DISS research) which examined issues concerning the numbers of support staff, issues concerning recruitment, their background characteristics, employment and line management arrangements, qualifications and training, deployment, relationships with teachers and impact, among other issues (Blatchford et al, 2007).

The One Wales agreement (2007) of the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) included a commitment to develop a national structure for classroom assistants. In order to inform this development, the Department for Children, Education, Lifelong Learning and Skills (DCELLS) commissioned the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) to undertake research to provide a snapshot of the employment and deployment of all school support staff in Wales. The following sections describe the conduct and findings of that research.

# 2. Project aims and objectives

## 2.1 Project aims

The aim of the research was to:

- Produce a comprehensive profile of the current school support staff workforce in Wales in order to inform policy development around the employment and deployment of the workforce and to develop their role in helping to raise standards in schools in Wales.

The objectives within this overarching aim were to collect data on the following:

- Who are school support staff:
    - The number and types of school support staff over the past five years.
    - Roles of school support staff, how these are changing and how they impact on the organisation of the school and outcomes for learners.
- How are support staff employed and deployed:
    - Pay scales – to what extent do LEAs use the NJC scales for the purpose of calculating pay ranges?
    - Who pays school support staff e.g. schools, LEAs?
    - Are school support staff paid weekly/monthly, during term time?
    - How are their wages calculated (consistencies across 22 LEAs in Wales)?
    - Different roles.
    - Sector – how many employed in primary, secondary, and ALN sectors?

- Gender and age profiles.
- Recruitment processes, including an examination of LEA involvement, challenges to recruitment, and LEAs' roles in raising awareness of employment opportunities and/or assisting in the recruitment process?

- Performance management:
  - To what extent do performance management arrangements exist for school support staff?
  - Who is responsible for managing the performance of school support staff (e.g. teachers, headteachers, LEA guidance)?

- Training and qualifications:
  - What qualifications do school support staff currently hold?
  - What qualifications are required by school support staff for particular roles?

- Continuing Professional Development:
  - Are there opportunities for progression?
  - Are there opportunities to specialise in a particular area e.g. basic skills, ICT, art?
  - Are there opportunities to progress to Higher Level Teaching Assistant status and beyond?

- What consistencies and variations are there across the LEAs in Wales.

### 2.2 Project methodology and samples

There were two strands to the project methodology.

#### i) School and LEA questionnaire surveys

Two bilingual questionnaires, one each for schools and local authorities, were developed through discussion with DCELLS staff with questions addressing the issues described in Section 2.1

above. This questionnaire was distributed by post to all primary, secondary and special schools in Wales and accompanied by a letter from the Minister for CELLS emphasising the importance of the survey and urging schools to complete and return the instruments. Table 2.1 below indicates the numbers of questionnaires distributed and received back in time for analysis.

| Target group | Sent | Received | % received |
|---|---|---|---|
| Primary schools | 1472 | 397 | 27 |
| Secondary schools | 208 | 55 | 26 |
| Special schools | 45 | 15 | 33 |
| LEAs | 22 | 9 | 41 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey, 2008

Responses were received from a total of 471 schools, including four schools of an unrecorded phase or type.

The schools and LEAs were initially allowed a period of three weeks to complete and return the questionnaires. When the initial response proved sluggish, efforts were made to maximise the response rate. A reminder letter was sent to the samples on 15 February before the end of the three week period and another on 29 February when the deadline for return was extended. Telephone reminder calls were also made to non-responding schools between 12 February and 13 March.

The overall response rate for all schools was 27 per cent. The response rate from primary and secondary schools was very similar while the percentage returns from special schools were a little higher. This overall response was lower than the target rate, and comments received during the qualitative research visits suggested that headteachers had found the complexity of the questionnaire a little daunting. The response rate of 41 per cent from LEAs was also rather disappointing, despite the despatch of reminders to LEA officers.

### ii) Qualitative field interviews

In order to obtain supplementary evidence to illuminate the questionnaire responses, qualitative, in-depth research interviews were carried out in a sample of two primary and two secondary schools and one Special Unit attached to a secondary school. In each institution interviews were conducted with the headteacher or senior manager responsible for support staff, and support staff themselves representing different categories of support.

Qualitative interviews were also undertaken with LEA officers with responsibility for support staff in two local authorities.

The perspective of trade unions was captured through qualitative interviews with representatives of eight different unions.

### 2.3 Representativeness of questionnaire sample

Despite the rather disappointing total number of schools returning the questionnaire, this sample proved highly representative of the national profile of schools in Wales.

The numbers of responding schools were compared with the national profile of schools by six variables: local authority, region, primary school type, school size, free school meals and rurality. Pearson chi-square tests indicated that the responding samples of both primary and secondary schools were representative of the national population in every category. For example, as regards local authority, seven per cent of primary schools in Wales are located in Gwynedd, and seven per cent of the responding primaries were in Gwynedd. The highest comparative response for the primary sector was from Neath Port Talbot with seven per cent of responding schools against five per cent of the national population. The lowest comparative response was from Swansea with only three per cent of responding primary schools compared with six per cent of the Welsh total. In the remaining 20 authorities the difference between their percentage of a) the total number of primary schools in Wales and b) responding primaries in the survey was one per cent or less.

In the secondary sector, too, although the national total of schools was much smaller (208), the sample of responding schools was representative of the whole population by all five variables. Only two local authorities were not represented in the secondary sample; Denbighshire and Merthyr Tydfil. However, the regional breakdown of responding schools by the three categories North, Powys and South West and South East corresponded closely to the national profile.

Considering the results by all stratifying variables, the results of the questionnaire survey can therefore be interpreted as representative of the total population of schools in Wales.

Complete tables of the representativeness of the obtained sample may be seen in Appendix 1.

## 2.4 Data analysis

The multiple-choice questionnaire responses were keyed in by data entry staff in the NFER's Research and Data Services (RDS) section, and the open-ended responses in Welsh and English coded according to a standard coding frame before being keyed in.

The qualitative interviews were recorded and written up by members of the research team and analysed by theme and response type.

**Main Findings**

2.(i) The overall response rate from schools to the questionnaire survey was 27 per cent after two written reminders and telephone calls; the response rate from LEAs was 41 per cent.

2.(ii) The school questionnaire sample which was obtained proved statistically representative of the whole school population in Wales for the six stratifying variables used in both the primary and secondary sectors.

# 3. Numbers and roles of support staff – Primary Schools

### 3.1 Recording data

In the questionnaire survey, schools were asked to record the numbers of support staff employed by them in the whole range of job categories found across the school sector. This chapter presents tables indicating the responses obtained from the primary schools who responded.

It should be noted that the sub-totals presented in many of the columns in the following tables do not sum as might be expected. For example, Table 3.1 below shows that primary schools recorded that they employed 353 full-time and 362 part-time classroom assistants. However, the number of assistants recorded by primary schools in the 'total' column of the questionnaire amounted to 615, and not the 715 which is the sum of the 'full-time' and 'part-time' staff.

There may be several reasons for this kind of discrepancy.

i) Schools were required to enter each total and sub-total as an independent item. They were not asked to enter sub-totals and then add these together to give a 'total' figure in that category.

ii) Some schools entered the figure for the 'total' number of assistants on their payroll but omitted to complete the columns for 'full-time' and 'part-time' staff.

iii) Other schools entered the figures for 'full-time' and 'part-time' staff, but not their 'total' figure for all classroom assistants.

iv) Some schools may have entered the total number of full-time or part-time staff, but calculated their 'total' number as Full Time Equivalent (FTE).

v) Some schools may have made clerical errors in recording figures.

It should also be noted that where the numbers of staff recorded in a category were fewer than 10, this category has been omitted from the relevant table as numbers were too small to be meaningful.

In the following tables, ‘Sum’ refers to the total number of personnel recorded, while ‘N’ indicates the number of schools who responded to that particular question. The figures recorded by primary schools were as follows:

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 2 | 615 | 215 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 2 | 524 | 189 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 2 | 94 | 44 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 353 | 100 |
| *Total number working part time* | 2 | 362 | 154 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 3 | 498 | 133 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 3 | 463 | 124 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 2 | 89 | 33 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 2 | 288 | 88 |
| *Total number working part time* | 2 | 272 | 97 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 91 | 68 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 92 | 66 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 62 | 42 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 34 | 28 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

In the overall category of teaching and learning assistants it is possible than some schools were unsure of the difference between ‘classroom’ and ‘teaching’ assistants. However, as recorded, classroom assistants were employed in 215 schools as compared with 133 schools for teaching assistants. The balance between full-time and part-time employment in these two groups was roughly even. The numbers of HLTAs was much lower, and only 68 of 397 primary schools reported employing this sub-category. Two thirds of HLTAs were employed full-time.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 3 | 718 | 218 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 2 | 207 | 71 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 3 | 509 | 167 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 2 | 259 | 117 |
| *Total number working part time* | 2 | 476 | 179 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 302 | 170 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 249 | 143 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 2 | 55 | 30 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 223 | 133 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 87 | 64 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Only five therapists were reported in primary schools and this number was too small to be included in a table.

Learning support assistants for pupils with additional learning needs (ALN) were the most numerous sub-category of teaching and learning assistants. An average of three was found in those schools where they were employed and almost two thirds of them worked part-time. Some 71 per cent of them were employed by an agency other than the school, principally the LEA. Nursery nurses were employed in 170 schools and 72 per cent were full-time.

**Pupil Welfare officers**

Extremely small numbers of pupil welfare officers were found in the primary sector, and these numbers could not be included in tables.

**Technicians**

The numbers of technicians employed in the primary sector were also very small. Only the figures for ICT technicians are presented here in table form.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 21 | 21 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 16 | 16 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 7 | 7 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 21 | 21 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

The most numerous sub-category was that of ICT technician, who were reported from 21 of 397 schools. 21 of the 24 individual ICT technicians were employed part-time.

The numbers of ICT network managers, ICT support staff (other), librarians, science technicians and technology technicians were too small for inclusion in tables. It was a little surprising that only two primary schools reported employing a librarian, these three people all working part-time.

**Other Support Staff**

Very small totals were recorded in ‘other support staff’ categories and only the numbers for bilingual support assistants are presented here in table form.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 22 | 14 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 28 | 18 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 32 | 21 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

The most common sub-category of other support staff was that of bilingual support assistant where 21 schools reported employing a total of 32 individuals on a part-time basis.

**Facilities and site support staff**

This was the most numerous of all the overall categories in the primary sample.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 3 | 1023 | 294 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 3 | 966 | 269 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 2 | 86 | 30 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 2 | 125 | 40 |
| *Total number working part time* | 3 | 932 | 263 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 3 | 374 | 104 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 3 | 374 | 95 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 2 | 33 | 15 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 3 | 44 | 14 |
| *Total number working part time* | 3 | 332 | 95 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

The difference between midday supervisor and assistant might not have been clear to all schools. The great majority (88 per cent) of staff across these two sub-categories worked part-time, and 92 per cent were employed by the school itself.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 303 | 297 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 246 | 241 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 42 | 42 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 161 | 115 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 194 | 180 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

297 of the 397 schools reported employing a caretaker, and 55 per cent of these staff worked part-time in the school. Premises managers were only found in five schools.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 2 | 514 | 222 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 2 | 62 | 30 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 2 | 485 | 196 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 2 | 59 | 22 |
| *Total number working part time* | 2 | 480 | 201 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 278 | 267 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 48 | 48 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 217 | 208 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 85 | 63 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 224 | 186 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 2 | 568 | 276 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 2 | 279 | 134 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 2 | 274 | 127 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 40 | 26 |
| *Total number working part time* | 2 | 521 | 237 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Kitchen staff and cleaners were reported from most responding schools, and the great majority across the three sub-categories were employed on a part-time basis. The majority, particularly the kitchen staff, were not employed by the school but by the LEA or external companies. The numbers of premises managers were too small for inclusion in a table.

**Administrative staff**

The next three tables indicate the numbers of administrative staff recorded by the primary sample.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 285 | 232 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 251 | 203 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 18 | 17 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 105 | 68 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 228 | 186 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 10 | 10 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 7 | 7 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 143 | 129 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 128 | 117 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 8 | 7 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 45 | 44 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 119 | 88 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Secretaries were only reported from one third of the primary sample schools, although it is possible that some schools were unsure of the difference between the terms secretary and clerk. Some 73 per cent of secretaries were employed on a part-time basis in the school.

Bursars were reported from only eight schools. The numbers of these, together with data managers/analysts, finance officers, office managers and PAs to the head were too small to be reported in table form.

Table 3.39 indicates the numbers of male and female support staff in each category in the primary sample. N shows the number of schools reporting staff of this gender.

| Category | Male | N | Female | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching and learning assistants | 29 | 27 | 1900 | 368 |
| HLTAs | 3 | 3 | 111 | 79 |
| Pupil welfare staff | 3 | 2 | 50 | 15 |
| Technicians | 19 | 17 | 19 | 5 |
| Other support staff | 8 | 4 | 154 | 65 |
| Facilities/site staff | 114 | 100 | 640 | 100 |
| Admin staff | 6 | 6 | 395 | 284 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Across all categories, the female representation was 95 per cent. The highest proportion of male staff (50 per cent) was identified in the technicians category although this whole category was numerically small. Males were only 1.5 per cent of the workforce in both the administrative and the most numerous teaching and learning assistant categories.

| Group category | Age 21-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50+ | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching and learning assistant | 323 (16%) | 692 (35%) | 702 (35%) | 261 (13%) | 1978 |
| HLTA | 9 (8%) | 33 (29%) | 53 (46%) | 20 (17%) | 115 |
| Pupil welfare | 6 | 15 | 13 | 9 | 43 |
| Technician | 4 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 22 |
| Other support staff | 26 (13%) | 66 (33%) | 77 (38%) | 31 (15%) | 200 |
| Facilities/site | 32 (5%) | 175 (25%) | 239 (34%) | 246 (36%) | 692 |
| Administrative | 9 (2%) | 64 (18%) | 146 (40%) | 142 (39%) | 361 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008
Due to rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

Overall, support staff tended towards the upper end of the age range. Some 57 per cent were aged 40 or over, and only 12 per cent under 30. The sub-category with the youngest age profile was teaching and learning assistant with 51 per cent aged 39 or less, while the oldest profile was found in the administrative sub-category with 80 per cent aged over 40 and 39 per cent over 50. The profile for facilities and site staff was also weighted towards the older end with 70 per cent over 40 and 36 per cent over 50.

| Group category | Below Level 1 | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching and learning assistant | 199 (11%) | 211 (12%) | 460 (26%) | 788 (44%) | 108 (6%) | 13 (.3%) | 1779 |
| HLTA | 4 (4%) | 5 (5%) | 20 (18%) | 56 (50%) | 24 (22%) | 2 (2%) | 111 |
| Pupil welfare | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Technician | 1 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 21 |
| Other support staff | 29 (20%) | 18 (13%) | 45 (31%) | 42 (29%) | 12 (8%) | 0 | 146 |
| Facilities/site | 265 (63%) | 75 (18%) | 46 (11%) | 21 (5%) | 13 (3%) | 0 | 420 |
| Administrative | 42 (16%) | 19 (7%) | 88 (33%) | 85 (32%) | 29 (11%) | 4 (1%) | 267 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008
Due to rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

Considerable differences were found between the qualifications profile for the different group categories of support staff. Technicians were the best-qualified group, although numerically very few in the primary sector. The HLTA category showed 22 per cent at level 4 and 50 per cent level 3. Just over half of teaching and learning assistants were at level 3 or above. Most other categories had a majority of staff on levels 2 and 3. The category with the lowest qualifications by far was facilities/site staff with 81 per cent at or below level 1.

**Main Findings**

3 (i). The support staff workforce in primary schools was overwhelmingly female at 95 per cent. The highest proportion of male staff (50 per cent) was identified in the technicians category although this whole category was numerically small. Males were only 1.5 per cent of the workforce in both the administrative and the most numerous teaching and learning assistant categories.

3 (ii). In general, primary school support staff tended towards the upper end of the age range. Some 57 per cent were aged 40 or over - 79 per cent of administrative staff - and only 12 per cent under 30.

3 (iii). The best-qualified categories were technicians and HLTAs.

3 (iv). Just over half of teaching and learning assistants in primary schools were qualified at level 3 or above. The HLTA category showed 22 per cent at level 4 and 50 per cent at level 3.

3 (v). Most other categories had a majority of staff qualified at levels 2 and 3; site and facilities staff had the lowest qualifications with 81 per cent at or below level 1.

3 (vi). Classroom assistants were employed in 215 primary schools as compared with 133 primary schools for teaching assistants. The balance between full-time and part-time employment in these two groups was roughly even.

3 (vii). Only 17 per cent of the primary sample reported having appointed HLTAs.

3 (viii) Learning support assistants for pupils with ALN were the most numerous sub-category of teaching and learning assistants in primary schools.

3 (ix). 297 of the 397 primary schools reported employing a caretaker, with 55 per cent of these part-time. Most kitchen staff and cleaners (87 per cent) were reported as employed on a part time basis. The great majority, particularly the kitchen staff, were not employed by the school but by the LEA or external companies.

3 (x). Around a third of school administrators/clerks worked full time and just over a quarter of school secretaries.

