

Earley, P. and Bubb, S. (2007) 'The school workforce in London' in Brighouse, T and Fullick, L (eds) *Education in a Global City – Essays on London*, London: Institute of Education.

The school workforce in London

Peter Earley and Sara Bubb

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the school workforce. It is about the people who work in London's 2,600 plus primary, secondary and special schools. Its main focus is on London's teachers - and particular attention is given to an innovative scheme entitled the Chartered London Teacher (CLT) – but it's about other school workers too. The school workforce includes all those who work in schools, for example, teaching assistants, bursars, administrators, cleaners, playground assistants and catering staff. After an introductory comment about working in London, this chapter looks at some facts and figures about the school workforce before raising a number of key issues affecting London schools and all those who work in them.

The scale of educational challenge in London is unique within Europe. It is dynamic and successful, both economically and culturally and offers opportunities involving sports, culture, music, arts, museums, business, education and government. However, it is a city of contrasts with extremes of wealth and deprivation – often in close geographical proximity. It has both higher than national average unemployment levels and, for those in work, higher overall earnings. People new to the country, such as economic migrants or those seeking asylum, tend to come to London. Twenty-eight per cent of pupils across London are known to be eligible for free school meals (39% in inner, 20% in outer London). Half of pupils in inner London speak English as a second language: there are over 300 first languages (DfES, 2006).

Many schools are performing extremely well and add significant value but there is a range of performance between schools and for groups of pupils (Ofsted, 2006). Enabling every young person to achieve, no matter what their background, remains the number one challenge. The leadership and management of schools are important – which Ofsted notes have improved more in London than elsewhere in the country (*ibid*) - but London's teachers and support staff are vital in meeting this challenge.

The staffing of schools is a fundamental issue. It is often stated that the school's staff is its most important yet most expensive resource. Yet how can children and young people learn without high quality and committed staff? It is generally recognised that good staff make good schools but schools too have a significant role in developing their workforce (Bubb and Earley, 2007). In 2006, just over 1.2 million pupils attended schools in London (DfES, 2007a). This was an increase of 14,000 pupils compared with 2002 and against the national trend. Approximately ten per cent of children (126,000 in 2006) in London attend independent schools, which is well above the national average of seven per cent. With the independent sector competing for staff, how can the city attract even more teachers and support staff? So what do we know about the current school workforce in London?

The school workforce in London: Facts and figures

Teachers

London has 63,600 (full time equivalent) teachers, which is just over a sixth of all the (fte) teachers in England (434,900). This represents an increase of 11 per cent since 1997 compared to only 8.1 per cent in England (DfES, 2007a). London's teachers work in over 2,600 schools organised into 33 different local authorities without any overarching London body to unite them. The Inner London Education Authority, abolished in 1990, had oversight of the inner London boroughs.

Teacher recruitment, retention, mobility, experience and quality present considerable challenges for London state schools. The DfES School Workforce Statistics (2006) show that teachers in London have less teaching experience than those in England as a whole: a fifth of inner London teachers have less than three years' and just over one-third (37%) have less than six years' service (compared with 15% and 29% of teachers in England). Also while only 3.8 per cent of 'teachers' in England and Wales are unqualified, in London 10.2 per cent are unqualified, and in some London boroughs the figure is over 17 per cent.

More London teachers than elsewhere are women under 40 (Hargreaves et al, 2007). Inner London has a young teaching workforce with nearly one-half of teachers under 40, compared to England as a whole (42%). London schools have a higher teacher vacancy rate (1.2%), exactly double that of the rest of the country (0.6%). There are higher turnover and wastage rates for teachers in London (23% and 12% respectively) than England (19% and 10%). Nearly 40 per cent of teachers leaving schools in London are aged under 30 – much higher than the 25 per cent leaving nationally (DfES, 2006). A significant number move into the burgeoning independent sector. Around two-thirds of the new independent schools in England opened since 2001 are in London (GLA, 2005).

As might be expected given its composition, the percentage of teachers from black and minority ethnic groups is significantly greater in the London region (17.9%) than the rest of England (5.4%) and this percentage has increased from 17.4 per cent in 2006 (DfES, 2007a). Data from a recent report on black teachers for the Mayor of London (2006) show that the highest percentages can be found in the boroughs of Hackney, Lambeth and Southwark (16-18%), followed by Haringey and Brent (9%). The highest proportions of teachers of black-Caribbean origin are also in Hackney, Lambeth and Southwark (10%), followed by Haringey and Brent (9%). Lewisham schools have the highest proportion of teachers of black-African origin (7%). Westminster, Camden, Kensington and Chelsea, as well as the City of London, have a black teaching workforce of five per cent or less yet each has a black pupil population of 20 per cent or more.

