PROFILES OF TEACHERS IN SELECTED CURRICULUM AREAS:

FURTHER ANALYSES OF THE *STAFF IN AUSTRALIA'S SCHOOLS 2013* SURVEY

Paul Weldon

Julie McMillan

Glenn Rowley

Phillip McKenzie

May 2014

This report was commissioned by the Australian Government Department of Education, (DoE). The assistance of Paul Hunt (DoE) and Martin Murphy (ACER) in preparing the report is gratefully acknowledged. The report is based on analyses of the data collected through the *Staff in Australia's Schools 2013* (SiAS) survey which DoE commissioned from ACER. The assistance of DoE, Advisory Committee members, ACER colleagues, school authorities and teacher and principal associations from around Australia in supporting the SiAS survey is gratefully acknowledged. Particular appreciation is due to the teachers and school leaders who completed the survey questionnaires. The views expressed in the report are those of the authors and not necessarily of DoE or any other individual or organisation.

ISBN 978-1-74361-923-0 [PDF]
ISBN 978-1-74361-924-7 [DOCX]

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACRONYMS

ABS	Australian Bureau of Statistics
ACER	Australian Council for Educational Research
AITSL	Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership
APST	Australian Professional Standards for Teachers
DoE	Department of Education
ESL	English as a Second Language
FTE	Full-time equivalent
IT	Information Technology
ITE	Initial Teacher Education
LOTE	Languages other than English
PL	Professional learning
SES	Socio-economic status
SiAS	*Staff in Australia's Schools* project
VET	Vocational Education and Training

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This report was commissioned by Australian Government Department of Education and uses data from the 2013 *Staff in Australia's Schools* (SiAS) survey to analyse the profiles of the teachers teaching in five selected curriculum areas in primary schools and 12 areas in secondary schools and to compare those data with earlier SiAS surveys. The areas were selected to help inform policy initiatives as well as concerns about teacher shortages in those areas and other related workforce issues.

The SiAS survey was conducted in Terms 2 and 3 of 2013 and achieved responses from 5,213 primary teachers and 10,349 secondary teachers Australia-wide. While the number of responding teachers across Australia was very substantial, the overall response rates (32.8% for primary teachers and 31.4% for secondary teachers) were lower than was intended. All possible steps were taken to examine and minimise the potential impact of non-response bias, and to carefully weight the data. Nevertheless, the results should be used with caution, particularly in those curriculum areas in which relatively few teachers are teaching.

Table 1 provides estimates of the proportions of teachers who reported teaching in the specified curriculum areas that are the focus of this report. With the exception of LOTE, primary specialist subjects excluded teachers who indicated that they were also generalist primary teachers. As such, these areas are not directly comparable with 2007 and 2010 figures.

Table 1: Proportion and number of teachers teaching in specified curriculum areas

Area	Proportion of all teachers who reported teaching in the area (%)	Estimated number of teachers teaching in the area
Primary specialist subjects		
Literacy	4.7	6,100
Numeracy	3.5	4,500
LOTE	3.9	5,000
Computing	2.1	2,700
Special Needs	2.8	3,600
Secondary		
English	19.9	25,400
LOTE	5.2	6,600
Mathematics	20.9	26,700
Biology	4.7	6,000
Chemistry	4.4	5,600
Physics	3.9	5,000
Science – General	14.5	18,500
Geography	8.8	11,200
History	12.6	16,100
Computing/IT	5.1	6,500
VET	9.6	12,300
Special Needs	6.2	7,900

MAIN FINDINGS

School Location, Sector and Socioeconomic Composition

Geographical location of the school

Primary: LOTE teachers share similar distribution characteristics with all primary teachers. Specialists in Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are proportionally more likely to be in metropolitan schools, and less likely to be in provincial areas.

Secondary: The distribution of all 12 areas is broadly similar to that of secondary teachers overall. Slightly lower proportions of teachers are teaching LOTE in provincial and remote schools than would be expected given the distribution of all secondary teachers, as was reported in 2007 and 2010.

School sector

Primary: The distribution of LOTE teachers in government primary schools is about 7 percentage points lower than for primary teachers as a whole, as was the case in 2010 and 2007. Independent primary schools have noticeably fewer Computing teachers, as was also noted in 2010.