# 4. Numbers and roles of support staff – Secondary Schools

This chapter presents the numbers of support staff reported from the secondary school sample and offers commentaries on the outstanding features of the data. As explained in Chapter 3, discrepancies will be observed between the totals and sub-totals recorded by schools for various categories. For example, a total of 87 classroom assistants was recorded, but 55 full-time and 33 part-time, which sum to 88. The reasons set out in Chapter 3 for the discrepancies also hold good for Chapter 4. In the following tables, 'sum' refers to the total number of personnel recorded and N to the number of schools who responded to this item.

**Teaching and learning assistants**

The first six tables provide data on the overall category of teaching and learning assistants.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total number in school | 7 | 87 | 11 |
| Total number employed by school | 5 | 56 | 10 |
| Total number employed by other | 4 | 33 | 6 |
| Total number working full-time | 7 | 55 | 7 |
| Total number working part time | 4 | 33 | 8 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total number in school | 5 | 152 | 18 |
| Total number employed by school | 4 | 115 | 15 |
| Total number employed by other | 6 | 31 | 3 |
| Total number working full-time | 3 | 47 | 11 |
| Total number working part time | 8 | 115 | 11 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Minorities of the sample schools reported employing classroom or teaching assistants. However, in the responding schools an average of seven classroom and five teaching assistants were recorded per school. Almost two thirds of the classroom assistants were full-time, but only 29 per cent of the teaching assistants.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total number in school | 1 | 15 | 11 |
| Total number employed by school | 1 | 21 | 11 |
| Total number employed by other | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total number working full-time | 1 | 7 | 6 |
| Total number working part time | 1 | 16 | 8 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Only 11 schools reported employing HLTAs, and 30 per cent of these were full-time, compared to two thirds full-time in the primary sector.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total number in school | 8 | 353 | 40 |
| Total number employed by school | 6 | 217 | 31 |
| Total number employed by other | 6 | 180 | 25 |
| Total number working full-time | 6 | 147 | 22 |
| Total number working part time | 5 | 246 | 31 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

As in the primary sample, ALN assistants were the most numerous group in the overall learning assistant category, although the majority of these in secondary schools were employed by the school. As in the primary sector, the majority (63 per cent) were part-time.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 2 | 27 | 9 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 2 | 29 | 10 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 14 | 8 |
| *Total number working part time* | 4 | 8 | 2 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

It was unexpected that nursery nurses were recorded in nine secondary schools. The term might possible have been confused with ‘nurse.’ No therapists were reported at all.

**Pupil welfare support staff**

The following five tables indicate the numbers of pupil welfare staff employed.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 32 | 29 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 32 | 29 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 8 | 8 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 26 | 23 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Careers advisers were largely employed externally, probably by the careers companies. Three quarters of them worked part-time in the school.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 47 | 36 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 18 | 9 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 33 | 31 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 18 | 16 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 30 | 23 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Welfare officers were found in the majority of the 55 secondary schools who returned questionnaires. Two thirds were employed externally, probably by the LEA , and a similar proportion worked part-time in the school.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 26 | 21 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 22 | 18 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 8 | 7 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 8 | 7 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 22 | 19 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Attendance officers were largely (73 per cent) employed on a part-time basis and mainly by the schools.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 22 | 16 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 16 | 13 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 11 | 9 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 11 | 8 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Learning mentors were equally likely to be working full-time or part time.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 26 | 24 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 10 | 9 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 18 | 18 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 7 | 7 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 22 | 20 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

The majority of nurses were employed externally, and some three-quarters were part-time.

**Technicians**

The next five tables relate to kinds of technician or librarian employed in the secondary sample.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 29 | 29 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 28 | 28 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 25 | 25 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 4 | 4 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 39 | 34 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 41 | 36 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 31 | 28 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 11 | 9 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Similar patterns were observed for ICT network managers and ICT technicians, most being employed by the school and on a full-time basis, particularly the managers.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 48 | 42 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 49 | 43 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 23 | 22 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 27 | 24 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 2 | 109 | 50 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 2 | 109 | 52 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 56 | 36 |
| *Total number working part time* | 2 | 57 | 31 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 57 | 43 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 57 | 44 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 20 | 20 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 40 | 32 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Librarians, science and technology technicians were the commonest type of technicians found in the secondary sample. Overwhelmingly employed by the schools, a small majority in each category was employed on a part-time basis. The numbers of other ICT support staff were too small for presentation in table form.

**Other support staff**

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 27 | 16 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 26 | 15 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 23 | 14 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Greater numbers of language assistants than bilingual support assistants were reported. Bilingual assistants were far more likely to be employed externally, probably by the LEA. Both sub-categories were largely part-time staff.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 3 | 76 | 28 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 2 | 74 | 28 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 3 | 6 | 2 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 2 | 37 | 17 |
| *Total number working part time* | 2 | 47 | 19 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Cover supervisors were a common sub-category in schools and 44 per cent employed full-time, while escorts were very few.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 8 | 347 | 34 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 8 | 338 | 36 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 19 | 19 | 1 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Total number working part time* | 8 | 357 | 37 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Examination invigilators were unsurprisingly very numerous in secondary schools and entirely part-time.

The numbers of bilingual support assistants and escorts were too small to be presented in table form.

**Facilities/site staff**

The next seven tables indicate the numbers of site and facilities support staff in the secondary sample.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 4 | 163 | 35 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 4 | 177 | 38 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 4 | 8 | 2 |
| *Total number working part time* | 4 | 171 | 37 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 4 | 59 | 14 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 3 | 48 | 12 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 3 | 9 | 3 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Total number working part time* | 4 | 57 | 14 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Midday supervisory staff were relatively numerous, predominantly part-time and engaged by the school.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 2 | 98 | 43 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 2 | 98 | 44 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 2 | 11 | 6 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 76 | 41 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 33 | 22 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Caretakers were another frequently reported sub-category and were employed two per school on average. Seven of every 10 worked full-time.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 25 | 25 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 24 | 24 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 23 | 23 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 3 | 3 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Premises managers were very largely full-time and employed by the schools.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 10 | 340 | 36 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 9 | 92 | 10 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 10 | 317 | 33 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 2 | 8 | 5 |
| *Total number working part time* | 10 | 386 | 41 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 44 | 34 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 14 | 11 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 37 | 29 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 18 | 16 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 31 | 22 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 9 | 419 | 36 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 10 | 246 | 21 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 9 | 252 | 23 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 10 | 31 | 3 |
| *Total number working part time* | 9 | 458 | 39 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Catering staff and cleaners were the most numerous of all sub-categories in the secondary sample and almost exclusively part-time. Cooks were employed at an average of just over one per school and 37 per cent worked on a full-time basis. All the kitchen staff were mainly employed externally by the LEAs.

**Administrative staff**

The following nine tables relate to administrative staff.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 3 | 167 | 43 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 3 | 153 | 42 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 16 | 16 | 1 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 2 | 86 | 33 |
| *Total number working part time* | 2 | 90 | 30 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 38 | 38 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 40 | 40 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 40 | 40 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 5 | 5 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Staff in both sub-categories were numerous, with an average of three administrative officers per school, although bursars were predominantly full-time and only just under half of administrative officers/clerks.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 17 | 16 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 21 | 19 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 11 | 10 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 9 | 8 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 33 | 29 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 33 | 30 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 16 | 16 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 21 | 19 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 26 | 20 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 27 | 21 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 16 | 14 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 11 | 7 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Examination officers were the most numerous of these three sub-categories which were almost exclusively employed by the schools. Across the three groups there was a fairly equal balance between full-time and part-time working.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 28 | 27 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 27 | 26 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 24 | 23 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 4 | 4 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 36 | 19 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 38 | 21 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 22 | 13 |
| *Total number working part time* | 2 | 17 | 9 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Office managers and secretaries were relatively numerous in the secondary sample at an average of one per school. Office managers were predominantly full-time, but only 56 per cent of secretaries.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Total number in school* | 1 | 18 | 18 |
| *Total number employed by school* | 1 | 18 | 18 |
| *Total number employed by other* | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| *Total number working full-time* | 1 | 14 | 14 |
| *Total number working part time* | 1 | 7 | 7 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Of the 55 secondary schools in the total sample, 18 reported employing a PA to the headteacher, but a third of these staff were part-time.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total number in school | 1 | 46 | 33 |
| Total number employed by school | 1 | 46 | 34 |
| Total number employed by other | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Total number working full-time | 1 | 21 | 18 |
| Total number working part time | 1 | 26 | 20 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Approximately six of every 10 secondary schools who returned the questionnaire employed a receptionist, although 55 per cent of these worked part-time.

Table 4.35 indicates the numbers of male and female support staff in each category in the secondary sample. N shows the number of schools reporting staff of this gender.

| Category | Male | N | Female | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching and learning assistants | 61 | 30 | 571 | 52 |
| HLTAs | 5 | 5 | 17 | 9 |
| Pupil welfare staff | 14 | 10 | 89 | 34 |
| Technicians | 103 | 49 | 142 | 51 |
| Other support staff | 90 | 22 | 196 | 36 |
| Facilities/site staff | 154 | 46 | 474 | 28 |
| Admin staff | 49 | 22 | 395 | 52 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Of staff recorded across all categories, 22 per cent were male and 78 per cent female. The male representation was therefore considerably higher than in the primary sector although still only one in five of all support staff. The highest representation of male staff was found in the technicians category where 42 per cent were men and the lowest amongst teaching and learning assistants with 10 per cent and administrative staff with 11 per cent.

| Group category | Age 21-29 | 30-39 | 40-49 | 50+ | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching and learning assistant | 148 (24%) | 172 (28%) | 194 (32%) | 96 (16%) | 610 |
| HLTA | 5 | 5 | 12 | 2 | 24 |
| Pupil welfare | 5 (5%) | 24 (25%) | 40 (42%) | 27 (28%) | 96 |
| Technician | 22 (9%) | 47 (20%) | 69 (30%) | 95 (41%) | 233 |
| Other support staff | 43 (15%) | 60 (20%) | 57 (19%) | 134 (45%) | 294 |
| Facilities/site | 58 (9%) | 141 (23%) | 245 (40%) | 167 (27%) | 611 |
| Administrative | 44 (10%) | 95 (22%) | 148 (34%) | 152 (35%) | 439 |

N=55 schools
Due to rounding, percentages may not total to 100.

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

As in the primary sample, the age profile was weighted towards to the older end, and 62 per cent of all support staff were aged 40 and over. The oldest categories on average comprised the technician and pupil welfare staff with 71 and 70 per cent respectively aged over 40. Almost seven out of 10 facilities/site and administrative staff were also older than 40. Teaching and learning assistants, including HLTAs, represented the youngest sub-category, as in the primary sector. Some 52 per cent of this group were aged under 40 (51 per cent in primary) with a quarter between 21-29.

### 4.9 Qualifications of secondary school support staff

| Group category | Below Level 1 | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching and learning assistant | 77 (16%) | 78 (16%) | 196 (40%) | 99 (20%) | 43 (9%) | 0 | 493 |
| HLTA | 1 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 21 |
| Pupil welfare | 3 (4%) | 12 (14%) | 22 (26%) | 28 (33%) | 14 (17%) | 5 (6%) | 84 |
| Technician | 22 (11%) | 25 (13%) | 68 (35%) | 31 (16%) | 44 (23%) | 4 (2%) | 194 |
| Other support staff | 32 (14%) | 39 (17%) | 79 (34%) | 27 (12%) | 48 (21%) | 6 (3%) | 231 |
| Facilities/site | 311 (59%) | 169 (32%) | 25 (5%) | 15 (3%) | 5 (1%) | 0 | 525 |
| Administrative | 32 (10%) | 62 (19%) | 122 (37%) | 51 (15%) | 53 (16%) | 12 (4%) | 332 |

N=55 schools

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

The qualifications profile varied substantially across the categories, but some interesting differences were found from the primary sector profile. Teaching and learning assistants were less well qualified in the secondary sample, with 29 per cent at level 3 and above compared with 50 per cent in primary schools. Some 32 per cent were at level 1 or below compared with 23 per cent in the primary sector.

Pupil welfare staff were markedly better qualified in secondary schools with 56 per cent at level 3 or higher compared with 33 per cent in primary schools, although the numbers in primary schools were very small. Technicians were less well qualified in the secondary sector although the numbers in primary schools were very small and not suitable for robust statistical comparison.

Administrative staff were on the whole not as well qualified in secondary schools, with 35 per cent at level 3 and above but 44 per cent in the primary sector. The group with the lowest qualifications were again facilities/site staff with 91 per cent at or below level 1, compared with 81 per cent in primary schools.

**Main Findings**

4 (i) Overall, many more sub-categories of support staff were employed in the secondary sector than in primary schools.

4.(ii) The gender balance was again strongly in favour of female staff, although not as overwhelmingly as in the primary sector; some 20 per cent of support staff overall were male, but this dropped to 11 per cent of administrative staff and 10 per cent of Teaching and Learning Assistants; the highest proportion of males was in the technicians category at 42 per cent.

4.(iii) Analysis of support staff by age showed a slightly older profile than the primary sector with 62 per cent aged 40 or over; four sub-categories had around 70 per cent aged 40 or over; as in the primary schools, the youngest category were the Teaching and Learning Assistants with 52 per cent aged 39 or under and 24 per cent under 30.

4.(iv) On the whole, support staff in the secondary sector had lower average qualifications than those in primary schools.

4.(v) The qualification profile revealed interestingly that Teaching and Learning Assistants were less well-qualified in secondary schools with only 29 per cent at Level 3 or higher compared to 50 per cent in primary schools; welfare staff were better qualified but technicians and administrative staff less so than their primary counterparts.

4.(vi) Facilities and site support staff were again the lowest qualified category with 91 per cent at or below Level 1.

4 (vii) The most numerous kind of Teaching and Learning Assistant, as in the primary sector, was the additional needs ALN learning assistant, of whom 63 per cent were part-time.

4.(viii) 62 per cent of classroom assistants but only 29 per cent of teaching assistants worked full-time.

4.(ix) HLTAs were only reported in 14 of the 55 sample secondary schools; only 30 per cent of these were employed full time compared with two thirds in the primary sector.

4.(x) Careers officers, pupil welfare officers and nurses were all predominantly working part-time in the schools and employed by the LEA or other agencies.

4.(xi) ICT technicians were largely employed full-time and by the schools; except for ICT assistants, all kinds of technicians and librarian were found more widely than Teaching and Learning Assistants in the secondary sector.

4.(xii) In the ‘other’ support staff category, examination invigilators were by far the commonest group with an average of 8 per school and almost all part-time; cover supervisors and language assistants were also reported widely.

4.(xiii) Caretakers were recorded at an average of 2 per secondary school and site managers were also widely employed.

4.(xiv) The patterns for the very numerous midday and kitchen staff was similar to the primary sector, the great majority part-time and employed by the school, while cleaners were also mainly part-time but employed quite evenly between schools and external employers.

4.(xv) There was a greater diversification of administration roles, and all widespread throughout schools, than in the primary sample, although the balance between full-time and part-time work varies across the groups; bursars and office managers were common and mainly full-time, while data managers, examination and finance officers were fairly equally full-time or part-time.

4.(xvi) A majority (56 per cent) of the secretaries were full-time, in contrast to about a quarter in primary schools, and about a third of the responding schools had PAs to the headteacher.

# 5. Employment arrangements

This chapter presents information about the employment arrangements for school support staff in Wales. It examines how they were funded, how full time and part time staff hours were organised, and the percentage of full time equivalent (FTE) for which staff were contracted at the beginning of 2008. The chapter then considers the extent to which the National Joint Council for Local Government Services (NJC) influenced schools and LEAs and the role of different stakeholders in determining support staff's employment arrangements.

## 5.1 Budgets used to fund teaching and learning assistants

LEAs and schools were asked to identify which budgets were used to fund Teaching and Learning Assistants.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number funded from school budget | 3 | 1871 | 388 |
| Number funded from LEA central budget | 3 | 741 | 200 |
| Number funded from joint LEA and school budget | 2 | 184 | 70 |
| Number fully funded through external grant (e.g. RAISE) | 1 | 132 | 73 |
| Number part funded by school and external funding | 1 | 81 | 45 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

In the school survey, information about a total of 3009 teaching assistants was provided. Of these, nearly two thirds (1871) were employed from school budgets and a further quarter of them (741), were funded from LEA central budgets. Some seven per cent were funded wholly or partly through an external grant such as RAISE.

Nearly two thirds of teaching assistants in secondary schools were funded through schools' own budgets. Most of the others were funded by the LEAs and only a small number were employed through an external grant. Most primary school teaching and learning assistants (90 per cent) were employed by the schools or the LEAs. However, nearly 200 primary school teaching and

learning assistants were funded with the assistance of some form of external grant, such as RAISE.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number funded from school budget | 1 | 127 | 84 |
| Number funded from LEA central budget | 1 | 8 | 6 |
| Number funded from joint LEA and school budget | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Number fully funded through external grant (e.g. RAISE) | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Number part funded by school and external funding | 1 | 5 | 4 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

In all schools, the great majority of HLTAs (89 per cent) were paid from school budgets. All but one of the 24 HLTAs identified in secondary schools were funded by the school. HLTAs in primary schools were normally funded by the schools themselves. This was the case in 66 of the 77 primary schools who provided this information.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number funded from school budget | 2 | 65 | 22 |
| Number funded from LEA central budget | 2 | 68 | 32 |
| Number funded from joint LEA and school budget | 1 | 10 | 6 |
| Number fully funded through external grant (e.g. RAISE) | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| Number part funded by school and external funding | 3 | 3 | 1 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Only a small number of schools reported that they had pupil welfare support staff. Approximately equal numbers of these were employed through school and LEA budgets. Nearly two fifths of pupil welfare support staff in secondary schools were funded by the LEA (39 per cent) although a higher percentage (47 per cent) were funded by the schools. However, nearly two thirds of pupil welfare support staff in primary schools were funded by LEAs or by LEAs in conjunction with schools. Very few (N=4) primary schools funded welfare officers from their own budgets.