London's schools also make considerable use of Overseas Trained Teachers (OTTs) although the exact number is not known. Regional statistics on initial teacher training from the (then) Teacher Training Agency (TTA, 2004) show that in 2002/03 there were 471 trainees registered on the OTT programme in London. Over this period 93 achieved qualified teacher status (QTS) with the rest working towards the award. Two-thirds of the London OTTs were female and their average age was 33. However, it is not known how many OTTs are working in London's schools who are not registered for the award of QTS.

A recent survey of OTTs, commissioned by one of the teacher unions, found that most are located in inner city London schools (McNamara et al, 2004). Of the 277 schools involved in the research, 182 had employed 1155 OTTs between September 2001 and March 2004. Three-quarters of the headteachers in the sample claimed they had recruited OTTs because no UK teachers were available at the time. The researchers also found that the majority of

OTTs are female, under 30 years of age, primary trained, with about one-third having less than four years' teaching experience. Most came from the southern hemisphere, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand. Sixty per cent of the sample of OTTs had the status and salary of unqualified teachers.

Many OTTs are employed by agencies and engaged in supply teaching. Barlin and Hallgarten (2001) estimated that up to 4,000 supply teachers were deployed across London every day in 2000, although the exact proportion of such teachers who are OTTs is not known. Preston and Danby (2005) in their large scale national survey of supply teachers found one-fifth were from overseas.

These statistics concerning overseas trained and supply teachers, along with the facts that about one in ten teachers in London are not qualified and that more than one in five pupils are taught by someone with less than three years' teaching experience, present their own challenges to London's state schools. The profile of teachers working in independent schools in London is not known but it is most unlikely to be similar to that of the state sector.

Teach First, an innovative approach to training teachers for London secondary schools was first set up in 2003. Teach First allows good graduates to work in challenging London schools for two years. It is specifically designed to attract people who would not otherwise have become teachers and there is a strong focus on recruiting teachers in shortage subjects. Each year about 200 Teach First teachers experience a short training course after which they are allocated placements to teach in challenging schools in the Greater London area, where they teach a timetable equivalent to that of a newly qualified teacher (NQT). The scheme has been positively evaluated (Hutchings, et al, 2005) and recently extended to Manchester (from September 2006) with expansion to other large English cities planned.

In part, Teach First has been a response to filling vacancies especially in shortage subjects. This is a problem for London schools but vacancy rates have dropped from 3.5 per cent in 2001 to just one per cent in 2007. However, this is higher than the rest of England where it was one per cent in 2001 and is currently 0.5 per cent. The 2007 vacancy rates for the inner and the outer London weighting areas are 0.6 per cent and 0.2 per cent (nursery and primary), 0.9 per cent and 0.6 per cent (secondary), 2.7 per cent and 2.6 per cent (special) respectively (DfES, 2007a).

Another group of London teachers which has grown in recent years are Advanced Skills Teachers (ASTs). There are 640 in post in London – 350 in secondary, 250 in primary and 40 in special schools (DfES, 2007a). This represents a sixth of the national total of 4,045 ASTs. Launched in 1998, the Advanced Skills Teacher grade has introduced a new category of practitioner into maintained schools in England. All ASTs are assessed and judged to have satisfied a set of standards that describe an excellent classroom teacher. They are required to spend four days a week working in their own school and one day a week in other schools (outreach) to improve the practice of other teachers. Taylor and Jennings (2004) found that their potential was great but their actual impact was limited because of issues to do with deployment and support. The ASTs expressed 'at best a lukewarm level of satisfaction with the way in which their outreach work is managed'. This comment from an inner London primary AST is not untypical:

Since the day you awarded me AST status two and a half years ago, I have not been out anywhere to help anyone. The local authority has been awful at organising anything: it seems no one wants to take ownership of deploying ASTs. I am increasingly disenchanted. (Personal correspondence, 2007)

Whilst this is a national initiative, London also has its own Chartered London Teacher scheme (see later) and the London Commissioner's Teachers (DfES, 2003). The latter consist of a small group of experienced ASTs who may be placed to work in London's most challenging schools.