Secondary: As noted in 2010, there are slightly fewer teachers of LOTE in government schools than teachers in other areas. The emphasis of government schools on VET continues to be evident, with 75% of those teaching VET being located in government schools, which is about 15 percentage points higher than for secondary teachers overall, a higher proportion than in 2010.

Socioeconomic composition of the school

Primary: Computing/IT was lower in low and high SES schools than the average, which was also the case in 2010. Literacy, LOTE and Special Needs were notably higher in low SES schools and lower in high SES schools.

Secondary: LOTE and VET stand out as areas in which the distribution of teachers currently working in the area is different to what would be expected from the distribution of secondary teachers overall, as was the case in 2010. The high SES group of schools has about 52% of those currently teaching LOTE which is about 15 percentage points higher than would otherwise be expected. VET teachers are largely concentrated in low and medium SES schools. There are relatively few VET teachers in high SES schools.

Demographic Characteristics

Teacher age

Primary: Teachers in specialist areas are about the same age as the average for primary teachers, with LOTE and Special Needs teachers being 3 and 2 years older, on average. There are notable fewer teacher of LOTE below age 35 (20%) compared to the average (33%).

Secondary: VET, Physics and Special Needs teachers are about 1-2 years older on average than teachers in the other areas and secondary teachers overall. Over 45% of teachers currently working in Special Needs are aged over 50 years (an increase of 5 percentage points from 2010), suggesting relatively strong future replacement demand as teachers retire.

Teacher gender

Primary: Overall about 20% of primary teachers are males. Very few primary LOTE teachers (6%) are male, as was the case in 2010 and 2007. Fewer special needs teachers are male (12%) compared to the average. While the average age for primary teachers is about the same (43), with the exception of LOTE, specialist teachers are older, on average, than their female counterparts (by 3-8 years).

Secondary: A much higher proportion of secondary teachers (42%) are males than primary teachers, and there are large gender differences according to the curriculum area in which teachers are teaching. Relatively low proportions of males are teaching in English, LOTE, Special Needs, and History, whereas in Mathematics, Chemistry, Physics, Computing/IT and VET, over half the teachers are males. These figures are similar to 2010. In all cases, male teachers are older than females and in most areas the there are proportionally fewer male teachers under 35 years.

Teachers' country of birth

The teacher workforce has a lower proportion who were born overseas (about 15% for primary teachers, and 19% for secondary teachers) than the Australian population as a whole (about 28%). At primary school level it is only LOTE teachers who have a markedly higher proportion (40%) born overseas, compared to other teachers (as was the case in 2010 and 2007). At secondary level about 36% of LOTE teachers were born overseas.

Teachers' self-assessment of their English language proficiency

The proportion of teachers who spoke a LOTE at home was 8.7% in primary schools and 10.9% in secondary schools, lower than for the Australian population as a whole (19% in 2011). Those teaching LOTE were the only specialists that were more likely to speak a language other than English at home (49.5% of LOTE primary teachers and 39.3% of LOTE secondary teachers).

The vast majority of teachers considered their proficiency to be 'very good' or 'good'; at most, 1.5% of LOTE teachers and fewer in other areas considered their proficiency to be 'satisfactory'..

Qualifications and Tertiary Study

Qualifications in Education

Primary: About 70% of primary teachers completed an undergraduate ITE program and 30% a graduate program. LOTE teachers are more likely to hold a graduate diploma (38%) than the average (25%). About 25% of literacy and numeracy specialists and 41% of Special Needs teachers have a Masters degree compared to an average of 10%. Computing/IT specialists are more likely to have a bachelor/honours degree (71%) than the average (58%).

Secondary: About 49% of secondary teachers completed an undergraduate ITE program and 51% a graduate program. Teachers in LOTE and the sciences were more likely to have completed a graduate program (60-70%). As in 2010, teachers in the sciences stand out as holding fewer bachelor/honours qualifications in Education than other teachers (presumably because they tend to hold Science degrees). A higher number of Special Needs teachers (23%) than average (13%) hold a Masters degree.