**Budgets used for technicians: all schools**

72 of the 73 responding schools funded technicians from their own budgets.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number funded from school budget | 2 | 303 | 62 |
| Number funded from LEA central budget | 3 | 161 | 45 |
| Number funded from joint LEA and school budget | 2 | 21 | 10 |
| Number fully funded through external grant (e.g. RAISE) | 2 | 13 | 7 |
| Number part funded by school and external funding | 1 | 2 | 2 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

126 schools reported that they had other pupil support staff of whom 303 (60 per cent) were employed from school budgets and nearly a third (N=161) from LEA budgets. One school had 24 such members of staff funded from its own budgets and another had 16 funded from LEA budgets.

Most other pupil support staff in secondary schools were funded from school budgets. A total of 74 primary schools reported that they had ‘other’ pupil support staff. More than half (58 per cent) of these were funded by the LEAs and most of the others were funded from school budgets.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number funded from school budget | 3 | 1035 | 177 |
| Number funded from LEA central budget | 4 | 416 | 60 |
| Number funded from joint LEA and school budget | 1 | 9 | 3 |
| Number fully funded through external grant (e.g. RAISE) | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Number part funded by school and external funding | 1 | 3 | 3 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Of a total of 1464 facilities/site personnel reported, 1035 (70 per cent) were paid from school budgets. This was true of both

primary and secondary schools. The vast majority of the remainder were funded by the LEA.

An overwhelming 97 per cent of administrative staff were paid through schools' budgets. LEAs were the main other source of funding.

| | Median | Sum | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number funded from school budget | 1 | 825 | 338 |
| Number funded from LEA central budget | 1 | 20 | 16 |
| Number funded from joint LEA and school budget | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Number fully funded through external grant (e.g. RAISE) | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Number part funded by school and external funding | 1 | 3 | 3 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

### 5.2 Organisation of full time staff hours

The pattern of the employment arrangements for full-time support staff varied considerably.

| ***Classroom assistant*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 228 | 34 | 193 | 36 | 23 | 27 |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 289 | 43 | 214 | 40 | 62 | 73 |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 150 | 22 | 123 | 23 | 0 | 0 |
| *Total* | 667 | 100 | 530 | 100 | 85 | 100 |

| ***Teaching assistant*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 186 | 30 | 123 | 30 | 8 | 11 |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 335 | 54 | 231 | 56 | 40 | 53 |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 97 | 16 | 59 | 14 | 27 | 36 |
| | 618 | 100 | 413 | 100 | 75 | 100 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| ***Higher level teaching assistant*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 31 | 35 | 24 | 32 | 0 | 0 |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 39 | 44 | 35 | 46 | 3 | 60 |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 19 | 21 | 17 | 22 | 2 | 40 |
| | 89 | 100 | 76 | 100 | 5 | 100 |

| ***Learning support assistant*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 215 | 29 | 155 | 42 | 47 | 21 |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 358 | 47 | 136 | 37 | 136 | 61 |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 181 | 24 | 79 | 21 | 41 | 18 |
| *Total* | 754 | 100 | 370 | 100 | 224 | 100 |

| ***Nursery Nurses*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 250 | 77 | 190 | 74 | 21 | 88 |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 53 | 16 | 48 | 19 | 2 | 8 |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 20 | 6 | 19 | 7 | 1 | 4 |
| | 323 | 100 | 257 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Schools reported that a third of all classroom assistants were employed 52 weeks each year. A higher percentage (43 per cent) were employed term time only and a fifth were employed term time with a holiday retainer.

However, the qualitative research indicated that there were variations within this pattern. For example, an officer of a trade union representing support staff referred to the various ways which were used to determine terms and conditions including:

- Term time working.
- Dividing 36 weeks' pay over 52 weeks.
- Differences in the standard week.

Most teaching assistants (54 per cent) were employed term time only while around 30 per cent were employed 52 weeks each year. Around a third of schools employed all or some of their teaching assistants for 52 weeks each year. In primary schools a slightly higher percentage (55 per cent) of teaching assistants were employed during term time and a lower percentage of them were in receipt of a holiday retainer.

In primary schools two fifths of classroom assistants (40 per cent) were employed term time only and a third were employed 52 weeks a year and another third were employed during term time with a holiday retainer.

Among Teaching and Learning Assistants, two thirds of classroom assistants and LSAs and half of all teaching assistants in secondary schools were employed during term time only.

The percentage of HLTAs employed 52 weeks a year (35 per cent) was lower than the equivalent figure for teaching assistants. Slightly more than a third of the schools responding to this question said that they employed HLTAs for 52 weeks each year. In secondary schools the number of HLTAs was too small to draw reliable conclusions, but none were employed 52 weeks a year. In primary schools less than a third of HLTAs were employed 52 weeks a year and nearly half (46 per cent) were paid during term time only. Two fifths (42 per cent) of LSAs were employed 52 weeks a year. More than a third of them were employed during term time only. However, nearly three quarters of nursery nurses were employed 52 weeks a year, a reflection of a longstanding agreement.

Similarly, most LSAs were employed during term time/term time with holiday retainer (71 per cent). Less than half of all schools reported that they employed LSAs on a 52 week basis.

**Full-time pupil welfare staff**

The numbers of full-time pupil welfare staff employed were too small to permit a meaningful statistical breakdown.

However, in the two largest sub-categories, 80 per cent of the 36 welfare officers were employed for 52 weeks per year but only nine of the 25 attendance officers.

| ***ICT network manager*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 27 | | 2 | | 24 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 3 | | 0 | | 3 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 2 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| | | 32 | | 2 | | 28 | |

| ***ICT technician*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 31 | 57 | 3 | | 28 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 20 | 37 | 9 | | 10 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 3 | 6 | 1 | | 1 | |
| | | 54 | 100 | 13 | | 39 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| ***Librarian*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 7 | | 0 | | 7 | |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 20 | | 0 | | 20 | |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| | 28 | | 0 | | 28 | |

| ***Science technician*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 37 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 44 |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 47 | 53 | 2 | 100 | 44 | 52 |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 |
| | 88 | 100 | 2 | 100 | 85 | 100 |

| ***Technology technician*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 26 | | 1 | | 25 | |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 15 | | 0 | | 15 | |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 2 | | 0 | | 2 | |
| | 43 | | 1 | | 42 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

The majority (84 per cent) of ICT Network Managers were employed 52 weeks a year. Most ICT technicians were also employed for 52 weeks but the percentage (57 per cent) was lower than was the case with network managers. Most librarians (71 per cent) were employed term time only. Slightly more than half of all science technicians were employed term time only but nearly two thirds of technology technicians were employed 52 weeks a year.

In secondary schools, nearly all ICT network managers were employed 52 weeks a year. ICT technicians and other ICT support staff, tended to be employed term time only. The majority of librarians were employed term time only although 44 per cent were employed 52 weeks a year. More than half of the technology technicians were employed 52 weeks a year. The numbers of ICT support staff employed were too small to be included in table form.

| ***Cover supervisor*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | Percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 16 | | 0 | 0 | 16 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 29 | | 2 | 100 | 27 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 3 | | 0 | 0 | 3 | |
| | | 48 | | 2 | 100 | 46 | |

| ***Escort*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | Percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 6 | | 0 | | 6 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 4 | | 4 | | 0 | |
| | | 11 | | 5 | | 6 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| ***Exam invigilator*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | Percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 1 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 98 | 99 | 0 | | 98 | 100 |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| | 99 | 100 | 0 | | 98 | 100 |

| ***Language assistant*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | Percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 12 | | 2 | | 10 | |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| | 12 | | 2 | | 10 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Most cover assistants were employed term time only/term time with retainer while a third were employed 52 weeks a year. A total of five schools gave details of escorts only one of whom (in one school) was employed 52 weeks a year. All language assistants and nearly all exam invigilators were employed term time only. The two bilingual support assistants, six escorts and 10 language assistants for whom information was provided were employed term time only. The same was true of the 98 exam invigilators whose details were provided. In secondary schools most cover assistants were employed term time only but a third were employed 52 weeks a year.

The numbers of bilingual support assistants (N=8) were too small for presentation in table form.

| ***Midday supervisor*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | Percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 91 | 12 | 91 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 381 | 50 | 288 | 44 | 73 | 94 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 288 | 38 | 281 | 43 | 5 | 6 |
| | | 760 | 100 | 660 | 100 | 78 | 100 |

| ***Midday assistant*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 36 | 14 | 36 | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 142 | 54 | 117 | 50 | 19 | 100 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 85 | 32 | 79 | 34 | 0 | 0 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| ***Caretaker*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 272 | 83 | 161 | 78 | 98 | 91 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 28 | 9 | 17 | 8 | 10 | 9 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 28 | 9 | 28 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 328 | 100 | 206 | 100 | 108 | 100 |

| ***Premises manager*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 30 | | 6 | | 24 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 3 | | 3 | | 0 | |
| | | 34 | | 9 | | 25 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| ***Catering staff*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 60 | 16 | 57 | 22 | 1 | 1 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 189 | 50 | 95 | 37 | 85 | 78 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 131 | 34 | 102 | 40 | 23 | 21 |
| | | 380 | 100 | 254 | 100 | 109 | 100 |

| ***Cook*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 57 | 30 | 52 | 32 | 3 | 13 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 68 | 36 | 55 | 34 | 11 | 48 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 65 | 34 | 54 | 34 | 9 | 39 |
| | | 190 | 100 | 161 | 100 | 23 | 100 |

| ***Cleaner*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 97 | 21 | 88 | 31 | 4 | 2 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 224 | 48 | 100 | 35 | 124 | 71 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 148 | 32 | 94 | 33 | 46 | 26 |
| | | 469 | 100 | 282 | 100 | 174 | 100 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

In primary schools most midday supervisors were either employed 52 weeks a year (44 per cent) or term time with a holiday retainer (43 per cent). However, half of the midday assistants were employed only during term time. Most primary school caretakers (78 per cent) were employed 52 weeks a year. More than three quarters of catering staff (78 per cent) were employed during term time; 40 per cent were paid a holiday retainer and 38 per cent no retainer. A third of primary school cooks and cleaners were employed 52 weeks a year, a third were paid term time only and a third were employed term time with holiday retainer.

In secondary schools most midday supervisors, school cooks and catering staff were employed term time only although a small number received a holiday retainer. The same was true of cleaners. All midday assistants whose details were included were employed term time only. Most caretakers and premises managers were employed 52 weeks a year.

| ***Administrative/clerk*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 112 | 36 | 66 | 36 | 40 | 34 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 150 | 48 | 75 | 41 | 74 | 63 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 49 | 16 | 41 | 23 | 3 | 3 |
| | | 311 | 100 | 182 | 100 | 117 | 100 |

| ***Bursar*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 47 | 87 | 3 | | 43 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 4 | 7 | 0 | | 4 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 3 | 6 | 2 | | 1 | |
| | | 54 | 100 | 5 | | 48 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| ***Data manager/analyst*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 8 | | 0 | | 8 | |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 5 | | 1 | | 4 | |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 2 | | 0 | | 2 | |
| | 15 | | 1 | | 14 | |

| ***Examination officer*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 11 | | 0 | | 11 | |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 7 | | 1 | | 6 | |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 4 | | 0 | | 4 | |
| | 22 | | 1 | | 21 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| ***Financial officer*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 17 | | 5 | | 11 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 9 | | 2 | | 7 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 5 | | 2 | | 2 | |
| | | 31 | | 9 | | 20 | |

| ***Office manager*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | Percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 23 | | 2 | | 20 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 7 | | 3 | | 4 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 2 | | 0 | | 2 | |
| | | 32 | | 5 | | 26 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| ***School secretary*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 45 | 38 | 35 | 36 | 8 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 50 | 43 | 44 | 46 | 4 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 22 | 19 | 17 | 18 | 4 | |
| | | 117 | 100 | 96 | 100 | 16 | |

| ***Personal assistant to head*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 22 | | 3 | | 17 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 5 | | 0 | | 5 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| | | 28 | | 3 | | 23 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| ***Receptionist*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 14 | | 1 | | 13 | |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 24 | | 5 | | 18 | |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 3 | | 0 | | 2 | |
| | 41 | | 6 | | 33 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

A third of primary school administrative staff/clerks were employed 52 weeks a year. More (41 per cent) were paid term time only than were paid term time with holiday retainer. Nearly half of all school secretaries (46 per cent) were paid term time only; a third were employed 52 weeks a year.

Nearly all secondary school bursars were employed 52 weeks a year. Most data managers/analysts, personal assistants and office managers were also employed for 52 weeks. Although most clerks/administrative staff were employed term time only, a third were employed 52 weeks a year. Half of the examinations officers, receptionists, and school secretaries were employed for 52 weeks as were slightly more than half of all finance officers.

## 5.3 Organisation of part time staff hours

Schools were asked to provide information about the employment arrangements of part time staff.

| ***Classroom assistant*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 168 | 28 | 162 | 30 | 4 | 7 |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 327 | 54 | 276 | 52 | 47 | 85 |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 107 | 18 | 97 | 18 | 4 | 7 |
| | 602 | 100 | 535 | 100 | 55 | 100 |

| ***Teaching assistant*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 75 | 18 | 68 | 24 | 1 | 1 |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 263 | 64 | 159 | 56 | 102 | 83 |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 75 | 18 | 55 | 19 | 20 | 16 |
| | 413 | 100 | 282 | 100 | 123 | 100 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| ***Higher level teaching assistants*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 24 | 30 | 24 | | 0 | |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 48 | 59 | 16 | | 32 | |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 9 | 11 | 8 | | 0 | |
| | 81 | 100 | 48 | | 32 | |

| ***Learning support assistant (ALN pupils)*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 132 | 22 | 112 | 32 | 20 | 8 |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 340 | 57 | 153 | 44 | 179 | 76 |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 129 | 21 | 83 | 24 | 37 | 16 |
| | 601 | 100 | 348 | 100 | 236 | 100 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Half of part time primary school classroom assistants (52 per cent) were employed term time only. Less than a third (30 per cent) were employed 52 weeks a year. Similarly more than half of primary school part time teaching assistants (56 per cent) were employed term time only and less than a quarter (24 per cent) were paid 52 weeks a year. Half of primary school part time HLTAs were paid 52 weeks a year while a third were paid during term time only. Two fifths of primary school part time LSAs (44 per cent) were paid term time only, a third were paid 52 weeks a year and a quarter (24 per cent) were paid term time with a holiday retainer. Nearly two thirds (60 per cent) of nursery nurses were employed 52 weeks a year and most of the others were employed term time only.

In secondary schools nearly all part time classroom assistants and teaching assistants and all part time HLTAs were employed term time only. The same was true of three-quarters of the part time LSAs. A small number of part time nursery nurses (12) was identified of whom 8 were employed 52 weeks a year.

| ***Nursery nurse*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 78 | 62 | 65 | 60 | 8 | |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 35 | 28 | 31 | 29 | 4 | |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 12 | 10 | 12 | 11 | 0 | |
| | 125 | 100 | 108 | 100 | 12 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| ***Careers advisors*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 5 | | 0 | | 5 | |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 7 | | 0 | | 7 | |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| | 12 | | 0 | | 12 | |

| ***Welfare office or equivalent*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 5 | 28 | 1 | | 4 | |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 13 | 72 | 0 | | 13 | |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | |
| | 18 | 100 | 1 | | 17 | |

| ***Attendance officer*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 7 | | 1 | | 6 | |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 13 | | 1 | | 12 | |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| | 21 | | 2 | | 19 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

The numbers of part-time therapists, learning mentors and nurses were too small for presentation in table form. Other part-time pupil welfare staff were usually employed during term time only.

| ***ICT technician*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 5 | | 2 | | 3 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 26 | | 11 | | 13 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 2 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| | | 33 | | 14 | | 17 | |

| ***Librarian*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 3 | | 0 | | 3 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 23 | | 2 | | 21 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| | | 27 | | 2 | | 25 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| ***Science technician*** | All | | Primary | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 6 | 11 | 0 | 6 | 11 |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 44 | 79 | 0 | 44 | 79 |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 6 | 11 | 0 | 6 | 11 |
| | 56 | 100 | 0 | 56 | 100 |

| ***Technology technician*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 10 | | | 0 | 10 | |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 30 | | | 2 | 28 | |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 2 | | | 0 | 2 | |
| | 42 | | 2 | | 40 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

The numbers of part-time ICT network managers and other ICT support staff were too small for presentation in table form.