Support staff

The label 'support staff' includes all those people who undertake paid employment in schools, other than teachers and heads. Blatchford et al (2006) have researched the impact of support staff and categorised them into seven groups:

1. TA equivalent (TA, LSA (SEN pupils), nursery nurse, therapist)
2. Pupil welfare (Connexions personal advisor, education welfare officer, home-school liaison officer, learning mentor, nurse and welfare assistant)
3. Technical and specialist staff (ICT network manager, ICT technician, librarian, science technician and technology technician)
4. Other pupil support (bilingual support officer, cover supervisor, escort, exam invigilator, language assistant, midday assistant and midday supervisor)
5. Facilities staff (cleaner, cook, and other catering staff)
6. Administrative staff (administrator/clerk, bursar, finance officer, office manager, secretary, attendance officer, data manager, examination officer, and PA to the headteacher)
7. Site staff (caretaker and premises manager).

Greater flexibility in school budgets and local management of schools (LMS) has meant the number and range of support staff working in schools has increased considerably over the last decade. The growth in the number of full time equivalent support staff has outmatched the increase in teachers across the country. The total number of full time equivalent support staff reached 305,500 in 2007: there were 162,900 teaching assistants; 65,900 administrative staff; 23,600 technicians; and 53,000 'other' support staff (DfES, 2007a). Increases have occurred in both the number and type of responsibility and there is no reason to assume such growth in support staff will not equally be reflected in London's schools. For instance, 60 per cent of the workforce at Kemnal Manor, a specialist technology college for boys in Bromley, are support staff against a national average for secondary schools of approximately 24 per cent. This shift in staffing profile (including cover supervisors, lunchtime/breaktime supervisors, life style managers and administrative staff) has enabled teachers to focus more in the classroom on teaching and learning (www.remodelling.gov.uk).

It is, however, interesting to consider the figures for Higher Level Teaching Assistants (HLTAs), a new form of support staff which has developed partly as a consequence of the government's remodelling agenda. The number of HLTAs in London is fewer than in other government regions but it is not clear why this is the case. Looked at as a proportion of the number of local authority pupils, the density is 0.67 in the capital, compared to 1.9 in the North-East and 1.42 in the country as a whole (DfES, 2007a). The role of the teacher unions, possibly stronger in London than in other parts of the country, who are largely against non-teachers covering for absent teachers, may offer a partial explanation for this relatively low uptake in HLTAs.

School workforce issues

The above 'facts and figures' especially those concerning the greater use of overseas trained and supply teachers, the number of unqualified teachers, their limited experience and their teaching in non-specialist areas present their own set of challenges to London schools. In this section we consider a number of workforce issues which apply particularly to London schools, including a) recruitment and retention and b) the workplace, wellbeing and morale. We begin with an area that has always presented challenges for some London schools – obtaining staff and keeping them!

Recruitment and retention

London suffers the most in terms of teacher shortages and although the number of vacant teacher posts has fallen recently there are about twice as many temporary posts in London than nationally. Even when vacancies are filled, Ofsted has found that staff are significantly less likely to be specialists in the subjects they teach in London than is found across the country (HMI, 2003).

Teacher retention and turnover remains an issue for many London schools, especially those facing challenging circumstances or under notice to improve. Tim Brighouse (in Bush, 2005: vii) vividly highlights the effects of variations in teacher turnover when he says:

This can mean that a youngster, during the course of a five-year stay from Year 7 to Year 11 in an average sized challenging school, encountering ten times as many new teachers as more fortunate colleagues in schools further up the pecking order.

Smithers and Robinson (2005: 5) state that the teaching profession is losing many of its members to 'unavoidable teacher loss due to retirement, change of profession, issues of salary, promotion and job security, etc', whilst the extent of teacher shortages in London means that some schools are 'losing 40 per cent of their teachers every year as more staff take early retirement. In one London primary school, the staff turnover was 200 per cent, meaning some teachers did not complete a year (2005: 5).

It is not uncommon in the most difficult to staff schools, for school pupils to start the school year with one set of staff and end it with another. As Brighouse notes, 'while some of the senior teachers and those in the management team may stay for a while, the remainder of their teaching staff are often "here today and gone tomorrow" ' (in Bush, 2005: vii).