Qualifications in fields other than Education

Primary: About half of all primary teachers have no qualification in a field other than education (lower than was the case (70%) in 2010). Higher proportions of specialist teachers hold qualifications in fields other than Education than primary teachers overall, except in the case of Special Needs (where teachers tend to have higher-level qualifications in teaching, such as Masters degrees).

Secondary: As in 2010, those teaching in the Sciences are more likely to hold a bachelor/honours degree in a non-Education field, and those teaching VET or Special Needs are less likely to have a bachelor/honours degree in a non-Education field. Those teaching LOTE, Chemistry or Physics were more likely to have a Masters or Doctoral degree in a non-Education field.

Tertiary study in the curriculum area

Primary: Around two-thirds of LOTE teachers have studied the area for at least one semester at second year tertiary level or have trained at tertiary level in teaching methodology, fewer in the cases of Computing (52%) and Special Needs (57%). One-third or more of those currently teaching in these three areas appear to be teaching 'out-of-field'. In the case of Literacy and Numeracy the proportion of primary teachers who are notionally qualified in the terms used here is considerably higher (over 80%) and hence less than one-fifth of these teachers could be considered to be teaching out-of-field. These proportions are similar to 2010 figures.

Secondary: Over 80% of the secondary teachers teaching English, LOTE, Mathematics, Biology, Chemistry, Physics, and General Science have undertaken at least one semester at second year tertiary study in the area or training in teaching methodology in that field. There would appear to be relatively little out-of-field teaching in these areas. Other secondary areas in which relatively high proportions of the teachers are qualified as indicated by this measure are History (75%) and Computing/IT (69%). Areas in which lower proportions of teachers have undertaken at least one semester at second year tertiary study (and hence out-of-field teaching is likely to be higher) are Geography (60%), VET (35%) and Special Needs (40%).

The size of the potential 'reserve pool' in the specified secondary areas is relatively small. In general, most of the secondary teachers who are qualified in a given area are teaching in the area, and the other areas in which they are teaching are also often those reported to be experiencing shortages. For example, around 50% of the potential reserve pools of Chemistry, Physics and Computing/IT teachers are currently teaching Mathematics. These proportions are similar to those of 2010 and 2007.

Professional Learning Activities

Extent of participation in professional learning

The SiAS survey used a broad definition of professional learning (PL) and included formal and informal activities provided out-of-school and at school. Primary teachers indicated that they engaged in an average of 10 days PL in the past 12 months, and secondary teachers 8.2 days (a rise from 2010: 9 days for primary teachers and 7.6 days for secondary teachers).

Primary: As in 2010, teachers in Literacy (12), Numeracy (12.4) and Special Needs (13.7) reported higher participation in PL than primary teachers overall (10 days), while teachers in LOTE reported lower participation (8.8 days).

Secondary: LOTE (9), VET (9.4) and Special Needs (9.3) all reported more days of PL than the average (8.2). Those teaching in the sciences tended to report fewer days; about 7-7.5 on average.

Perceived benefits of professional learning

The main SiAS survey reported that the majority of teachers felt that the PL activities they had engaged in over the previous 12 months had been beneficial in improving their skills and knowledge, a similar pattern to the 2010 and 2007 surveys. PL questions in 2013 were revised to cover aspects of the teaching standards developed by AITSL in 2011 so results cannot be compared with earlier SiAS surveys.

Primary: LOTE teachers were more positive than the average about areas of *2. Know the content and how to teach it*, *3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning*, and *5. Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning*. Computing/IT teachers were also more positive about areas 2 and 3. Over 80% of Literacy and Numeracy teachers, and all specialist areas were higher than the average for the impact of *'Learning about resources available for my teaching areas'* for increasing capacity.

S*econdary*: Secondary teachers as a whole were less positive about the benefits of their PL than primary teachers, and secondary teachers in the Sciences were less positive than teachers in other areas, as was the case (albeit with different questions) in 2007 and 2010. The one area excepted from this was *'Making effective use of ICT'*, for which teachers in all areas recorded about the same impact as the average (about 65%). Teachers of English, LOTE, Geography and History were more positive about their PL in *2. Know the content and how to teach it*.

Perceived needs for professional learning

Primary: The areas of greatest need appear to be in *'Making effective use of ICT'* (51% indicated either a major or moderate need), *'Learning about resources available for my teaching areas'* (about 50%), and *'Dealing with difficult student behaviour'* (about 45%). There were few differences among the five curriculum areas in these perceived needs.