Other part-time ICT staff were usually employed during term time only. Similarly, 85 per cent of part time librarians, 79 per cent of part time science technicians and 71 per cent of part time technology technicians were employed during term time only.

| ***Bilingual support assistant*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 13 | | 5 | | 8 | |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 8 | | 8 | | 0 | |
| | 22 | | 14 | | 8 | |

| ***Cover supervisor*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 10 | 16 | 1 | | 9 | 15 |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 50 | 81 | 1 | | 49 | 82 |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 2 | 3 | 0 | | 2 | 3 |
| | 62 | 100 | 2 | | 60 | 100 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| ***Exam invigilator*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 269 | 99 | 1 | 100 | 268 | 99 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| | | 273 | 100 | 1 | 100 | 272 | 100 |

| ***Language assistant*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 2 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 17 | | 0 | | 17 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | |
| | | 20 | | 2 | | 18 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Most (60 per cent) of the 22 part-time bilingual support staff for whom information was provided worked term time only and only one was contracted for 52 weeks. The majority of part-time cover supervisors (80 per cent) were employed term time only. Information was provided about only five part-time escorts; in each case they were employed during term time only; however, the number is too small for reliable conclusions to be drawn. Nearly all part-time exam invigilators were employed during term time only.

| ***Caretaker*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 141 | 67 | 120 | 68 | 17 | |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 36 | 17 | 27 | 15 | 9 | |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 34 | 16 | 29 | 17 | 4 | |
| | 211 | 100 | 176 | 100 | 30 | |

| ***Premises manager*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 8 | | 2 | | 6 | |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 2 | | 0 | | 2 | |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 3 | | 3 | | 0 | |
| | 13 | | 5 | | 8 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| ***Catering staff*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 80 | 12 | 73 | 22 | 7 | 2 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 341 | 52 | 145 | 43 | 194 | 62 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 231 | 35 | 116 | 35 | 110 | 35 |
| | | 652 | 100 | 334 | 100 | 311 | 100 |

| ***Cook*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 53 | 26 | 51 | 31 | 1 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 82 | 40 | 55 | 33 | 22 | |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 72 | 35 | 59 | 36 | 12 | |
| | | 207 | 100 | 165 | 100 | 35 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| ***Cleaner*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 169 | 24 | 111 | 34 | 54 | 15 |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 305 | 44 | 114 | 35 | 186 | 53 |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 225 | 32 | 103 | 31 | 110 | 31 |
| | 699 | 100 | 328 | 100 | 350 | 100 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| ***Midday supervisor*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 122 | 15 | 120 | 18 | 1 | 1 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 353 | 43 | 252 | 38 | 100 | 77 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 342 | 42 | 283 | 43 | 29 | 22 |
| | | 817 | 100 | 655 | 100 | 130 | 100 |

| ***Midday assistant*** | | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 43 | 14 | 36 | 14 | 7 | 14 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 153 | 49 | 122 | 49 | 26 | 52 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 117 | 37 | 92 | 37 | 17 | 34 |
| | | 313 | 100 | 250 | 100 | 50 | 100 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Most primary school part time midday supervisors were either employed during term time only (44 per cent) or term time with holiday retainer (43 per cent). Half of primary part time midday assistants (50 per cent) were paid during term time only and a third (34 per cent) term time with holiday retainer. Most part time caretakers (78 per cent) were employed 52 weeks a year. Catering staff were employed term time only although slightly more were in receipt of a holiday retainer than did not have one. School cooks were divided almost equally among those who worked 52 weeks a year, those who worked term time only and those who worked term time with holiday retainer. A third of cleaners (34 per cent) were paid for 52 weeks, 35 per cent term time only and 31 per cent term time with holiday retainer

Part time midday staff (supervisors and assistants) in secondary schools were normally employed during term time only although some were in receipt of a holiday retainer. More than half of part-time caretakers were employed 52 weeks a year but nearly a third for term time only. Most premises managers were employed 52 weeks a year. Part time cooks and catering staff were usually employed during term time only. The same was true of cleaners, although more of them were in receipt of a holiday retainer.

| ***Administrative/clerk*** | All | Primary | Secondary |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | Sum | Sum |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 64 | 53 | 9 |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 199 | 94 | 102 |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 45 | 39 | 3 |
| | 308 | 186 | 114 |

| ***Bursar*** | All | Primary | Secondary |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | Sum | Sum |
| *Number employed 52 weeks each year* | 10 | 2 | 8 |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 7 | 4 | 3 |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 17 | 6 | 11 |
| ***Data manager/analyst*** | All | Primary | Secondary |
| | Sum | Sum | Sum |
| *umber employed 52 weeks each year* | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| *Number employed term-time only* | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| *Number employed term-time with holiday retainer* | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | 8 | 0 | 8 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

| ***Examinations officer*** | | All | Primary | Secondary |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | Sum | Sum |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 13 | 0 | 13 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| | | 24 | 0 | 24 |

| ***Financial officer*** | | All | Primary | Secondary |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | Sum | Sum |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 9 | 1 | 8 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 13 | 3 | 10 |

| ***Office manager*** | | All | Primary | Secondary |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | Sum | Sum |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 6 | 1 | 5 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| | | 14 | 6 | 7 |

| ***School secretary*** | | All | Primary | Secondary |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | Sum | Sum |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 33 | 30 | 3 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 51 | 40 | 7 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 30 | 25 | 5 |
| | | 114 | 95 | 15 |

| ***Personal assistant to head*** | | All | Primary | Secondary |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | Sum | Sum |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 7 | 1 | 6 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 11 | 1 | 9 |

| ***Receptionist*** | | All | Primary | Secondary |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Sum | Sum | Sum |
| *Number employed* | *52 weeks each year* | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time only* | 28 | 3 | 25 |
| *Number employed* | *term-time with holiday retainer* | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | | 31 | 3 | 28 |

The employment of primary school part time administrative/staff varied. A quarter (28 per cent) worked 52 hours a week, half (51 per cent) worked term time only and a quarter were employed during term time with holiday retainer. Similar figures pertained for school secretaries.

In secondary schools most part time bursars and office managers were employed 52 weeks a year. However, it was usual for other part time administrative staff in secondary schools (administrative staff/clerks, data manager/analysts, exams officers, finance officers, school secretaries, personal assistants, and receptionists) to be employed during term time only.

### 5.5 Influences on terms and conditions

Stakeholders were asked whether the National Joint Council (NJC) rates were used to determine the terms and conditions of different categories of support staff. LEAs said that NJC scales were used for support staff although the pattern varied. Seven said they were used for Teaching and Learning Assistants in most schools. However, fewer (four) said that they were used by most schools for HLTAs. The number of LEAs who said that NJC scales were used for the other categories of support staff by most schools varied between four and six. LEAs said that the decisions on the wages of staff not employed on NJC scales were taken by schools (four responses) or a combination of school and LEA (2) and LEA (2).

| | % |
|---|---|
| Yes | 54 |
| No | 4 |
| Don't know | 31 |
| No response | 12 |
| **N=471** | |

*A single response item*
*Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.*

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Half the schools who responded (54 per cent) said that the NJC rates were used for teaching and learning assistants and 52 per cent said they were used for administrative staff. However this was much higher among secondary schools where 82 per cent said that they were used for teaching and learning assistants compared with 49 per cent of primary schools. Nearly all secondary schools (95 per cent) said they were used for administrative staff compared with less than half (45 per cent) primary schools.

| | % |
|---|---|
| Yes | 52 |
| No | 2 |
| Don't know | 17 |
| No response | 30 |
| **N=471** | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

In secondary schools 49 per cent said that the scales were used to determine the pay and conditions of pupil welfare support staff, 93 per cent said they were used for technicians, 64 per cent said the were for other pupil welfare support staff, and 98 per cent for facilities/site personnel. However many schools, especially primary schools (by far the largest number) either said they did not know whether they were used as a basis for the terms and conditions of other categories of support staff or did not respond to these questions.

Most of the schools who responded to the question indicated that LEA advice was the usual method of calculating support staff wages in those cases where the NJC scales were not used.

| | % |
|---|---|
| Yes | 81 |
| No | 4 |
| Don't know | 11 |
| No response | 3 |
| **N=471** | |

*A single response item*
*Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.*

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

More than four fifths of schools (81 per cent) said that their LEAs had issued guidance about the scales which should be used to calculate the pay and conditions of different categories of support staff. This figure was higher (89 per cent) among secondary schools than secondary schools (80 per cent).

### 5.6 School data on payroll arrangements

All LEAs believed that support staff were paid through the LEA payroll.

| | % |
|---|---|
| Yes | 96 |
| No | 1 |
| Don't know | 1 |
| If no, how they paid | 0 |
| No response | 3 |
| **N=471** | |

*A single response item*
*Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.*

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Nearly all schools (96 per cent) said that their support staff were paid through the LEA payroll.

### Key findings

5.(i) The pattern of the employment arrangements for full-time support staff varied considerably. In general, a lower proportion of part-time staff were paid 52 weeks a year than full-time staff.

5.(ii) Nearly two thirds of Teaching and Learning Assistants were employed from school budgets and a further quarter from LEA central budgets.

5.(iii) Some seven per cent of all school Teaching and Learning Assistants were funded with the assistance of some form of external grant, such as RAISE.

5.(iv) School budgets were the most common way of funding technicians.

5.(v) The hours for which part time support staff were contracted varied considerably. Part-time Teaching and Learning Assistants were mostly contracted for more than 50 per cent of FTE and many were contracted for more than 75 per cent.

5.(vi) Most part-time ICT network managers were employed 52 weeks each year. However, other part-time ICT staff (ICT technicians, ICT support staff) were usually employed during term time only. The same was true of technicians.

5.(vii) There were differences in the hours of facilities staff; caretakers were usually employed for the higher quartile of FTE.

5.(viii) Most schools said that the NJC rates were used for teaching and learning assistants and administrative staff. Most also indicated that LEA advice was the usual method of calculating support staff wages where the NJC scales were not used.

5.(ix) More than four fifths of schools said that their LEAs had issued guidance about the scales which should be used to calculate the pay and conditions of different categories of support staff.

5.(x) Nearly all schools said that their support staff were paid through the LEA payroll.

# 6. Recruitment

This chapter discusses the recruitment of support staff. It examines the methods used to enlist support staff in schools and the issues encountered by schools through the recruitment process. The roles and levels of involvement of LEAs in the recruitment of support staff are also examined.

## 6.1 Recruitment processes

Schools were asked about the processes used for recruiting the various categories of support staff.

| | % |
|---|---|
| Newspaper advertisement | 42 |
| Jobcentre advertisement | 34 |
| Word of mouth | 43 |
| No response | 19 |
| **N=471** | |

*A multiple response item*
*More than one box may be ticked so percentages may not sum to 100.*

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

All three recruitment strategies were used by at least one third of sample schools. Similar percentages of schools recruited through newspaper advertisements (42%) and word of mouth (43%). 34% of schools recruited teaching and learning assistants through advertisements at the jobcentre.

Very small numbers of schools reported methods for recruitment of HLTAs, but newspaper advertisements were the most frequently used.

The low percentages of schools reporting their recruitment methods for HLTAs is related to the low numbers of HLTAs currently employed in the schools.

Only 11 per cent of schools responded to the question on the recruitment of pupil welfare support staff. Recruitment through newspaper advertisements, jobcentres and word of mouth was reported.

Technicians and other pupil support staff were most commonly recruited to schools through newspaper advertisements although jobcentres and word of mouth were also reported by some.

Considering that all schools clearly need to employ some facilities or site staff, the omission rate of 65 per cent for that question is a little puzzling. However, the qualitative interviews suggested that staff in categories such as catering and cleaning may be recruited directly by the LEA and are not the responsibility of the school.

Responses reporting newspaper and jobcentre advertisements were quite similar at about one in five schools with only one in eight reporting using word of mouth although the qualitative research indicated that word of mouth was important for recruiting some staff such as midday supervisors.

| | % |
|---|---|
| Newspaper advertisement | 41 |
| Jobcentre advertisement | 30 |
| Word of mouth | 21 |
| No response | 35 |
| **N=471** | |

*A multiple response item*
*More than one box may be ticked so percentages may not sum to 100.*

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Some 41 per cent of sample schools reported recruiting administrative staff via newspaper advertisements. Jobcentre advertisements were used by 30% of schools and word of mouth by 21%. The qualitative school interviews suggested that word of mouth may have been underreported in the questionnaire responses. Certainly, the support staff who took part in the interviews were most commonly recruited informally, through word of mouth. Several had been personally approached by the headteacher or other senior staff member who had informed them of the vacancy and suggested that they apply for it. Other support staff had applied for their jobs through newspaper advertisements, and through internal LEA advertisements, although the latter was the least frequently used method of recruitment.

When asked what attracted them to their roles, learning support assistants primarily stated that they wanted to help children progress in and enjoy their learning. *'I met and got to know the children…I thought I'd like to try working with them to see if I could make a difference.'*

Senior staff in the schools stated that a variety of methods were used to recruit support staff. Advertisements were usually placed in the local paper, and on the school, LEA and external websites. If they felt that a member of staff currently working in another role at the school would be suitable for a vacant position, they would sometimes be approached directly or provided with an application form to gauge their interest in applying for it. A headteacher was considering approaching the local college directly to attract support staff for the next academic year.

### 6.2 The role of the LEA in support staff recruitment

71 per cent of sample schools reported that the LEA played some role in the recruitment process for support staff.

The LEA was most frequently involved in supplying advice and guidance (10 per cent, N=60), and more general support (five per cent, N=29) during and concerning the process of recruiting staff.

Some schools gave more detailed information on the advisory capacity of their LEAs in relation to the recruitment of support staff. HR or personnel support was given to three per cent (N=16) of the schools, and advice on job descriptions and person specifications was provided to the same proportion. Three per cent (N=15) of schools received guidance on pay scales and working hours for support staff, and two per cent (N=10) interview procedures from their LEAs. Relevant legal counsel was supplied to one per cent (N=7) of schools by their LEAs.

The LEA also completed practical tasks related to the recruitment of support staff on behalf of the schools. Eight per cent (N=47) of the respondent schools reported that the LEA was responsible for advertising support staff vacancies, whereas in two per cent (N=9), the LEA actually interviewed, recruited or employed support staff.

A further six per cent (N=37) of schools stated that the LEA arranged internal bulletins for support staff vacancies. The LEA placed advertisements for support staff on their own website or intranet on behalf of six per cent (N=34) of the schools. Contracts for support staff were drawn up by the LEA for two per cent (N=11) of the schools.

Four per cent (N=24) of the schools outlined that a more general role was taken by the LEA in terms of support staff employment through distributing, circulating and publishing advertisements. Administrative tasks such as drafting advertisements, and issuing and checking application forms for prospective support staff were undertaken by the LEA on behalf of four per cent (N=21) of the schools. The LEA kept a database of information relating to current and prospective support staff, including Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) data, for three per cent (N=18) of the schools.

Less than one per cent of schools indicated that the LEA was involved in the recruitment of support staff in other ways. Examples of these other duties included placing adverts with the local job centre, arranging CRB checks, fulfilling school governing body roles, recruiting support staff from colleges, and providing general help with administrative duties.

Schools reported during the qualitative interviews that the LEA primarily assisted them with advertising for support staff. This was done through placing adverts on their websites, or on bulletins which would be circulated around the schools in the county.

It was generally felt by senior staff in these schools that the LEA provided sufficient help with the recruitment process. However, a deputy head commented that there was sometimes not enough time to submit the advertisement(s) to the LEA. *'With the advertising, sometimes you have to do this externally because you have to put the advert in so early with the LEA. Advertising can be very last minute'.*

When asked whether the LEA should do more to assist schools in the recruitment process, most senior staff felt that the current levels of input were sufficient. The amount of autonomy or *'free rein'* that schools had in relation to recruitment tended to be welcomed by these staff.

A head teacher of a Welsh-medium primary school stated that the LEA had no involvement at all in the process of recruiting support staff for the school. Further help with recruitment would be welcomed from the LEA in order to reduce the considerable amount of time demanded by the recruitment process.

### 6.3 Issues in support staff recruitment

A learning support assistant commented that the numbers of applicants for support staff roles had recently decreased. She attributed this to the poor wages; '*The number of applicants has declined as the years have gone on because the money is so poor. It's getting ridiculous really, there's no incentive and no financial incentive to upskill.'* A comprehensive school deputy headteacher stated that the numbers of support staff may decline further in future, due to funding cutbacks and falling rolls in the school.

This could present a cause for concern as several interviewees anticipated a growing need for support staff. A learning support assistant working primarily with pupils with ALN in a mainstream secondary school stated *'I think there is going to be more need for LSAs, in primary schools as well, because the number of children with [ALN] is getting higher every year. LSAs will be needed more and more, throughout the whole school and not just in certain classes or groups.'*

Recruiting Welsh-speaking support staff was an ongoing challenge for the Welsh-medium schools. The headteacher of a Welsh medium comprehensive school said that the school was prepared to fund support staff through courses aimed at increasing their fluency in the language, but despite this, the availability of support staff with sufficiently good Welsh language skills was low.

Several interviewees commented on the need to recruit more male support staff. It was felt that male pupils would be able to relate to support staff of their own gender more effectively. A trade union representative stated that more male support staff would compensate in part for the lack of male role models in many pupils' home environments. It was hoped that this would have a positive effect on standards of behaviour, achievement and engagement in learning.

Salary levels were seen to influence the numbers of male support staff recruited in comparison to females. A female member of support staff said that *'Most [support staff] are women on a second wage. The money would not be enough for a man.'* Another support assistant commented that *'It's very rare to have a male applicant because the wages are so poor.'* Similarly, a trade union official commented that *'The pay structure should be made more rewarding as it will not attract men as it stands now.'*

The '*informal*' and '*ad-hoc'* processes used to recruit support staff were seen to contribute towards creating unequal opportunities by several of the trade union officials interviewed. Currently, '*most schools tend to try to advertise internal promotions and posts, but a lot still relies on grace, favour and patronage.*' The trade union leaders to express these views felt that the gender imbalance could be partly redressed through introducing standardised recruitment processes. These processes should be designed and their implementation in LEAs and schools monitored by the WAG and WLGA. '*This would promote fairness, equality of opportunity and transparency*,' according to one trade union representative.