The earlier research of Hutchings (1999) and her colleagues (Hutchings et al, 1999) into teacher supply and retention in London found that the main reasons for teachers leaving their current posts or the teaching profession, centred around three key factors: unruly pupil behaviour and ill-discipline; poor school leadership and management; and the demands of a heavy workload. Whilst efforts are being made to address the latter factors, through for example the remodelling agenda and the leadership strategy of the London Challenge (Earley and Weindling et al, 2005), the issue of pupil behaviour remains. It should not however be seen only as a London issue: in a survey of over 800 teachers, 99 per cent have dealt with disruptive pupils in class, and over a third have faced physical aggression. These frequent disruptions in the classroom have made over half of the respondents think about leaving teaching and 54 per cent know someone who has left teaching as a result of pupil behaviour (ATL, 2007). Schools with low attainment are often perceived to have behaviour challenges. Some teachers actively seek to work in these schools but many wish to avoid them.

The cost of housing continues to be a factor in the retention of teachers. Already by far the most expensive place to buy a house in Britain, between 2006 and 2007 house prices in London rose by another 16.3 per cent - the greatest leap in the UK. According to the Land Registry, an average home in the borough of Kensington and Chelsea cost £677,318 in 2006 - an increase of £95,000 on the previous year. In Hull, the average home costs £84,700 (Frankel, 2007).

Attempts to help teachers afford to live in the capital have been successful but demand is high and further resources needed. The key worker living programme was introduced in 2004, and helped almost 5,000 teachers by giving interest-free loans of up to £100,000, although the more typical loan was £50,000. Between 2004-06, the scheme was allocated £725 million, a lot more than the £400 million ring-fenced for 2006-2008. The Open Market HomeBuy scheme enables people to buy 75 per cent of a property, with an equity loan from the government and a lender covering the rest of the cost. The shared ownership schemes allow teachers to own a minimum 35 per cent share in a property while paying subsidised rent on the rest. On a salary of £29,000, a Hackney teacher was able to buy half a new one-bedroom flat in Clacton for £105,000. She pays £330 a month in rent to the housing association and £500 a month in mortgage repayments (ibid).

School leadership turnover is an issue too – the pool of potential leaders is diminished because many teachers do not stay in London in the long term. The DfES/NCSL are targeting London leaders through such schemes as ‘Future Leaders’, which currently is only found in London secondary schools. Teachers on this scheme are supported for two years: after spending a year in a residency school they are expected to secure a senior leader post in a ‘complex urban school’ and become a headteacher of such a school within four years (NCSL, 2006).

Another issue concerning the leadership of London schools and which is related to staff recruitment and retention is the rapid promotion that individuals can achieve. Some teachers have been asked to take on major responsibilities at a very early stage in their careers: for example, a secondary teacher becoming head of a major department in only their second year and an NQT taking up responsibility for the co-ordination of staff development in their primary school. Is the increase in pay and status worth the stress and risk of burn out placed on individuals with such limited experience? The effects on London schools of such young inexperienced people taking on such key posts is not known, although Ofsted’s recent report on London is very positive about recent improvements made both in terms of school performance and school leadership (Ofsted, 2006).

Workplace, wellbeing and morale

The workplace and staff wellbeing and morale are vital to retention. Cockburn and Haydn (2004) remind us of the ‘soft’ factors which can be influential in retaining people: ‘friendly colleagues’, ‘pleasant surroundings’, ‘intellectual challenge’, ‘freedom’, ‘scope for creativity’ and ‘room for initiative’. A series of surveys of London teachers commissioned by the London Challenge suggest that teachers feel positive about their work and their workplace with almost two-thirds recommending their school to their friends or their children (DfES, 2004). However, the same research found that less than half of the teachers reported that teacher morale was high. Factors influencing the choice of London school in which to work were varied but included good working conditions, travel to work distance, and being in a location that enables teachers to meet family (own children and schooling) responsibilities. Factors that may be important but are rarely noted include commuting and safety in travelling to/from

school (the fear factor), the availability of parking and of course the Congestion Charge which cost £8 a day in 2007.

The study of the views of London teachers and students, conducted by the NFER for the London Challenge (Wilson et al, 2007) provides a very positive picture of London teachers' morale and motivation. However, on closer examination of their response rates it is not clear how many of their survey respondents were from challenging schools. Schools in challenging circumstances and under pressure to improve very often give completing questionnaires a low priority!