Secondary: The areas of greatest need among secondary teachers are: *'Making effective use of ICT'* (48.3%), *'Teaching students with a wide range of backgrounds and abilities'* (33.9%), *'Dealing with difficult student behaviour'* (30.7%) and *'Supporting students with disabilities'* (29.7%).

Employment Basis and Workload

Basis of employment

As noted in 2010, full-time employment is the most common time fraction for both primary teachers (73%) and secondary teachers (80%). Female teachers are much more likely to be employed part-time than are male teachers.

Primary: The proportion of full time teachers is about the same as that of primary teachers as a whole in all areas except Literacy and LOTE, of which about 60% are full time.

Secondary: As in 2010, in most areas there are higher proportions working full-time than among secondary teachers as a whole. The highest proportions (89-91%) are evident in Physics, Biology, Chemistry and Computing/IT. LOTE (72%) and Special Needs (73%) are the exceptions.

As in 2010, most teachers are employed on an on-going/permanent basis, and this is slightly more common among secondary (86%) than primary teachers (78%).

Workload

On average, full-time primary school teachers report that they spent 47.9 hours per week on all school-related activities, and secondary teachers an average of 47.6 hours per week, higher than 2010 figures but about the same as in 2007. Within this, full-time primary teachers reported an average of 23.8 hours per week of face-to-face teaching, and secondary teachers 19.6 hours; again, higher than in 2010 but similar to 2007 figures.

There are only small differences in the average number of hours reported by teachers in the various curriculum areas and secondary teachers overall.

Career Paths

Age started teaching

Primary and secondary teachers were about the same age (25-26 years) on average when they started teaching. There are only small differences in the average age at which teachers in the specified curriculum areas started teaching.

Teaching experience

On average, primary teachers had been teachers for 16.1 years and secondary teachers for 17.3 years, about the same as in 2010 (15.9 and 17.6 years respectively). With the exception of Numeracy, primary specialists tended to have more years' experience (about 18 years) than the average. There is greater variability in teaching experience among the teachers working the areas specified at secondary level. Teachers of Special Needs, Physics and Mathematics have slightly more teaching experience on average than other secondary teachers.

School sectors and locations worked in

On average, about 81% of teachers have worked in more than one school.

Primary: Results in this area were variable and considerably lower than was the case in 2010, with between 4-21% of teachers working in their first school. The 2013 primary sample for this report includes only those who are specialist teachers (not those who may also have a generalist role, as was previously the case), and the results are likely to be a reflection of the difference in sample.

Secondary: Teachers in the specified secondary areas were slightly more likely to be working in their first school than average (about 21%) except for Special Needs (14%), Physics (16%), and Chemistry (17%), which are lower than the average (18%).

Career Intentions

Intention to leave teaching

Around 5% of primary teachers and 8% of secondary teachers intend to leave teaching permanently prior to retirement, representing a small downward trend from 2007 and 2010. Around 58.5-63.5% of teachers indicated that they do not intend to leave teaching prior to retirement. However, about one-third of primary and secondary teachers were unsure about their intentions in this regard.

Primary: With the exception of Computing/IT, which was about the same as the average, fewer specialist teachers reported intending to leave teaching prior to retirement.

Secondary: Differences between fields in terms of those likely to leave teaching prior to retirement are fairly small and do not differ greatly from secondary teachers as a whole. The main issue of concern across all areas is the fact that about 30% of teachers are uncertain about whether they will continue in the profession.

Number of years teachers intend to keep working in schools

On average, primary teachers intend to continue working in schools for another 13.7 years and secondary teachers for another 13.0 years, slightly lower than the 2010 figure (14.7 years) and slightly higher than the 2007 figure (12 years). Secondary teachers intend to remain in schools for about 13 years, one year more than in 2010. Given the average age of teachers, this implies that most intend to continue to retirement in their mid to late 50s.

Primary: Teachers in the five specified areas intend to teach for about the same length of time than the average primary teacher, except Computing/IT, which was a bit lower (11.8 years).