Another trade union leader suggested that additional policies should be introduced to challenge the perception that the support staff role was more suited to females than males. A female support assistant working in a secondary school stated that the support staff post was '*definitely a female job.'*

This view was felt by union officials to contribute towards the unequal proportions of male and female support staff employed in schools in Wales. One commented that: '*There is a misconception,*

*especially with Early Years learning, that education is a more female-oriented occupation. We need a strategy in place to target that as well. More men should be introduced to this as a worthwhile career path*.'

Some other trade union representatives expressed the view that the recruitment processes for support staff in most schools were satisfactory, and did not lead to inequality of opportunity at present, although one commented that the recruitment processes '*may need reviewing in this sense in the future*.' It was seen to be beneficial for schools to retain some autonomy in terms of how they chose to recruit support staff, so that the individual needs of the schools could be fully addressed. A typical comment in this direction was '*There needs to be a 'best fit' between the skills and personal qualities of the individual and the needs of the school.'*

### 6.4 Qualifications, skills and experience

Schools were asked about the minimum level of qualifications they expected for the different categories of support staff.

**Teaching and learning assistants**

The greatest range of expected requirements in this overall category was for ALN learning support assistants, from below Level 1 (11 per cent) to Level 4 (six per cent).

For classroom and teaching assistants and NNEBs, requirements also ranged widely from below Level 1 to Level 3. For classroom assistants, 18 per cent of schools felt that the minimum qualification could be below NVQ Level 1, or equivalent, but a further 18 per cent thought it should be NVQ Level 2 or equivalent with eight per cent opting for level 3.

The greatest agreement was found for NNEBs where 25 per cent of sample schools set Level 3 as the minimum requirement.

**Pupil welfare support staff**

Overall, only three per cent of all schools responded to this question in relation to pupil welfare support staff. Within the secondary school sample, however, the proportion of responses was higher because of the relatively higher numbers of pupil welfare support staff in secondary schools.

Within this very small sample, welfare officers, learning mentors and nurses were felt to require Level 2 or higher, and careers officers at least Level 3. Levels 1 or 2 were judged sufficient for attendance officers.

**Technicians**

Levels of response for sub-categories of technician were very low and ranged from two to nine per cent. The main reason for this was the very small number of technicians employed in the primary sector. The expected levels of qualification for all sub-categories varied considerably, from below Level 1 to Level 4 for ICT technicians and librarians, while the range for science and technology technicians was below Level 1 to Level 3.

**Other support staff**

Low response rates were also obtained overall for the category of other school support staff, but figures for secondary schools were again higher. Although the sample was small, the highest minimum qualifications were expected for language and bilingual support assistants at Level 3.

**Facilities/site staff**

Substantially more schools provided information pertaining to facilities/site support staff, with response levels ranging from six to 51 per cent over the sub-categories. The expectations for cooks varied from below Level 1 to Level 3, but higher level qualifications were seen as less relevant for this category of support staff with the highest proportion of respondents content with staff below Level 1 for all sub-categories, including midday supervisors, kitchen staff and caretakers.

**Administrative support**

Higher response percentages were obtained in the secondary sample than the primary sector. Response rates for individual sub-categories ranged from four to 48 per cent, apparently according to the occurrence of each sub-category in schools. The spread of expected qualifications for secretary and administrator/clerk ranged very widely from below Level 1 to Level 4 with the highest proportion for both sub-categories on Level 2. The highest average requirements were for the four categories of bursar, examinations officer, office manager and PA to the

headteacher, where Level 2 was the minimum and some schools expected Level 4.

The questionnaire asked whether the qualifications of all support staff met the school's needs.

| | % |
|---|---|
| Yes | 79 |
| No | 15 |
| Don't know | 3 |
| No response | 4 |
| **N=471** | |

*A single response item*
*Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.*

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

The great majority of schools were positive on whether the qualifications of all support staff met the school's needs, four out of every five responses being affirmative and only 15 per cent negative.

From the 15 per cent of respondents who stated that their support staff's qualifications were not adequate, the main additional comment supplied was that classroom assistants were lacking the necessary qualifications.

The second most frequent comment was that support staff were seen to be lacking in practical, *'hands on'* experience. However, some schools believed that support staff with no qualifications can still be very useful.

Other occasional comments recorded were that administrative staff were lacking sufficient qualifications, that support staff generally had achieved unsatisfactorily low levels of NVQs, that classroom assistants required the HLTA qualification to perform effectively, and that basic level training and NVQ Level 3 were required across the general category.

Insufficient numbers of Welsh-speaking support staff was seen as an issue by 4 per cent of respondents. A further 2.7 per cent identified that qualifications relating to the impending Foundation Phase and ICT were insufficient among support staff. A similar proportion stated that difficulties existed in accessing qualifications beyond basic level for support staff.

Other areas where qualification levels of support staff were judged to be inadequate were mentioned by one or two respondents each, namely:

- Clerical/secretarial.
- Cover supervisors.
- Midday supervisors.
- Early years.
- Child development.
- Disability speciality, eg. Autism.
- First Aid.
- ALN.
- Practical skills, eg. constructing displays.
- NVQ3 for classroom assistants.
- NVQ2 for administration.

A range of qualifications were found amongst the members of support staff interviewed during the school visits. Some possessed no formal qualifications, others had a variety of vocational and academic qualifications such as NVQs and GCSEs or O Levels, and some had degrees.

All support staff who took part in qualitative interviews felt their qualification levels to be adequate to enable them to fulfil the requirements of their roles. The senior staff interviewed also held this view. Where support staff had been recruited to work in specific areas or subjects such as ICT, science or ALN, they had been encouraged to undertake further accredited and non-accredited training to supplement their knowledge and understanding. All such support staff working in specific areas had gained relevant qualifications whilst employed at the schools.

The opinion was expressed by headteachers that support staff should possess basic qualifications such as GCSEs in maths and English, but that it was not essential for them to have further higher level qualifications. A deputy headteacher of a comprehensive

school stated that *'Some of the LSAs come in, and they are very good with the children but they may not have anything on paper.'*

A learning support assistant who had gained a first degree and a PGCE qualification prior to starting work at the school also felt that qualifications were not necessary for enable effective role fulfilment. She felt that her qualifications were relevant to her practice, but that practical experience was also important: *'Because I am highly qualified, I think I see it from a different perspective. For example, the kids may get given a worksheet that I know will be too difficult for them, and I can see ways to help them work because of my teaching experience. My teaching experience has definitely helped, but then again, people without it can be just as good - I am not saying that you need the qualifications.'*

A learning support assistant working in an autism unit who did not have any qualifications before obtaining her current job was concerned that her previous lack of qualifications might have prevented her appointment to her present role.

However, after being directly approached by the headteacher who suggested that she applied for the job, it became clear that this was not the case*: 'When I was first thinking about coming into the centre, even though I was working in the school, I had never worked with children before. I didn't have any qualifications directly with children. I spoke to the previous head about this, and his reaction was, "Well, you're a mother aren't you?" Since I have been in the centre I have gone on autism courses to get to know how the children can be, but I think you learn more actually working with them and being hands-on.'*

It was generally felt by the trade union officials interviewed that most school support staff possessed adequate qualification levels, but that additional qualifications were needed in certain areas. The areas mentioned most frequently by them were ALN, ICT, and Welsh language, although the ability to speak and write in Welsh was thought to be more important than gaining accredited qualifications relating to it.

The introduction of a formal qualification structure in schools would facilitate the recruitment of sufficiently qualified support staff, according to one trade union representative: *'At present, the diversity of generic qualifications can make it difficult for an appointments panel to determine whether an individual has the appropriate qualifications for a particular post.'*

**Key findings**

6.(i) Newspaper advertisements, jobcentres and word of mouth were methods used to recruit teaching and learning assistants. Few schools had experience of recruiting HLTAs or pupil welfare support staff.

6.(ii) Similar methods were used to recruit technicians, although newspaper advertising was rather more important for this category.

6.(iii) LEAs were more involved formally in recruiting catering and cleaning staff, although word of mouth around the school appeared to be an important means of recruiting midday supervision and kitchen staff.

6.(iv) There was some concern among trade union representatives about the methods used to recruit support staff. They felt that such staff's professional status could be enhanced by greater standardisation.

6.(v) LEAs were important sources of advice and guidance to schools when they recruited support staff. This included support with personnel and contractual issues and in drawing up post and person specifications. Several LEAs took responsibility for advertising and other recruitment work.

6.(vi) In general, schools were satisfied with the support they received from their LEAs. However, there was a feeling in some areas that schools needed more support, especially those seeking to recruit staff who could work through the medium of Welsh.

6.(vii) There is a growing demand for support staff, particularly in view of the Foundation Phase, and schools reported difficulties in recruiting such staff. This was attributed to issues concerned with low remuneration and the terms and conditions enjoyed by support staff.

6.(viii) There was some concern about the gender imbalance among support staff and the preponderance of females.

6.(ix) Schools had mixed views about the minimum qualifications levels which should be required for recruitment to support staff posts.

6.(xi) The great majority of schools were positive on whether the qualifications of all support staff met the school's needs but some

were concerned about the qualifications levels of classroom assistants.

6.(x) There was concern in the Welsh-medium sector about insufficient numbers of Welsh-speaking support staff.

6.(xi) A range of qualifications were found amongst support staff, and expectations about the required level of qualifications for many categories of support staff varied considerably. Headteachers believed that basic qualifications such as GCSEs in maths and English were required but that it was not always necessary to insist on higher level qualifications.

# 7. Professional development and support

This chapter examines the professional development and training opportunities for support staff. The research team examined schools' arrangements for performance management, along with their levels of take-up and factors influencing this.

Support staff's opportunities for training are also discussed in this chapter. Aspects such joint training with teachers and opportunities to gain the HLTA status and specialise in subject areas are also examined.

The chapter also considers the extent to which training opportunities for support staff lead to accredited qualifications, along with the methods of training delivery and the ease and difficulty of accessing training.

## 7.1 Performance management arrangements

Schools were asked whether they had arrangements in place for performance management for support staff.

| | Yes | No | Don't know | No response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % |
| Teaching and Learning Assistants | 71 | 21 | 2 | 5 |
| HLTAs | 19 | 5 | 1 | 76 |
| Pupil Welfare Support Staff | 7 | 3 | 2 | 87 |
| Technicians | 11 | 6 | 1 | 83 |
| Other Pupil Support Staff | 20 | 6 | 0 | 74 |
| Facilities/Site Personnel | 25 | 16 | 1 | 58 |
| Administrative staff | 46 | 20 | 0 | 33 |
| N=471 | | | | |

A single response item
Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

For every support staff type enquired about in the questionnaire, a greater percentage of schools had performance management (PM) arrangements in place than those which did not.

The commonest PM arrangements were those for teaching and learning assistants and reported from seven out of every 10 schools. The second most frequent arrangements were for administrative staff. PM procedures were much less in evidence for other categories of support staff with a quarter or fewer of schools having arrangements in place for them.

In all the schools which took part in interviews, the senior staff reported that formal procedures were in place for the PM of support staff. The degree of formality of these arrangements in fact varied between the schools, but most teaching and learning assistants received both verbal and written appraisals although their frequency ranged from every term to once a year.

A '*form-filling'* exercise was conducted in one of the primary and one of the secondary schools, whereby a number of teaching personnel would supply evaluatory information relating to the performance of support staff. This information would then be discussed with support staff during a subsequent appraisal meeting and incorporated into their targets for the following year. The support staff would also reflect on their progress and outline any issues which they may have encountered during the year.

Informal monitoring of the work of support staff was also carried out by senior staff. As a headteacher of a primary school explained, '*The staff fill out a form to note what they have enjoyed, what were the challenges, what needs to be developed. We create a support programme for them. Informal evaluation happens constantly throughout the year too.'* The same individual also stated that they would like to see some more formal processes for the performance appraisal of support staff introduced, perhaps at LEA level.

A learning support assistant working primarily with pupils with ALN felt that the informal regular monitoring and advice sessions between herself and her line manager facilitated her progression and helped to develop her knowledge and understanding of the role*. 'We have informal meetings at the start of class for five minutes or during break time…she is very good at knowing where we are and keeping us up to date with what we are doing. We can always talk to her and discuss things. There is very good communication.'*

Most of the school support staff felt that their performance management arrangements were satisfactory. Several stated that they felt able to approach their managers to discuss any issues that arose. Typical comments included *'If there was something*

*bothering me, or I felt something needed changing, I could always go and speak to someone about it. I feel quite confident about that. Everyone is very supportive here,'* and*, 'The arrangements are satisfactory. The head's door is always open'.* All of the senior staff interviewed also expressed their satisfaction with their current performance appraisal systems.

However, in one comprehensive school, support staff stated that no formal arrangements were in place for the management of their performance. One stated that she had only once received a *'kind of appraisal'* from the headteacher, despite having been employed at the school for several years. She expressed the desire to see formal PM systems introduced.

A variety of opinions were expressed by trade union representatives when asked about the adequacy of the PM arrangements for support staff. Some saw the arrangements as adequate in most schools, and others felt that they were wholly insufficient. Two said that the differences in the quality of arrangements between schools made it impossible to express an overarching opinion of them.

A number anticipated that establishing a formal, national structure for the management of the performance of support staff would be problematic. One union official felt that a formal appraisal structure was completely unnecessary because of the more practical nature of the work of support staff; *'I don't know whether I would like to see a formal appraisal system as we have for teachers. The work of the support staff within the school is very much a hands-on role. They would be part of the structure and foundation of the school, and part of the teaching staff. There is a continuous monitoring and appraisal going on.'*

Another was more strongly against having a formal appraisal system for support staff as he believed that it could lead to unnecessary bureaucracy and have a detrimental effect on the school as a whole: *'What would worry me if we had an appraisal system for support staff would be that it would become unwieldy and bureaucratically intensive once others got hold of it. Systems will be put in place which will then be workload intensive for those who manage the support staff…I would suggest that teachers identify if any issues arise with their support staff, and that there would then be procedure within the school for capability, grievance, and discipline…[appraisal systems] would actually impede upon the work of the schools.'*

Participants were asked about who was responsible for the performance management of support staff.

| | % |
|---|---|
| Headteacher | 47 |
| Other senior manager | 13 |
| Other | 2 |
| No response | 38 |
| N=471 | |

A single response item
Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

In the majority of schools which responded to this item (47%), the headteacher was accountable for the performance management of support staff. Another senior manager undertook this task in 13% of schools, and in 2%, another member of staff had this responsibility. 38% of the schools did not respond to this item.

The line managers of the support staff interviewed tended to vary according to their roles within the schools. Catering staff were usually managed by staff in the local authority. In one primary school the caretaker was responsible for managing the performance of the cleaners because the school chose to opt out of their Service Level Agreement. Classroom assistants there were line-managed by senior teaching staff as part of the TLR arrangements.

Support staff working primarily with pupils with ALN reported that the ALN co-ordinator (SENCO) was immediately responsible for their PM. A teaching and learning assistant in a primary school had their performance managed by the class teacher. In three of the fieldwork schools, the headteacher was responsible for the PM of all support staff.

Secondary schools with their much greater numbers of teaching and support staff had developed line management networks which delegated responsibility for PM. In one comprehensive school, the PM system had recently been changed. The headteacher was formerly accountable for the PM of all support staff within the school, but this responsibility had since been delegated to one of the deputy headteachers. Under her were six team leaders; *'There is a [ALN] manager, who line manages the [ALN] staff. We then have an office manager, who line manages the team of receptionists and admin staff. There is a network manager who manages the IT staff, an exams officer who manages the assistant*

*exams manager and the invigilators, and a site officer who is responsible for the caretaking staff...I have an indirect involvement there in so much as I manage them from an administrative point of view, but not their day to day work'.*

### 7.2 Opportunities for progression and development

The questionnaire enquired about the availability and level of take-up of professional development and progression opportunities for support staff.

| | Once a term or more | At least once a year | Less than once a year, or never | No response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | |
| Teaching and Learning Assistants | 49 | 41 | 4 | 6 |
| HLTAs | 13 | 8 | 1 | 78 |
| Pupil Welfare Support Staff | 4 | 5 | 1 | 90 |
| Technicians | 4 | 8 | 2 | 86 |
| Other Pupil Support Staff | 7 | 13 | 2 | 78 |
| Facilities/Site Personnel | 6 | 21 | 8 | 64 |
| Administrative Staff | 35 | 35 | 7 | 22 |
| N=471 | | | | |

A single response item
Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

The highest response rates were obtained for teaching and learning assistants and administrative staff, who accessed professional development opportunities more frequently than the other categories of support staff. Administrative staff were equally likely to undertake professional development activities once per term or per year, but teaching and learning assistants were slightly more likely to have opportunities each term.

The response rates were low for other categories of support staff. This reflected the fact that they were not very numerous in the primary sector. It was noted that site and facilities personnel at almost a quarter of the schools where they were reported rarely or never received training opportunities, which raises some concern about health and safety issues.

Schools' additional comments about opportunities for career development and progression of support staff gave a somewhat complex picture.

Eight schools stated that opportunities for support staff's career development or progression were *'limited'*.

Some potential barriers to the development of opportunities for support staff were suggested. 19 schools (3.9%) mentioned a lack of funding for support staff career development; 5 schools (1%), referred to a need for more suitable courses to be developed, and the same number stated that difficulties had been experienced in arranging cover for support staff to be freed to attend training sessions. Only one school felt that support staff did not want to progress in their careers.