The Institute of Public Policy Research (ippr) report for the DfES (2005) – a small scale qualitative study of teachers working in challenging schools in and outside of London - refers to 'push and pull' factors with regard to what motivates teachers to work in particular schools and these are summarised below:

- Good leadership and a strong, supportive senior leadership
- Support for learning and development, teaching assistants (TAs), learning mentors, etc
- Effective systems for dealing with poor behaviour
- Support at the school level for teachers to learn how to deal with difficult behaviour
- Good atmosphere and supportive colleagues
- Opportunities for professional dialogue
- Teamworking and good departments
- Good working conditions, the physical state of the school, and resources (staff and equipment)
- Additional classroom support
- Class size
- Opportunities for professional development.

The ippr study for the DfES also pointed to the importance of good pay for motivation and morale, noting that teachers in London were least likely to feel positively about their pay and perceived increases in future salary and responsibility.

Pay and budgets are very important and people may require incentives to work in the most difficult schools. Working in challenging schools, of which London has many, is very demanding and requires stamina and resilience, more so than in other schools. The VITAE report found that teachers in challenging schools were more likely to experience greater challenges to their health, wellbeing, and thus resilience, than those who work in relatively more advantaged schools (Day et al, 2006). While commitment levels did not differ, the consequences for personal health certainly did: in more disadvantaged secondary schools, 63 per cent of teachers reported ill health compared to 42 per cent in more advantaged areas (Stobart, 2007).

Moynihan (2007) has argued the need for government deregulation of teacher salaries and a funding regime that is more closely targeted to the needs of the school. Such changes, he suggests, would give school leaders the flexibility they need to ensure that the most difficult schools to teach in had the most capable teachers and leaders. However, Bush (2005) is adamant that increasing pay would not resolve the problems associated with teaching in the most difficult schools, arguing that 'teachers' pay has risen significantly and schools already have the flexibility to use additional pay as a recruitment incentive' (2005: xiii). For her, teachers' terms and conditions are just as important as pay yet 'the demand for

“accountability” puts teachers in more challenging schools under a difficult amount of pressure’ (ibid).

School staff want to feel valued and appreciate clear investments in training and development. However, the ippr research found that teachers within London were less satisfied that their professional development and career progression needs were being met than were those teachers working in challenging schools outside of London. The Training and Development Agency (TDA) defines staff development as ‘reflective activity designed to improve an individual’s attributes, knowledge, understanding and skills. It supports individual needs and improves professional practice’ (2007). But for us staff development is:

an on-going process encompassing all formal and informal learning experiences that enable all staff in schools, individually and with others, to think about what they are doing, enhance their knowledge and skills and improve ways of working so that pupil learning and wellbeing is enhanced as a result. It should achieve a balance between individual, group, school and national needs; encourage a commitment to professional and personal growth; and increase resilience, self-confidence, job satisfaction and enthusiasm for working with children and colleagues (Bubb and Earley, 2007).

It is about creating opportunities for adult learning – and not just teachers, which is why we prefer not use the term ‘professional’ - ultimately for the purpose of enhancing the quality of education in the classroom.

Vivienne Porritt has been working as the CPD consultant for London Challenge and helped school practitioners in London’s local authorities to work together to develop *London’s Learning*, a CD Rom and web-based resource and community about staff learning at www.cpd.lgfl.net. The training and development cycle consists of six stages. The first two stages are the identification of needs and their analysis, taking into account what people already know and can do. The next challenge is to find the best way to meet needs: the range of activities is huge. The final stages in the cycle - monitoring and evaluating the impact of development and training - are neglected areas. Monitoring is concerned with checking progress, seeing that things are going according to plan and making alterations if necessary. Gauging the impact or evaluating its effectiveness on teaching and learning - the sixth and last stage in the staff development cycle - is more difficult but vital to staff in London schools. The Chartered London Teacher initiative provides a helpful framework for teachers’ professional development.

Chartered London Teacher status

Chartered London Teacher (CLT) status is a unique scheme which London Challenge set up in September 2004 to recognise and reward teachers’ achievements and provide a framework for professional development. As well as having the prestige of being a Chartered London Teacher for life, when people obtain the award they get a one-off payment of £1,000 from the school budget and Fellowship of the College of Teachers, the body that manages the registration and award process.