Secondary: The average length of time that teachers intended to keep working in schools were much the same as for secondary teachers overall, ranging from 11.8 years for Physics teachers through to 15.3 years for English teachers.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview of the project

This report was commissioned by the Australian Government Department of Education (formerly the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations). It was designed to analyse the characteristics and profiles of the teachers teaching in selected learning (or curriculum) areas in primary and secondary schools. The intent was to use the data collected through the *Staff in Australia's Schools* 2013 (SiAS) project to provide a more detailed analysis of the teachers concerned than was provided in the main survey report (McKenzie et al., 2014).[1]

The SiAS project was designed to provide a detailed picture of the Australian teacher workforce, and to gather information to assist in future planning.

The main survey report concentrated on the primary and secondary teacher workforces as a whole. However, the factors that shape the teaching career and workforce issues are likely to differ somewhat across the various curriculum areas in which teachers work. The present report is intended to provide more detail on the teachers teaching in particular curriculum areas of current high priority, as well as a comparison with 2010 SiAS data.[2]

1.2 Curriculum areas examined in this report

The curriculum areas are those selected previously for the 2007 and 2010 profiles reports on the basis of continued concerns about current or prospective shortages of teachers working in those areas, as well as other related workforce issues.

There were five areas identified in primary schools, and 12 areas identified in secondary schools:

Primary schools: areas selected for the study
Literacy
Numeracy
Languages other than English (LOTE)
Computing
Special Needs

Secondary schools: areas selected for the study
English
Languages other than English (LOTE)
Mathematics
(Science): Biology; Chemistry; Physics; Science – General
Geography
History
Computing/Information Technology
Vocational Education and Training (VET)
Special Needs

[1] McKenzie, P., Weldon, P., Rowley, G., Murphy, M. & McMillan, J. (2014). *Staff in Australia's Schools 2013: Main Report on the Survey*. Melbourne: ACER. See [website details]
[2] Weldon, P., Rowley, G., Murphy, M. & McKenzie, P. (2011). *Profiles of Teachers in Selected Curriculum Areas: Further Analyses of the Staff in Australia's Schools 2010 Survey*. Melbourne: ACER. See [website details]

The objective was to use the SiAS 2013 data to provide a stronger information base to assist those responsible for ensuring that sufficient numbers of teachers qualified in these areas are working in schools.

The variables identified for analysis were a sub-set of those collected through the SiAS survey and which were judged most relevant to issues concerning teacher career paths and supply. Part of the focus was on the extent to which teachers working in the specified curriculum areas differed from teachers overall, and from each other. The variables identified for analysis were as follows:

- School characteristics (geographic location, sector, and socioeconomic status)
- Teacher demographic characteristics (age, gender, country of birth, and language spoken at home)
- Teacher qualifications and tertiary study
- Professional learning activities
- Teacher employment and workload
- Career paths and teaching experience
- Career intentions.

1.3 Background on the SiAS survey

This project involved further analyses of the SiAS 2013 dataset and did not involve the collection of any new data. Accordingly, this section provides a brief outline of the SiAS survey and the strengths it offers for this work, as well as some cautions in interpreting the results. Full details on the survey design, operations, and methodology are provided in McKenzie et al. (2014).[3]

SiAS was commissioned by the Australian Government Department of Education in December 2012. The survey was conducted by the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) and the work was supported by a representative Advisory Committee. The project used an online survey of samples of teachers and leaders from all States and Territories and all school sectors. The survey ran from May to August 2013.

The survey was structured around four populations: primary teachers; secondary teachers; primary leaders; and secondary leaders. 'Leaders' were defined as principals and deputy principals (or their equivalent terms in the various jurisdictions). The design meant that all eligible teachers within a stratum had an approximately equal probability of selection.

This particular report uses the data from just the teacher survey, and so the rest of this section concentrates on that part of SiAS 2013. The *Teacher* questionnaire is included as Appendix 1 in this report. Primary and secondary teachers completed the same questionnaire although there were some elements that applied to particular levels of schooling.

The sample design was a two-stage cluster design in which schools were selected and all teachers within the selected schools were invited to take part in the teacher survey. Replacement schools were allowed at the first stage of sampling.