However, 10 schools stated that career development and progression opportunities were made available to all support staff whenever necessary or appropriate, while four schools offered the opinion that good systems were in place for support staff's career progression. Other respondents referred to *'excellent'* progression opportunities, and stated that paid time off was readily available for support staff when they decided to pursue this provision. n the field interviews, the vast majority of the senior school staff thought that the available opportunities for the professional development of support staff were *'good'*, or *'very good'.* Support staff were actively encouraged to pursue opportunities for professional development, and were funded through courses wherever possible and appropriate. A deputy headteacher at a comprehensive school stated that *'In the same way as teachers, the support staff have access to the same LEA information that comes along. Wherever possible we will support support staff. It is very rare that we would ever turn anyone down for a course.'*

In most cases, senior staff reported a high level of interest among support staff in taking up opportunities for professional development. The great majority of support staff had taken the opportunities offered them.

However, a senior teacher at a secondary school stated that a great deal of variation existed between support staff in terms of their inclination to pursue the available professional development opportunities. She said of the support staff that *'Some of them are very willing to learn while others work at a very basic level.'*

Several senior staff emphasised that support staff must not be coerced or pushed into taking up professional development. *'It must be their choice. They must have the right to say no sometimes. We don't want to lose them',* one primary school headteacher said.

When asked about the reasons for support staff not taking up professional development opportunities, most senior staff stated that family commitments meant that support staff had insufficient spare time; *'Family pressures, time- many have young families and it is difficult for them to get out. They have enough to do in the evenings without having to study too.'*

Some support staff in a Welsh-medium primary school had been reluctant to pursue professional development opportunities because they anticipated that there would be little or no subsequent financial reward, according to the headteacher. *'The problem is recognising their higher skills levels through more pay afterwards. Some say, 'Why should I do this course? I'll get nothing from it.'*

In all except one of the schools, support staff reported that the opportunities for professional development offered to them were good. Most had been *'actively encouraged'* to attend relevant courses and events. A learning support assistant working in an autism unit said: *'If there are any courses on we always get the information passed on. There is always someone going on courses here in the centre, even if it is not necessarily anything to do with the children. We are always aware of what is going on and have the chance to go on them'.*

As with senior staff, most of the support staff interviewed felt that opportunities for work-related development were sometimes not pursued due to family and home commitments. A cook in a primary school stated that her disinclination to progress further was affected by the fact that her current hours *'… fit in well with my children's school hours.'* The convenience of the school's location and working hours were factors in other support staff's personal development, too. A school secretary said: *'I have been at Level 2 for two years now. Nobody is encouraged to go beyond Level 3. Maybe there is that opportunity in other schools, but I wouldn't like to move because of the convenience here.'*

Two support staff at the same secondary school reflected that take-up of professional development was generally low among support staff because the content of the provision on offer was

inappropriate, and the monetary incentive poor. As one stated, *'The training provision doesn't meet the level of need. It's not pitched at a level that's high enough to enable you to move on. A lot of it is just textbook stuff that you know already. Some of it is so shambolic it's laughable.'*

Funding also affected the availability and take-up of professional development among support staff in the view of several trade union officials interviewed: *'There are some schools who do not want to spend on professional development. There is an issue there across the board.'*

Several trade union representatives felt that a national entitlement for professional development for support staff should be introduced. A typical comment was: *'I would like to see a minimum entitlement for everyone. That would be fully funded. They would have release time for this so would not be expected to use their own time for CPD…This should tie in with a definite career path and career progression for them. Something similar to what is in place for teachers should definitely be set up, in terms of pay progression and CPD.'*

However, an alternative trade union view was that implementing national structures for support staff's professional development would be undesirable. The majority emphasised that the support staff must make their own decisions concerning whether to accept the development opportunities available to them at their schools. One said: *'I would like to stress that we think employees themselves need to have a key role in deciding their CPD need in discussion with their line manager. In considering the needs of the institution, they would decide what kind of CPD is best for them. It should not be dictated to them by an institution.'* One school supported this view in its questionnaire comment, but two other schools believed that the school should select appropriate training routes for support staff.

Another union official felt that classroom assistants should aspire to undertake professional development which would bring them to the same level as fully-qualified teachers. He said: '*Teaching should be an all-graduate profession. I would expect support staff to go down the graduate route if they were to become full teachers.'*

### 7.3 Training and development

In the fieldwork schools, a variety of training was available for support staff, designed and delivered according to their roles and

responsibilities. A wider variety of training not always specifically related to the roles of the support staff was provided in some schools. In a Welsh-medium primary school, for instance, the headteacher reported that all support staff had the chance to attend courses on thinking skills, finance, the Internet, group reading, spelling, and phonics.

Providing support staff with a wide variety of training was seen by senior staff to be beneficial to the pupils and to the wider school in addition to enhancing the skills and knowledge of the support staff. In a primary school where a member of the administrative team had received management training, the headteacher reported that *'[the support staff member] is often called on now because she deals well with stubborn or naughty children. They don't see her as being the same as a teacher, so they are more open with her.'*

The overwhelming majority of support staff interviewed stated that the opportunities for training and development available to them in their schools were sufficient to enable them to do their jobs, and that all support staff in the school received the same level of opportunity. One learning support assistant commented: *'I have been actively encouraged to attend training events and I know that a lot of the others go on them too, things like dyslexia training and ICT'.* Additional reading material was also available for support staff if they felt they needed to enhance their knowledge in any particular areas.

Two learning support assistants based in the same comprehensive school felt that the training provided by the school was quite *'useful and effective',* but that the focus was sometimes inaccurate, and not relevant to their roles and responsibilities. One commented that: *'Some of it is not relevant and not always put into practice. For example, the reading catch up wasn't implemented in the school, despite staff having gone on the training and getting the certificates.'*

A senior member of staff in the same school echoed these sentiments, confirming that '… *the support staff are contracted to attend INSET days, but the content is not always appropriate to them*.'

### 7.4 Training alongside other staff

In 55 per cent (N=360) of schools, opportunities existed for support staff to train jointly with teachers. The most common type of event

where joint training occurred was school-based or INSET training (N=117; 18 per cent). Another nine per cent of schools stated that joint training took place occasionally or never.

The three principal types of joint training were reported as:

First Aid (N=22, three per cent of sample).

The Foundation Phase (N=16, three per cent).

‘LEA courses’ with unspecified content (N=17, three per cent).

Other courses or training events mentioned by fewer than one per cent of the sample schools included:

Curriculum matters, Child protection, ALN, ‘National Assembly training days’, Cluster initiatives, Health and Safety, ICT/PC related training, Fire safety, Discipline, Early years, Welsh second language.

These training events were seen by school heads as appropriate for joint attendance by teaching and support staff because their professional interests coincided on them. Common training requirements were viewed as more relevant in the primary sector because *‘teaching assistants and teachers do the same tasks.’* When training for key stage 1 classroom assistants and teaching staff was provided separately, elements of it were fed back to the other group because *‘it is always relevant to them too’.*

A small number of learning support assistants commented that they did not usually have the opportunity to train in conjunction with teaching staff during INSET days. If greater opportunities to train jointly were to be introduced, they anticipated benefits from this. As one of the learning support assistants explained:

*‘On INSET days, the majority of things are just for LSAs. The LSAs will be doing one thing and the teachers will be doing others…It would be nice for LSAs to be trained in the same areas because when they go into the classrooms, they know exactly what things those kids are being assessed on. It would be good knowledge for them to have.'*

A cook in a primary school stated that she would like greater opportunities to train alongside teachers because it would facilitate the mutual understanding of different roles.

## 7.5 Areas of training need

Schools were asked to list the top three priorities for the training and development of support staff. A total of 61 different topic areas were provided by the 144 schools which gave an analysable response to this item on the questionnaire.

The top three priorities were, in rank order, the Foundation Phase (N=102, nine per cent), discipline/behaviour management (N=76, seven per cent), and ICT (N=69; six per cent). Below are ranked the main other priority areas identified by the schools.

| Topic area | Frequency | Ranking |
|---|---|---|
| Special Needs / ALN | N=67, 5.9% | 4th |
| Own CPD | N=45, 4% | 5th |
| Basic Skills/language/literacy/numeracy | N=42, 3.7% | 6th |
| Health and Safety | N=42, 3.7% | 6th |
| First Aid | N=40, 3.5% | 7th |
| Child protection | N=32, 2.8% | 8th |
| WAG / new initiatives | N=28, 2.5% | 9th |
| Working with pupils | N=27, 2.4% | 10th |
| Awareness of job description/new role | N=26, 2.3% | 11th |
| New curriculum/the 2008 curriculum | N=26, 2.3% | 11th |
| Development of role/relationships | N=25, 2.2% | 12th |
| Qualifications/NVQs | N=22, 1.9% | 13th |
| Teaching and learning | N=22, 1.9% | 13th |
| Knowledge of curriculum | N=20, 1.8% | 14th |
| Bilingualism | N=20, 1.8% | 14th |
| Professional development courses | N=18, 1.6% | 15th |
| Teamwork / good team member | N=17, 1.5% | 16th |
| INSET/meeting needs of school | N=16, 1.4% | 17th |
| Curriculum support | N=15, 1.3% | 18th |
| Classroom practise/methodology | N=14, 1.2% | 19th |
| Speech and language development | N=14, 1.2% | 19th |
| Funding for CPD | N=13, 1.1% | 20th |
| Assessment techniques/strategies | N=12, 1.1% | 21st |

A multiple response item

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Areas named by between 10 and four schools were the following: Child development, Sharing good practise/feedback, Personal achievement targets, Time management,
Behavioural support, Career structure, Positive handling/restraint School development plan, LEA courses,
Development of teaching strategies, Supported reading strategies Praise/raising confidence/self esteem, Play opportunities Display/craft techniques, Keeping up to date with policies Structured opportunities, Meeting other support staff.

The level of training in most areas was seen to be satisfactory by most of the school support staff interviewed. A greater depth of training would be an improvement in certain areas, according to a comprehensive school learning support assistant. She said *'We had the dyslexia and ADHD training, but for things like that, you can't cover everything you will need to know in one hour. I would like to have had the opportunity to extend my knowledge and to help me in the classroom, especially in areas like that.'*

The Foundation Phase was an area of training need identified by senior primary school staff. This was partly due to the higher staff to pupil ratio needed, and the associated funding implications. *'We need six additional classroom assistants, but where are they? We are going to have to train up the existing staff that will then have less time to spend on other duties. Classroom assistants will end up taking classes instead of teachers.'*

Additional training in ALN would be beneficial to pupils, staff, and schools, according to a member of senior staff based at a secondary school. *'There is a great potential to deploy support staff to work with pupils with [ALN] to enable them to fulfil their potential. That calls for additional funding from the centre - not out of school budgets which are too limited.'*

The shortage of Welsh-speaking support staff was seen to be a problem by a trade union representative who stated: *'There are very few training opportunities for support staff to work in Welsh-medium schools…There is a huge shortage of suitable support staff able to work in the Welsh-medium sector. People need to be made to see that there is a future for them in Welsh-medium support work.'*

### 7.6 Opportunities to obtain HLTA status

The questionnaire enquired about the availability of opportunities for support staff to obtain the HLTA status

| | % |
|---|---|
| Yes | 69 |
| No | 15 |
| Don't know | 12 |
| No response | 5 |
| N=471 | |

A single response item
Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Seven of every 10 schools reported that adequate opportunities to obtain HLTA status were available to teaching assistants and only 15 per cent felt that there were not.

Senior staff in one of the comprehensive schools stated that adequate opportunities were given to teaching and learning support staff to gain the HLTA qualification. Some staff had not obtained

the status because they did not have the requisite GCSEs in maths and English. Funding was seen to be the main issue preventing staff from studying for or obtaining the HLTA in another comprehensive school, according to a classroom assistant: *‘ There are no HLTAs in the school because there is no money to pay them.’*

There were mixed opinions among trade union officials concerning the opportunities for support staff to gain the HLTA status. Some were of the view that these opportunities varied between schools, and that this imbalance needed redressing. *‘From some of our members we perceive that the opportunities for progression and to obtain the HLTA are very good. From others they are not. That is something that needs sorting out.’*

Those that did not perceive there to be sufficient opportunities for support staff to gain the HLTA status attributed this to funding shortages. It was thought to be necessary for these opportunities to exist for support staff: *‘I think that there does need to be the opportunity for the support staff to be able to step up a level and move to HLTA…There are not enough HLTAs being trained. Even if they are trained there is no guarantee that they will get the appropriate remuneration because the schools may not be able to afford it.’*

Another union representative stated that there had not previously been sufficient opportunities for school support staff to obtain the HLTA status, but that this was no longer the case: *‘The situation has changed considerably and will continue to do so’.*

### 7.7 Opportunities for specialisation

During the interviews, individuals were asked about the opportunities for support staff to specialise in certain areas or subjects.

Differing opportunities for specialisation were present in the schools. Senior staff in one comprehensive school stated that there were ample opportunities for support staff to become specialists in several different areas, including ALN, ICT, visual impairment and hearing impairment. The structure of the school was seen to facilitate support staff in developing specialisms. *‘Because of the structure, anyone can come in and over the years move up that structure.’*

Funding had restricted the opportunity for support staff to specialise in certain areas in another comprehensive school. Opportunities for support staff to specialise were being actively pursued by support staff in the primary schools. There, the specialist areas included sports and health awareness and the Foundation Phase.

Some union representatives also commented on the opportunities for support staff to specialise. The general opinion was that specialisation could be very beneficial, especially in assisting pupils with ALN. The motivation of support staff was crucial in the take-up of opportunities for specialising, and one official felt that a formal structure should be established to enable more support staff to specialise:

'My impression is that quite often, they have done that in their own time and under their own steam. In practise, there are certainly not enough opportunities for them to develop specialisms, and that needs to be put in place…something standardised should be put in place by the WAG. It all comes back to this question of entitlement and discernment.'

### 7.8 Training in the LEA leading to accredited qualifications

Participants were asked whether training available in the LEA led to accredited qualifications.

| | Yes | No | No response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % |
| Teaching and Learning Assistants | 63 | 21 | 16 |
| HLTAs | 31 | 5 | 64 |
| Facilities/Site Personnel | 12 | 19 | 69 |
| Administrative Staff | 27 | 30 | 43 |
| N=471 | | | |

A single response item
Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Training leading to qualifications was more easily available for teaching and learning assistants and HLTAs than other kinds of support staff. Training for facilities/site personnel and administrative staff led to no recognised qualifications more often than not.

Numbers of responses for technicians, pupil welfare and other support staff were too low for inclusion in this table.

### 7.9 Training in Wales leading to accredited qualifications

Participants were asked about the probability of training provided in Wales leading to accredited qualifications.

| | Yes | No | No response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % |
| Teaching and Learning Assistants | 69 | 9 | 22 |
| HLTAs | 30 | 3 | 68 |
| Facilities/Site Personnel | 14 | 11 | 75 |
| Administrative Staff | 27 | 17 | 56 |
| N=471 | | | |

A single response item
Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Percentages of schools reporting that training opportunities outside the LEA but in Wales led to qualifications were similar to those for within LEA. However, fewer schools stated that such training did not lead to qualifications.

Again, numbers of responses for technicians, pupil welfare and other support staff were too low for inclusion in this table.

In the fieldwork schools, the majority of the senior staff stated that good opportunities were present in their schools to enable support staff to gain qualifications. Generally, teaching and learning assistants worked towards NVQ or BTEC qualifications, with adequate opportunity to progress through the levels.

Despite the available opportunities to work towards qualifications in schools, some support staff were not interested in pursuing them at present. Reasons supplied for this were family commitments, and already possessing a sufficient standard of qualifications. According to one learning support assistant, *'If I needed further qualifications, it would be different but at the moment, everything seems alright.'*

A lack of salary increments was an important reason for some staff not pursuing accredited qualifications. A primary headteacher said: '*Pay is a factor. Some classroom assistants feel 'I am doing the same work as someone else, but I get paid less money. Why?'*

A national structure relating to formal qualifications for support staff is required, according to the majority of trade union representatives

interviewed. They felt that there should also be a *'minimum qualification level'* for school support staff. There were concerns that some schools were not willing to allocate sufficient funding to allow support staff to work towards accredited qualifications.

One union official stated that potential support staff were being discouraged from entering the profession due to the lack of opportunity for gaining qualifications. '*It is affecting new entrants. A lot of the NVQ is work-based assessed, but they can't get into it.'*

### 7.10 Methods of training delivery

Schools were asked about the ways in which training was delivered to support staff.

| | Part-time evening study % | Periodic release | Distance learning | No response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % |
| Teaching and Learning Assistants | 42 | 75 | 8 | 14 |
| HLTAs | 13 | 23 | 3 | 72 |
| Facilities/Site Personnel | 3 | 31 | 1 | 68 |
| Administrative Staff | 12 | 52 | 5 | 44 |
| N=471 | | | | |

A multiple response item so percentages may not sum to 100.

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Most responses were received for teaching and learning assistants and administrative staff, the two categories receiving most training. For all categories of support staff, however, training provision was accessed most frequently through periodic release and then through part-time evening provision. Training was accessed on the least frequent basis via distance learning. Four schools added the information that support staff's training provision was accessed or organised through external courses. In three of these, support staff had completed British Sign Language (BSL) courses, in two of the schools in their own time.

Numbers of responses for technicians, pupil welfare and other support staff were too low for inclusion in this table.