Achieving CLT status takes at least two years after registration. People have to have taught in London for at least four years and be on the upper, advanced skills teacher or leadership pay scales by the time they get the award. They have to show how their knowledge, skills and expertise have a positive impact on teaching and learning across the 12 CLT standards and complete a Professional Reflection. Diversity, communities and cultures are important

issues for urban teachers, so for instance, Standard 10 requires them to 'Build on, extend and apply knowledge of the range of communities, cultures and sub-cultures in London, to inform and promote individual pupils' learning' (DfES, 2007b). The CLT Professional Reflection requires reflection on a specific activity or piece of work carried out or led by the teacher, which makes a difference, in that it contributes to improved teaching and learning.

Because teachers work towards CLT as part of their day to day work and through their schools' performance management and professional development arrangements, the scheme has captured the interest of many. The numbers registered rose from 5,000 in July 2005 to 10,000 in February 2006 to 38,000 six weeks later, at the end of March 2006. By the end of July 2007, there were 38,800 people registered and 188 had gained the status. Thus, two out of three London teachers are registered for CLT: this is three-quarters of secondary, two-thirds of special school and one-half of primary teachers. Some boroughs have embraced CLT more than others. Four out of every five teachers are registered in Bromley, Harrow, Richmond and Kingston but in Westminster and Waltham Forest the proportion is only one in three (Bubb and Porritt, 2006).

The scheme has also the backing of unions, because as Mary Bousted says:

ATL welcomes the Chartered London Teacher status, as we are in favour of any move which will assist the recruitment and retention of teachers in London. This will be especially important in the decade to come, as London will be one of the very few areas of the country to experience rising school rolls. (Bousted, 2004)

The scheme has the potential to change the culture of teaching and raise the bar of professionalism. Working towards CLT status will help teachers to be more effective in two ways. Firstly, the CLT standards require teachers to be highly effective in key areas that link to the government's priorities, such as cultural diversity, personalised learning, student voice, improving behaviour and the Every Child Matters agenda. Secondly, there will be a substantial pool of teachers with the status who can support the development of others, and so reduce variation in the quality of teaching and learning within and between schools in London.

CLT has the potential to be both a conduit and driver for knowledge transfer, particularly around the standards relating to diversity, communities and cultures. London teachers will have more incentive to work together on projects that impact on standards: learning from each other through observation and coaching as well as evaluating the impact of professional development. A virtual learning environment has been set up at www.lcll.org.uk to help. Although CLT is a status and not a qualification, working towards it will be an incentive for teachers to gain further qualifications. For instance, teachers whose PGCE carries M level credits will find that completing a Masters fits in well with CLT.

The unique feature of CLT is its potential to unify the profession in that it is for all sorts of London's teachers, so in many schools newly qualified, experienced teachers and headteachers are now working to achieve the same standards. CLT sits within the standards framework so it is a universal career development option for London. It is also a way of building a coherent approach to an individual teacher's professional development and needs to be integrated with a school's process of professional review. This will help teachers to develop and demonstrate the skills needed to meet the 12 CLT standards and is a powerful way to link career and professional development to professional review and school improvement.

In many London schools all the teachers are registered so the CLT standards and structure are becoming fundamental to professional development, collaboration and aid the development of professional learning communities. CLT status not only offers opportunities for individual teachers but also schools, clusters of schools and local authorities so can be the umbrella that brings all the many organisations and networks together to create a shared picture of effective professional development, which meets the needs of teachers in schools. London Challenge has set up a wide range of physical and virtual networks:

- CLT e-community
- Local authority CPD Advisers
- Primary and Secondary Training School networks
- A CPD Partnership of strategic organisations such as the General Teaching Council, Training and Development Agency, Specialist Schools and Academies Trust and the National Strategies
- London Science Challenge and London Maths Challenge
- Leading London's Learning, a pan London CPD Leaders group
- London Gifted and Talented networks
- AST network.

This infrastructure has been built over the last few years in London so that the many pieces of the CPD jigsaw become more joined up and that, by working together, each can achieve more than the sum of the parts. However, building the infrastructure does not mean that exchange of practice and learning across London will happen. Indeed, there is some anecdotal evidence that some schools are not sufficiently encouraging teachers once registered on CLT to work towards achieving the status. There is much for these CPD networks to achieve to maximise the impact of professional development to bring about the changes inherent in the current landscape and to achieve further improvement (Bubb and Porritt, 2006).

The scheme is well-placed to take forward the notion of New Professionalism. It will be a missed opportunity if London schools do not take full advantage of CLT and the other initiatives noted above. The new performance management guidelines and professional standards for different stages of a teacher's career should be levers for - and be driven by - CLT. Key messages can be given about the importance of linking professional development with performance management, self-evaluation and school improvement. The judgements of headteachers and performance reviewers will need to be robust as well as transparent, and the moderation of CLT standards will drive more discussion about the quality of teaching within and across schools.

The chance to achieve CLT status hopefully will encourage teachers to start their career in London state schools (the percentage dropped from 18.3% in 1998-9 to 13.6% in 2002-3 [Bubb and Porritt, 2006]). It should also encourage the one in ten teachers in London who are not qualified to gain qualified teacher status, and so improve the quality of teaching in shortage subjects. The opportunity of CLT status will be an incentive to stay in London state schools because achieving it takes from two to about six years and carries with it a one-off payment of £1,000. But most of all, CLT status needs to be something worth working towards and achieving; that recognises the achievement of teachers succeeding against the odds and raises esteem. Building and maintaining the prestige of CLT will be vital over the next few years.

Conclusion and recommendations

The most important factor in raising levels of attainment in schools facing challenging circumstances is a high quality, stable workforce, backed up by good leaders. (DfES, 2005: 8)

This chapter has examined a number of key issues affecting London schools and those who work in them. The policy recommendations which follow centre on this school workforce – London’s human resource - and its management and development.

Human resource management

We recommend that:

- there is a funding regime which is more closely targeted to the needs of the school and greater flexibility of budgets to enable higher pay for staff willing to work in urban complex schools and those facing challenging circumstances;
- more efforts be made to help staff afford to live and work in the capital, through subsidised housing and public transport;
- there is greater recognition of the ‘push and pull’ factors in staff recruitment and retention, especially issues around the quality of school leadership and management, student behaviour and staff wellbeing (stress, workload, resilience);
- there is more recognition of the fact that individuals’ performance is under much greater scrutiny in schools in challenging circumstances and under ‘notice to improve’;
- factors leading to low staff morale and job satisfaction, such as lack of support and recognition, inadequate resources, need addressing.

Human resource development

We recommend that:

- the range of training and development is developed to ensure it meets the needs of all members of the school workforce;
- all staff are included within performance management systems and have access to individualised CPD;
- support networks, both formal and informal, are developed (e.g. time to work with colleagues, specific support for dealing with behaviour issues);
- new and established school leaders have effective training;
- Advanced Skills Teachers are deployed more strategically and have access to better support and professional development to maximise their effectiveness. Coordination at local authority level needs to be improved but also a London-wide system of sharing information and for deploying ASTs across boroughs would be beneficial at many levels;
- overseas trained teachers should be encouraged to gain QTS as soon as possible and have access to professional development based on an accurate analysis of their strengths and needs. Other members of the school community should be able to benefit from their strengths, experiences and knowledge;
- the potential value of achieving CLT status should be promoted and having enrolled their staff schools should be encouraged to help teachers achieve it;
- all schools in London should be encouraged to take part in initial teacher training in recognition of the benefits it gives.

Members of the school workforce in London, especially those working in our most challenging schools, should be given the highest respect and rewarded accordingly. There is

a need to revisit and reappraise existing policies aimed at recruiting and retaining high quality staff in London's schools. There needs to be greater recognition of the fact that a school is only as good as the quality of its workforce but especially its teachers. London has often been seen as the best place to work and some teachers make a positive decision to work in challenging inner-city schools. For the benefit of London's children we need to ensure however that teaching in London remains an attractive and appealing option for our most able staff.

References

Association of Teachers and Lecturers (2007) 'Bad behaviour by pupils is rampant and teachers are voting with their feet – ATL survey', Press release, April 2007 (see ATL website).

Barlin, D and Hallgarten, J (2001) *Supply Teachers: Symptom of the Problems or Part of the Solution*, London: Institute of Public Policy Research.

Blatchford, P, Bassett, P, Brown, P, Martin, C, Russell, A, Webster R, and Haywood, N (2006) *The Deployment and Impact of Support Staff in Schools*, RR776. London: DfES.