Work-based learning was seen to be the most effective way of providing training for support staff by two trade union representatives. More support staff would be encouraged to gain qualifications related to their roles, they felt, if more training was

offered on-site, as staff would not be required to give up their own time.

The cost of providing the training would also be less if provided internally. Additionally, in-house training could provide useful opportunities for informal appraisal and monitoring. *'Probably for support staff, work-based learning is a reasonable way forward. It can be developed by the classroom teacher, giving them something extra to do, looking at where they are and how useful they are and whether or not they are being under-utilised as they have the skills to do more advanced work than they are currently undertaking',* one union official suggested.

### 7.11 Training take-up

The questionnaire asked about the extent of support staff's take-up of available training.

| | Better than adequate | Adequate | Less than adequate | No response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % |
| Teaching and Learning Assistants | 41 | 42 | 8 | 9 |
| HLTAs | 13 | 8 | 3 | 75 |
| Facilities/Site Personnel | 8 | 23 | 10 | 59 |
| Administrative Staff | 29 | 29 | 6 | 36 |
| N=471 | | | | |

A single response item
Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Schools most frequently reported that the take-up of available training was better than adequate or adequate for all categories of support staff. The highest response rates were again for teaching and learning assistants and administrative staff. The number of responses for technicians, pupil welfare and other support staff was too low for inclusion in the table.

When asked what accounted for support staff not taking up training provision, the most commonly cited factor (15 schools, three per cent) was the lack funding for this purpose. Other factors affecting take-up mentioned by small numbers of schools were staff willingness or otherwise to pursue training, the timing of training sessions, linking of training to new initiatives and

the perceived relevance of the training to staff's tasks and responsibilities.

### 7.12 Ease of locating and accessing suitable training

The questionnaire enquired about the ease of accessing suitable training for support staff, and the factors influencing this.

| | Very easy | Fairly easy | Difficult | No response |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | % | % | % |
| Teaching and Learning Assistants | 15 | 53 | 25 | 7 |
| HLTAs | 6 | 17 | 6 | 72 |
| Facilities/Site Personnel | 4 | 15 | 19 | 61 |
| Administrative Staff | 17 | 37 | 19 | 27 |
| N=471 | | | | |

A single response item
Due to rounding, percentages may not sum to 100.

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Suitable training was fairly or very easy to find for most categories of support staff, although the number of responses for technicians, pupil welfare and other support staff was too low for inclusion in the table.

However, a few schools did report that relevant training was difficult to access for technicians, while responses were evenly divided between 'easy' and 'difficult' for site/facilities staff.

One in five of the responding schools provided additional details on this question. The launch of new WAG and/or LEA initiatives was the most frequently mentioned factor affecting the ease of locating suitable training for support staff (N=35, seven per cent). Similarly, two per cent (N=11) of schools stated that the LEA had provided suitable training courses for support staff.

Other factors impacting on the ease of finding training were the lack of available funding, and family and other commitments of support staff outside school. Conversely, courses being made available on-site at local colleges made it easier for schools to obtain training for support staff.

The majority of the trade union officials interviewed highlighted a lack of funding as the main issue in finding appropriate training for support staff. The location of external training was the primary

difficulty for one of the secondary schools. Senior staff in this school said that the shortage of locally based training had led to a lack of take up because it was impossible to provide cover for the staff for the additional time to travel to the venues, which tended to be held in the larger cities of Wales and England.

The deputy head of this school commented that: *'There are enough [training opportunities] at present…A good point to make here is that there should be more training opportunities closer to home. We are out on a limb here- we don't have many training providers coming out to [this area]. The problem is all over Wales. I see lots of interesting courses, but they are in London, so that is really two days including travelling time that staff have to be released for…It is a nightmare- you are just speaking to people on the phone all the time.'*

### 7.13 Difficulty of accessing types of training

No particular difficulties had been experienced by 100 schools (19 per cent) in finding certain types of training for support staff. Conversely, six schools (one per cent) commented that all types of training were difficult to access. A further five schools stated that it was especially hard to find relevant accredited qualifications for support staff.

Of the 163 schools to provide further details concerning the reasons behind problems in finding suitable training, 17, (three per cent) stated that the lack of available funding was a major factor. The three most frequent kinds of training reported as difficult to access were 'specialist training', ALN and First Aid. Other kinds found difficult to find by nine or fewer schools each included Welsh language, the Foundation Phase, ICT, general administrative skills, behaviour management, health and safety, and finance. Individual schools also named a variety of other topic areas.

Locating suitable training providers was mentioned by some schools, with several emphasising problems of accessibility and poor quality.

A number of schools saw scope for the development of the role of the LEA in terms of providing training for support staff, particularly on-site.

Schools also commented on the specific categories of support staff for which difficulties had been observed in finding suitable training.

The most frequently stated category was that of administrators and dinner supervisors (N=7, one per cent), while even fewer schools referred to other staff categories. During the field interviews, it was noted that in one secondary school suitable science technician training had been problematic in the past.

Arranging sufficient cover for lessons had been the main issue with this type of training, according to the deputy head of this school. *'With the NVQ training, a lot of it was aimed at primary schools rather than secondary schools. When the assessors were coming in, in a primary school you can just go and sit next door and do a science lesson to be assessed, but this is far more difficult in a secondary school. That was a little hiccup, but we overcame it.'*

In another secondary school, training for ALN had been made difficult by a lack of available funding.

### 7.14 Additional comments

The final question in the questionnaire asked whether schools had any further comments to add regarding support staff.

Some 45 per cent of schools did not respond, and a further four per cent stated that they had no further comments.

**Role and contribution of support staff**

However, a number of themes emerged from the responses that were offered. One theme related to school's perceptions of the role and contribution of the support staff. 78 respondents (13 per cent) commented that support staff played a vital role in the schools. This was the greatest single response for this item. However, two schools reported that teaching staff resented support staff.

It was emphasised by 13 schools that support staff need to feel valued (two per cent), and by another that they would benefit from more clearly defined roles within the schools. One school emphasised that support staff would benefit from the greater support that their representation by a professional body would bring.

Three schools stated that the LEA did not provide sufficient guidance and help to support staff, especially when issues or problems arose. Eight schools reported high levels of insecurity in the jobs of support staff.

Twelve schools said that recruitment problems had led to a general shortage of suitable support staff.

**Training and development**

The second theme to emerge from the school's responses to this question was the need for more consideration and addressing of the training and development needs of support staff.

Continuing professional development was considered to enhance the school's provision by 15 schools (two per cent), and was seen to directly benefit the pupils in a further five. The lack of suitable training opportunities for support staff was emphasised by 14 schools (two per cent).

A number of comments identified some of the more specific issues relating to the training of support staff. Four schools mentioned a shortage of Welsh-speaking support staff, and a shortage of appropriate Welsh-language training was reported in the same number of schools.

Contradictory statements were that more training was needed by support staff for accredited roles (three schools), while four schools thought that qualifications were not essential and another that 'common sense' was an important quality for support staff.

Other concerns raised by very small numbers of schools were the accessibility and quality of training and the difficulty in sustaining it, and a need for access to a database or termly lists of training courses for support staff, according to two respondents. It was commented that schools organised their own training for support staff, and that training provision was supplied in conjunction with the local college. Six schools reported difficulties in providing cover for support staff to attend training.

**Pay and funding**

The final theme to emerge from school's responses to this question was that of pay and funding. Five per cent (20) of the responding schools stated that support staff's salaries did not currently reflect the importance of their role, and that this is a priority which must be addressed in future. HLTAs were specifically mentioned in four schools as requiring the 'fair' pay which they did not currently receive.

The issue of support staff pay was also referred to frequently during the field interviews. One headteacher said that *'… the pay of all support staff is very low,'* although she could not make direct comparisons with similar occupations outside the school. When asked what the main issues for them were in regards to work, support staff of all categories referred above all to their low pay. One school secretary said that she *'… loved the work,'* but that her one concern was *'the awful pay.'* She felt that any national structure would have to address salary levels. Catering staff in a primary school spoke of the poor pay as the only negative factor in the job. Trade union representatives also referred to low salary levels as unfair and a factor which could affect recruitment.

Forty-four schools (seven per cent) commented that they were in need of larger budgets. More funding was said in 15 schools (two per cent) to be required to permit full implementation of the Foundation Phase and to extend more general training opportunities for support staff in 21 schools (three per cent).

**Key Findings**

7(i) Performance management arrangements for support staff varied. More schools had them in place than did not. However, there were variations depending on the nature of the support staff. Those working in classrooms were most likely to have some form of performance management system.

7(ii) In general, schools were satisfied with the performance management arrangements. The importance of informal procedures were emphasised.

7(iii) There was some opposition from school leaders to any proposal to introduce a mandatory formalised appraisal system for support staff.

7(iv) The headteacher or a designated member of a school's SMT was normally responsible for the performance management of classroom-based support staff. There was greater LEA involvement in some other categories, such as facilities/site personnel.

7(v) Professional development and promotion opportunities were said to be limited for most support staff, especially facilities/site personnel. Funding was perceived as a major obstacle.

7(vi) Some support staff were unable to pursue professional development opportunities because of family or other commitments.

7(vii) In general, it was considered that the training opportunities available to support staff were adequate.

7(viii) In most schools support staff and teachers were able to undertake some training together, particularly Early Years and Health and Safety.

7(ix) The Foundation Phase, behaviour management, and ICT were identified as areas which should be the priorities for future professional training.

7(x) Schools felt that the opportunities for teaching and learning assistants to obtain HLTA status were adequate. There were differing views about the extent to which there were adequate opportunities for specialisation.

7(xi) Periodic release was the most common way of enabling support staff to take part in professional development activities.

7(xii) Most schools thought that the take-up of training opportunities by support staff was adequate or better than adequate.

7(xiii) Suitable training was fairly or very easy to find for most categories of support staff.

7(xiv) Low pay for all categories of support staff was a major concern for the staff themselves, but also for headteachers who saw this as a factor inhibiting recruitment.

# 8. Overall conclusions

## 8.1 Characteristics of the support staff workforce

The largely female nature of the workforce in both the primary and secondary sectors has implications for the general ambiance of schools. It reinforces the growing lack of gender balance amongst the teaching workforce, particularly in primary schools, and its lack of male role models. Teenage boys might particularly find it easier to relate to male support staff.

Although the age profile of support staff is weighted towards the older end of the spectrum, this need not impact on the effectiveness of the workforce or its relationship with teachers and pupils. The concern is that as many support staff approach retirement age together, current recruitment issues could make it difficult to replace them adequately.

The general low pay earned by support staff in most categories means that they are inadequately rewarded for their contribution in schools and this affects recruitment. There are probably links between the low remuneration and female preponderance in the workforce as support staff jobs are often perceived as merely a ‘second wage’ inadequate to maintain a family by itself and therefore seen as unattractive by many men.

Qualifications held by support staff vary very widely according to needs of the particular role but staff with Level 4 qualifications are a clear minority. The low pay does not help to attract recruits with degrees, even to the more technical support roles.

## 8.2 Conditions of work

The provision of training is generally adequate and relevant for all types of support roles and these staff are usually able to maintain their levels of necessary skills and knowledge. Support staff especially appreciate opportunities to share training events with teaching staff and this aspect could be further developed.

However, possibilities for professional development and promotion are on the whole limited for all categories of support staff, except in larger schools where there may be different grades of administrative personnel, for example. These constraints can affect the motivation of staff to undertake training as there is then no recognition for their improved skills.

Inadequate funding in schools can mean that higher-level roles cannot be made available for staff. It causes frustration when staff have studied to acquire higher qualifications but the school cannot afford to advertise a higher-level post, such as an HLTA position.

Arrangements for the appraisal and development of support staff vary considerably across schools. Approaches which are too informal and infrequent can reinforce the impression that support staff form a largely casual workforce and do not help their motivation for self-improvement.

The importance of support staff to the success of schools is widely recognised by teaching staff and by many of the support staff themselves. Although difficult to quantify, their impact can be seen in improved academic results as their support improves pupils' basic skills and teachers are released by contractual arrangements arising from the workforce agreement from more mundane tasks to focus on raising pupil performance. Their potential impact is also considerable in terms of pupil behaviour and attitudes around the school where support staff have contact with them. In Welsh-medium schools, support staff can increase contact time with the language for pupils from non Welsh-speaking homes and offer more informal linguistic models than teachers.

The impact of support staff could be enhanced through a widening of certain roles they undertake, although that would need to be underpinned by training and properly recognised.

Generally, support staff enjoy their work, especially their contact with children and the opportunity to help them develop. They bring considerable goodwill to their roles. The element of 'convenience' is important to many of them as the great majority live close to the workplace and the hours of work fit with demands of childcare and other family responsibilities.

However, there is also a feeling of slight injustice that they carry out many of the tasks attributed to teachers but for a fraction of the salary. The expectations of and demands on support staff have increased since the implementation of teachers' contractual changes arising from the workforce agreement, and this is a trend that is likely to continue as schools further develop the role of their support staff.

Recruitment of support staff depends on several factors. The logistical convenience of many of the jobs can be attractive, but aspects such as the very limited hours of midday supervisors and catering staff and the general poor remuneration create problems for recruitment for many schools. Well-qualified applicants may only see a support staff post as a temporary measure until a better-paid opportunity arrives. The shortage of Welsh-speaking applicants in many areas is also creating difficulties of recruitment in the Welsh-medium sector, particularly for roles with a teaching requirement such as Teaching and Learning Assistants.

### 8.3 A National Structure for classroom assistants

The proposal for a National Structure for support staff was generally found interesting, although some uncertainty was encountered regarding its possible content and status. The evidence obtained through this project suggests that any development of a National Structure should keep the following considerations in view:

- There was a feeling among some groups that a National Structure should include all support staff not just classroom assistants.
- A Structure should allow for flexibility according to local conditions and history.
- There is a case for more formal and standardised arrangements for appraisal and performance management.
- The development of career paths would raise staff motivation and could be linked to the gaining of qualifications.
- Pay levels should be addressed, possibly through comparison with similar roles in other sectors of the economy; national pay scales for certain roles could be considered.
- The pressing need to address the gender imbalance.
- Compulsory unionisation of certain roles could help improve pay and conditions for staff.
- Job re-evaluations should be carried out regularly, particularly in view of technological change and school reorganisation.

- Entitlements for initial training and continuous professional development.

- The need for good marketing to aid recruitment to some support staff roles.

- A National Structure should not impact on the conditions of work of teachers or other professions.

# APPENDIX 1

**Representativeness of the School Sample**

**Table A1.1: Representation of participating primary schools compared to national schools**

| | | 0 Population | | 1 Sample | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Number | % | Number | % |
| % eligible FSM 2004 (5 pt scale) | Lowest 20% | 307 | 21 | 93 | 23 |
| | 2nd lowest 20% | 280 | 19 | 85 | 21 |
| | Middle 20% | 262 | 18 | 59 | 15 |
| | 2nd highest 20% | 279 | 19 | 69 | 17 |
| | Highest 20% | 312 | 21 | 84 | 21 |
| | Missing | 32 | 2 | 7 | 2 |
| Total schools | | 1472 | 100 | 397 | 100 |
| Primary school type | Infant/First | 143 | 10 | 45 | 11 |
| | Primary/Combined | 1188 | 81 | 318 | 80 |
| | Junior | 141 | 10 | 34 | 9 |
| Total schools | | 1472 | 100 | 397 | 100 |
| Number of pupils in primary school | Small | 487 | 33 | 143 | 36 |
| | Medium | 488 | 33 | 131 | 33 |
| | Large | 497 | 34 | 123 | 31 |
| Total schools | | 1472 | 100 | 397 | 100 |
| Urban/rural | not applicable | 9 | 1 | 6 | 2 |
| | Rural | 687 | 47 | 205 | 52 |
| | Non-rural | 746 | 51 | 179 | 45 |
| | Missing | 30 | 2 | 7 | 2 |
| Total schools | | 1472 | 100 | 397 | 100 |
| Welsh regions | North | 407 | 28 | 115 | 29 |
| | Powys and South West | 352 | 24 | 101 | 25 |
| | South East | 713 | 48 | 181 | 46 |
| Total schools | | 1472 | 100 | 397 | 100 |

| | | 0 Population | | 1 Sample | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Number | % | Number | % |
| LA number | Anglesey | 52 | 4 | 14 | 4 |
| | Gwynedd | 106 | 7 | 27 | 7 |
| | Conwy | 60 | 4 | 14 | 4 |
| | Denbighshire | 46 | 3 | 15 | 4 |
| | Flintshire | 75 | 5 | 22 | 6 |
| | Wrexham | 68 | 5 | 23 | 6 |
| | Powys | 105 | 7 | 33 | 8 |
| | Ceredigon | 72 | 5 | 16 | 4 |
| | Pembrokeshire | 60 | 4 | 20 | 5 |
| | Carmarthenshire | 115 | 8 | 32 | 8 |
| | Swansea | 85 | 6 | 13 | 3 |
| | Neath Port Talbot | 71 | 5 | 29 | 7 |
| | Bridgend | 58 | 4 | 16 | 4 |
| | Vale of Glamorgan | 45 | 3 | 12 | 3 |
| | Rhondda Cynon Taff | 118 | 8 | 34 | 9 |
| | Merthyr Tydfil | 24 | 2 | 7 | 2 |
| | Caerphilly | 68 | 5 | 14 | 4 |
| | Blaenau Gwent | 28 | 2 | 6 | 2 |
| | Torfaen | 33 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| | Monmouthshire | 32 | 2 | 11 | 3 |
| | Newport | 51 | 3 | 10 | 3 |
| | Cardiff | 100 | 7 | 24 | 6 |
| Total schools | | 1472 | 100 | 397 | 100 |

Since percentages are rounded to the nearest integer, they may not always sum to 100.

**Table A1.2: Representation of participating secondary schools compared to national schools**

| | | 0 population | | 1 sample | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Number | % | Number | % |
| Secondary school type | Middle | 2 | 1 | | |
| | Comprehensive to 16 | 40 | 19 | 9 | 16 |
| | Comprehensive to 18 | 166 | 80 | 46 | 84 |
| Total schools | | 208 | 100 | 55 | 100 |
| Number of pupils in secondary school | Small | 68 | 33 | 20 | 36 |
| | Medium | 69 | 33 | 17 | 31 |
| | Large | 71 | 34 | 18 | 33 |
| Total schools | | 208 | 100 | 55 | 100 |
| % eligible FSM 2004 (5 pt scale) | Lowest 20% | 17 | 8 | 6 | 11 |
| | 2nd lowest 20% | 55 | 26 | 15 | 27 |
| | Middle 20% | 64 | 31 | 13 | 24 |
| | 2nd highest 20% | 52 | 25 | 16 | 29 |
| | Highest 20% | 20 | 10 | 5 | 9 |
| Total schools | | 208 | 100 | 55 | 100 |
| Urban/rural | not applicable | 3 | 1 | | |
| | Rural | 59 | 28 | 17 | 31 |
| | Non-rural | 146 | 70 | 38 | 69 |
| Total schools | | 208 | 100 | 55 | 100 |
| Welsh regions | North | 51 | 25 | 12 | 22 |
| | Powys and South West | 41 | 20 | 13 | 24 |
| | South East | 116 | 56 | 30 | 55 |
| Total schools | | 208 | 100 | 55 | 100 |

| | | 0 population | | 1 sample | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Number | % | Number | % |
| LA number | Anglesey | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| | Gwynedd | 14 | 7 | 5 | 9 |
| | Conwy | 7 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| | Denbighshire | 7 | 3 | | |
| | Flintshire | 12 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| | Wrexham | 6 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| | Powys | 13 | 6 | 2 | 4 |
| | Ceredigon | 7 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| | Pembrokeshire | 8 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| | Carmarthenshire | 13 | 6 | 8 | 15 |
| | Swansea | 11 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| | Neath Port Talbot | 11 | 5 | 2 | 4 |
| | Bridgend | 9 | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| | Vale of Glamorgan | 7 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| | Rhondda Cynon Taff | 18 | 9 | 7 | 13 |
| | Merthyr Tydfil | 4 | 2 | | |
| | Caerphilly | 15 | 7 | 3 | 5 |
| | Blaenau Gwent | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| | Torfaen | 7 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| | Monmouthshire | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| | Newport | 8 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| | Cardiff | 18 | 9 | 4 | 7 |
| Total schools | | 208 | 100 | 55 | 100 |

Since percentages are rounded to the nearest integer,they may not always sum to100.

# APPENDIX 2

**This appendix indicates the full-time equivalent (FTE) for Categories of Support Staff**

The hours for which part-time support staff were contracted varied considerably. Most classroom assistants (70 per cent) worked more than 50 per cent FTE and nearly half worked more than 75 per cent or more FTE. More than 85 per cent of teaching assistants and 80 per cent of HLTAs worked 75 per cent or more FTE. Moreover, 82 per cent of LSAs and 88 per cent of nursery nurses worked more than 50 per cent FTE and most of those worked more than 75 per cent of FTE.

| ***Classroom assistant*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 63 | 8 | 59 | 9 | 2 | 2 |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 168 | 22 | 162 | 24 | 5 | 6 |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 180 | 23 | 150 | 22 | 27 | 31 |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 359 | 47 | 306 | 45 | 53 | 61 |
| | 770 | 100 | 677 | 100 | 87 | 100 |

| ***Teaching assistant*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 15 | 2 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 75 | 12 | 72 | 18 | 1 | 1 |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 156 | 25 | 111 | 28 | 42 | 34 |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 384 | 61 | 204 | 51 | 82 | 66 |
| | 630 | 100 | 400 | 100 | 125 | 100 |

| ***Higher level teaching assistant*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 15 | 16 | 7 | 10 | 8 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 6 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 0 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 12 | 13 | 10 | 14 | 2 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 63 | 66 | 50 | 69 | 10 | |
| | 96 | 100 | 72 | 100 | 20 | |

| ***Learning support assistant (aln pupils)*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 65 | 7 | 40 | 8 | 25 | 7 |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 150 | 15 | 132 | 26 | 18 | 5 |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 258 | 27 | 129 | 26 | 115 | 32 |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 493 | 51 | 201 | 40 | 205 | 56 |
| | 966 | 100 | 502 | 100 | 363 | 100 |

| ***Nursery nurse*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 28 | 11 | 28 | 12 | 0 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 25 | 10 | 24 | 10 | 0 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 202 | 78 | 175 | 76 | 20 | |
| | 259 | 100 | 231 | 100 | 20 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Most part time primary classroom assistants worked more than 50 per cent of FTE. Nearly half (45 per cent) worked more than 75 per cent of FTE. Similarly, nearly four fifths of teaching assistants worked more than 50 per cent of FTE, including 51 per cent who worked more than 75 per cent of FTE. More than two thirds (70 per cent) of the part time HLTAs worked more than 75 per cent FTE. The full time equivalence among LSAs was more varied. Few (10 per cent) worked less than 25 per cent, a quarter (26 per cent) worked 26-50 per cent of FTE and 51-75 per cent, and 40 per cent worked more than 75 per cent of FTE.
Three quarters (76 per cent) of part time nursery nurses worked more than 75 per cent of FTE.

In secondary schools most part time classroom assistants teaching assistants and LSAs were employed for more than 50 per cent of FTE and more than half worked more than 75 per cent of FTE. Although most part time HLTAs worked more than 75 per cent, 40 per cent were contracted for less than 25 per cent of FTE, although the total number of part time HLTAs was very small. All part time nursery nurses were contracted for 75 per cent or more of FTE.

The numbers of therapists were too small for inclusion in table form.

| ***Careers adviser*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 9 | | 0 | | 9 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 3 | | 0 | | 3 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 9 | | 0 | | 9 | |
| | 21 | | 0 | | 21 | |

| ***Welfare office or equivalent*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 5 | | 0 | | 5 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 4 | | 0 | | 4 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 18 | | 0 | | 18 | |
| | 27 | | 0 | | 27 | |

| ***Attendance officer*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 2 | | 0 | | 2 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 5 | | 0 | | 5 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 5 | | 0 | | 5 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 14 | | 0 | | 14 | |
| | 26 | | 0 | | 26 | |

| ***Nurse*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 7 | | 0 | | 7 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 4 | | 0 | | 3 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 3 | | 0 | | 2 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 6 | | 0 | | 5 | |
| | 20 | | 0 | | 17 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

A higher percentage of careers advisors (42 per cent), welfare officers (50 per cent), and attendance officers (50 per cent), and nurses (55 per cent) worked less than 50 per cent of FTE; however the total number of such staff was small.

Most part time careers officers in secondary schools worked less than 50 per cent of FTE. However more than two fifths were contracted for 75 per cent or more. Two thirds of part time welfare officers and more than half of part time attendance officers worked more than 75 per cent of FTE. School nurses varied. Approximately two fifths (40 per cent) were contracted for less than 25 per cent but nearly 30 per cent were contracted for more than 75 per cent of FTE.

The numbers of learning mentors were too small for inclusion.

| ***ICT network manager*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 4 | | 2 | | 2 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 15 | | 1 | | 14 | |
| | 20 | | 3 | | 17 | |

| ***ICT technician*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 10 | | 9 | | 1 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 2 | | 1 | | 0 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 2 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 35 | | 4 | | 31 | |
| | 49 | | 15 | | 33 | |

| ***Librarian*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 2 | | 0 | | 2 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 4 | | 0 | | 4 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 7 | | 0 | | 7 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 22 | | 0 | | 22 | |
| | 35 | | 0 | | 35 | |

| ***Science technician*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 4 | 5 | 0 | | 4 | 5 |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 4 | 5 | 0 | | 4 | 5 |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 17 | 20 | 0 | | 17 | 20 |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 61 | 71 | 0 | | 61 | 71 |
| | 86 | 100 | 0 | | 86 | 100 |

| ***Technology technician*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 5 | 10 | 0 | | 5 | 10 |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 11 | 21 | 0 | | 11 | 21 |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 14 | 27 | 0 | | 14 | 27 |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 22 | 42 | 0 | | 22 | 42 |
| | 52 | 100 | 0 | | 52 | 100 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Most ICT network managers (75 per cent) and ICT technicians (71 per cent) who worked part time were employed for more than 75 per cent of FTE. All other ICT support staff did so. Similarly, 83 per cent of part time librarians worked for more than 50 per cent or more FTE, most of whom worked for more than 75 per cent of FTE. The percentage of science technicians who worked 75 per cent or more FTE was 71 per cent and 42 per cent of technology technicians did so.

Most part time ICT network managers and ICT technicians who worked in secondary schools and all part time ICT support staff were contracted for more than 75 per cent of FTE. Less than a fifth of part time librarians were contracted for less than 50 per cent of FTE and more than half were contracted for more than 75 per cent of FTE. More than half of part time science technicians were contracted for more than 75 per cent of FTE and most others were contracted for more than 50 per cent. The pattern among part time technology technicians was more varied; nearly a third were contracted for less than 50 per cent of FTE; a quarter were employed for 51-75 per cent and the remainder were contracted for more than 75 per cent of FTE.

Part time bilingual support assistants were usually contracted for less than 50 per cent FTE (82 per cent). All part time exam invigilators and two thirds of language assistants whose details were provided were also employed for less than half FTE. However, 80 per cent of cover supervisors were contracted for more than 75 per cent FTE.

In secondary schools, part time bilingual support assistants were either contracted for less than 25 per cent or more than 75 per cent of FTE although the number included in the survey was small. The majority (80 per cent) of cover supervisors were employed for more than 75 per cent of FTE. Conversely, nearly 90 per cent of exam invigilators were employed for less than 25 per cent of FTE. Two thirds of part time language assistants were contracted for less than 50 per cent of FTE but a quarter were contracted for more than 75 per cent.

Numbers of librarians were too small for inclusion in the table.

| ***Midday supervisor*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 674 | 83 | 521 | 83 | 131 | 86 |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 53 | 7 | 29 | 5 | 18 | 12 |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 9 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 76 | 9 | 76 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| | 812 | 100 | 631 | 100 | 152 | 100 |

| ***Midday assistant*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 275 | 88 | 223 | 87 | 39 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 19 | 6 | 14 | 5 | 5 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 18 | 6 | 17 | 7 | 1 | |
| | 314 | 100 | 255 | 100 | 46 | |

More than four fifths (83 per cent) of midday supervisors and 88 per cent of midday assistants were contracted for 10-15 per cent of FTE.

| ***Caretaker*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 48 | 16 | 43 | 20 | 5 | 7 |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 69 | 24 | 58 | 27 | 9 | 12 |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 39 | 13 | 30 | 14 | 6 | 8 |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 136 | 47 | 80 | 38 | 54 | 73 |
| | 292 | 100 | 211 | 100 | 74 | 100 |

| ***Premises manager*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 5 | | 4 | | 1 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 5 | | 1 | | 4 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 25 | | 0 | | 25 | |
| | 36 | | 5 | | 31 | |

| ***Catering staff*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 149 | 25 | 121 | 38 | 27 | 10 |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 293 | 49 | 145 | 45 | 146 | 54 |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 93 | 16 | 24 | 7 | 65 | 24 |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 64 | 11 | 32 | 10 | 30 | 11 |
| | 599 | 100 | 322 | 100 | 268 | 100 |

| ***Cook*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 28 | 12 | 26 | 14 | 1 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 67 | 29 | 60 | 32 | 5 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 63 | 28 | 52 | 28 | 8 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 70 | 31 | 48 | 26 | 20 | |
| | 228 | 100 | 186 | 100 | 34 | |

| ***Cleaner*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 283 | 39 | 151 | 43 | 130 | 36 |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 322 | 44 | 141 | 40 | 173 | 48 |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 73 | 10 | 27 | 8 | 42 | 12 |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 52 | 7 | 33 | 9 | 19 | 5 |
| | 730 | 100 | 352 | 100 | 364 | 100 |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

Nearly half (47 per cent) of part-time caretakers worked for 75 per cent or more FTE and 60 per cent of them worked 50 per cent or more FTE. Most part-time premises managers also worked 75 per cent or more FTE. Nearly three quarters (74 per cent) of catering staff worked less than 50 per cent FTE but 60 per cent of school cooks worked more than half of FTE. The majority of cleaners (83 per cent) worked less than half FTE.

Most part time midday supervisors in secondary schools (86 per cent) and midday assistants (84 per cent) were contracted for less than 25 per cent of FTE. Nearly three quarters (73 per cent) of part time caretakers and more than 80 per cent of part time premises managers were contracted for more than 75 per cent of FTE. Most (59 per cent) part time school cooks were contracted for more than 75 per cent of FTE. There was more diversity among school catering staff; more than half (55 per cent) were contracted for 26-50 per cent of FTE. Most part time cleaners were employed for less than 50 per cent of FTE; nearly half (48 per cent) were employed for 26-50 per cent of FTE.

Four fifths of part time midday supervisors in primary schools (83 per cent) were employed for 10-25 per cent of FTE. Similarly 87 per cent of part time midday assistants in primary schools were employed for 10-25 per cent of FTE. The pattern among part time caretakers was varied. A fifth (20 per cent) worked 10-25 per cent of FTE, 27 per cent worked 26-50 per cent of FTE, 14 per cent worked 51-75 per cent of FTE and 38 per cent worked more than 75 per cent of FTE. Most part time catering staff worked less than 50 per cent of FTE. The pattern among part time cooks in primary schools was more varied. A third (32 per cent) were contracted for 25-50 per cent of FTE, 28 per cent were contracted for 51-75 per cent of FTE, and 26 per cent were contracted for more than 75 per cent of FTE. More than four fifths (83 per cent) of cleaners were contracted for less than 50 per cent of FTE and two fifths (43 per cent) for less than 25 per cent.

| ***Administrative /clerk*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 63 | 16 | 49 | 22 | 14 | 9 |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 60 | 16 | 44 | 20 | 14 | 9 |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 85 | 22 | 47 | 21 | 34 | 22 |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 177 | 46 | 79 | 36 | 93 | 60 |
| | 385 | 100 | 219 | 100 | 155 | 100 |

| ***Bursar*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 6 | | 5 | | 1 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 31 | | 0 | | 31 | |
| | 38 | | 6 | | 32 | |

| ***Data manager/analyst*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 2 | | 0 | | 2 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 2 | | 0 | | 2 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 14 | | 0 | | 14 | |
| | 19 | | 0 | | 19 | |

| ***Examinations officer*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 5 | | 0 | | 5 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 3 | | 0 | | 3 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 3 | | 0 | | 3 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 21 | | 0 | | 21 | |
| | 32 | | 0 | | 32 | |

| ***Finance officer*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 5 | | 4 | | 1 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 3 | | 0 | | 3 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 21 | | 3 | | 18 | |
| | 30 | | 8 | | 22 | |

| ***Office manager*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 1 | | 0 | | 1 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 2 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 28 | | 7 | | 20 | |
| | 31 | | 8 | | 22 | |

| ***School secretary*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 21 | 14 | 20 | 17 | 1 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 30 | 20 | 26 | 22 | 2 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 26 | 18 | 21 | 18 | 4 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 70 | 48 | 50 | 43 | 17 | |
| | 147 | 100 | 117 | 100 | 24 | |

| ***Personal assistant to head*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 2 | | 0 | | 2 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 18 | | 1 | | 16 | |
| | 20 | | 1 | | 18 | |

| ***Receptionist*** | All | | Primary | | Secondary | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sum | percent | Sum | percent | Sum | percent |
| *Number employed for 10-25 percent of ft* | 4 | | 1 | | 3 | |
| *Number employed for 26-50 percent of ft* | 3 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| *Number employed for 51-75 percent of ft* | 14 | | 0 | | 13 | |
| *Number employed for over 75 percent of ft* | 22 | | 0 | | 22 | |
| | 43 | | 2 | | 39 | |

Source: NFER Support Staff Survey 2008

More than a third (36 per cent) of part time administrative staff/clerks in primary schools were employed for more than 75 per cent of FTE. The remaining staff were divided equally among the other quartiles. Similar figures pertained among part time school secretaries where 42 per cent were employed for more than 75 per cent of FTE.

Most administrators/clerks who worked part time in secondary schools (82 per cent) were employed for more than 50 per cent of FTE and nearly two thirds (60 per cent) for more than 75 per cent. Nearly all part time bursars, finance officers, office managers, school secretaries, personal assistants and data managers/analysts were contracted for more than 75 per cent. Two thirds of part time examinations officers were contracted for 75 per cent of FTE. Nearly all receptionists worked more than 50 per cent FTE, half of whom worked more than 75 per cent.

# REFERENCES

BLATCHFORD, P., BASSETT, P., BROWN, P.,
MARTIN, C., RUSSELL, A., AND WEBSTER, R., (2007).
*Deployment and Impact of Support Staff in Schools: Report on findings from the second national questionnaire survey of schools, support staff and teachers (Strand 1, Wave 2 -2006).*