Bousted, M (2004) Comment on E-politix *Forum Brief: Teachers' Pay*.
<http://www.epolitix.com/EN/ForumBriefs/200403/365b0d76-3993-4565-a97e-0ef61d0c388b.htm>

Bubb, S and Earley, P (2007) *Leading and Managing Continuing Professional Development: Developing people, developing schools* (2nd edition). London: Sage.

Bubb, S and Porritt, V (2006) 'Recognising and Nurturing Urban Teachers: Chartered London Teacher Status', paper presented at BELMAS Conference, Aston, 6-8 October.

Bush, A (2005) *Choice and Equity in Teacher Supply*, London: Institute of Public Policy Research.

Cockburn, A and Haydn, T (2004) *Recruiting and Retaining Teachers: Understanding why teachers teach*, London, RoutledgeFalmer.

Day, C, Stobart, G, Sammons, P, Kington, A, Gu, Q and Mujtaba, T (2006) *Variations in Teachers' Work, Lives and Effectiveness*, RR 743, London: DfES.

Department for Education and Skills (2003) *The London Challenge: Transforming London Secondary Schools*. London: DfES.

Department for Education and Skills (2004) *London Challenge: Survey of pupils and teachers*. Research Report 643, London: DfES.

Department for Education and Skills (2005) *Why Here? Report of the Qualitative work with teachers working in schools above and below floor targets*, Research Report 666, London: DfES and ippr.

Department for Education and Skills (2006) *School workforce in England*, London: DfES.

Department for Education and Skills (2007a) *School Workforce in England*, London: DfES.

Department for Education and Skills (2007b) *Chartered London Teacher Guidance*. London: DfES.

Earley, P and Weindling, D with Bubb, S, Coleman, M, Crawford, M, Evans, J, Pocklington, K and Woodroffe, L (2005) *An evaluation of the Leadership Strategy of the London Challenge*, London: IoE.

Frankel, H (2007) 'Far from home', *Times Educational Supplement*, 4 May.

Greater London Authority (2005) *Statistics of Schools in London: Key Facts 2001-2005*. London: GLA.

Hargreaves, L, Cunningham, M, Hansen, A, McIntyre D, Oliver, C, and Pell, T (2007) *The status of teachers and the teaching profession: views from inside and outside the profession*. Research Report 831A. London: DfES.

Her Majesty's Inspectorate (2003) *Schools Use of Temporary Teachers*, London: Government Printing Office.

Hutchings, M., Menter, I., Ross, A. and Thomson, D. (1999) *Teacher Supply and Retention Project*, Institute for Policy Studies in Education, University of North London.

Hutchings, M. (1999), *Teacher Supply and Retention in London 1998-1999*, Teacher Training Agency, University of North London.

Hutchings, M, Maylor, U, Mendick, H, Menter, I and Smart, S (2005) *An evaluation of innovative approaches to teacher training on the Teach First programme*, London: IPSE.

Mayor of London (2006) *Black Teachers in London*, London: GLA.

McNamara, O, Lewis, S and Howson, J (2004) *The Recruitment of OTTs*, Birmingham: NASUWT.

Moynihan, D (2007) Headteachers can and do make a difference, in O'Shaughnessy, J (ed) *The Leadership Effect*, London: Policy Exchange.

NCSL (2006) *Future Leaders*, www.ncsl.org.uk.

Ofsted (2006) *Improvements in London schools 2000-06*, www.ofsted.gov.uk.

Preston, C and Danby, M (2005) *Who are the Supply Teachers?* London: MirandaNet & Select Education.

Smithers, A and Robinson, P (2005) *Teacher Turnover, Wastage and Movements between schools*, London: DfES.

Stobart, G (2007) *Teachers' Work, Lives and Effectiveness over Time – the VITAE project*, INSI Research Matters No. 30, London, IoE.

Taylor, C and Jennings, S (2004) *The Work of Advanced Skills Teachers*, Reading: CfBT.

Teacher Training Agency (2004) *Regional Report – ITT in London* (available on website).

Training and Development Agency for Schools (2007) *Continuing professional development: a strategy for teachers*, London: TDA.

Wilson, S, Benton, T, Scott, E and Kendall, L (2007) *London Challenge: Survey of Pupils and Teachers 2006*, RR 823, London: DfES.