For the 2013 survey, state governments were offered the option of increasing the sample size of their schools to enable appropriate estimates specifically within their jurisdiction (provided in a separate report). The Victorian government requested this option and so the sample size of Victorian

[3] McKenzie, P., Weldon, P., Rowley, G., Murphy, M. & McMillan, J. (2014). *Staff in Australia's Schools 2013: Main Report on the Survey*. Melbourne: ACER. See [website details]

government schools is considerably larger than would otherwise have been the case. Weighting ensures that Victorian results are not overrepresented in national estimates.

Special Schools were included in the sample frame in 2013. This differs from 2010 when Special Schools were excluded from the study. In order to facilitate comparisons with the 2010 data, the Special Needs category for 2013 in the tables in this report excludes teachers in Special Schools. Teachers in Special Schools are included in all other areas. Additional results pertaining to teachers in Special Schools are presented in Appendix 3.

Table 1.1 records the final school and teacher response rates for Australia. After excluding the responses from teachers where the within-school teacher response rate was less than 20%, 5213 primary teachers were classified as having responded (a within-school response rate of 46.4%) and 10,349 secondary teachers (46.7%). After multiplying together the school and within-school response rates, Table 1.1 shows that the final response rates were 32.8% for primary teachers and 31.4% for secondary teachers. The final response rate for primary teachers in 2013 was slightly lower than in 2010 (but higher than in 2007), while the final response rate in 2013 for secondary teachers was slightly lower than in the two previous SiAS cycles.

Table 1.1: Final school and teacher response rates for Australia, primary and secondary

	Number of schools sampled	Number of schools responded	School response rate	Number of teachers sampled	Number of teachers responded	Within-school teacher response rate	Final teacher response rate
Primary	876	619	70.7%	11,225	5,213	46.4%	**32.8%**
Secondary	760	511	67.2%	22,173	10,349	46.7%	**31.4%**

Weighting was used to ensure that the resulting data reflect the design of the sample. Weighting adjustments were made to account for the numeric effects of non-response and the proportional effect of differential non-response across known populations. However, weighting does not remove the potential for non-response bias. Section 1.5 below discusses the issues that need to be taken into account in interpreting the data.

1.4 The proportion of teachers in the specified curriculum areas

The survey asked teachers to indicate the curriculum areas and levels of schooling in which they were teaching (see Appendix 1, questions 23-29). Overall 84.9% of primary teachers reported that they are general classroom teachers (McKenzie et al., 2014).[4]

The five specialist areas at primary level which are the focus of this report – literacy, numeracy, LOTE, Computing/IT, and Special Needs – were among the areas classified as "primary - specialist teaching" in the questionnaire. Of course, all primary teachers engaged in general classroom teaching would be teaching literacy and numeracy as part of their general classes. The intent here was to identify those primary teachers who had specialist teaching responsibilities over and above their general classes, or instead of general classroom teaching. The relevant questions in the survey (26 and 27a) specifically indicated this intention, however the response in 2013 suggests that this instruction

[4] McKenzie, P., Weldon, P., Rowley, G., Murphy, M. & McMillan, J. (2014). *Staff in Australia's Schools 2013: Main Report on the Survey*. Melbourne: ACER. See [website details]

may not have been well understood: 40% of primary teachers indicated that they currently taught literacy as a subject specialist and 35.4% that they currently taught numeracy as a specialist subject. The majority of these respondents also indicated that they were generalist teachers. Some generalist teachers do have a dual role as a specialist teacher, however the high response rates suggest that a high proportion of general classroom teachers who do not have a specialist role are included. For this reason, only respondents who have indicated that they are not general classroom teachers have been included in the primary specialist areas of literacy, numeracy, Computing/IT, and Special Needs.

As these primary specialist subject areas in 2007 and 2010 did include some specialists who indicated that they were also general classroom teachers, proportions of reported specialists are higher in the previous reports. Some caution needs to be exercised when making comparisons between surveys regarding primary specialists because the reference group in 2013 is likely to be slightly narrower than has been the case previously, and this difference is noted below each of the tables. Most of the results presented in this report contain proportions that appear to be comparable across the surveys. Where they do differ, such as for example in proportions working full time (see chapter 6), this may be due to the exclusion of some primary teachers with a dual role rather than a change in the behaviour of the cohort.

Results pertaining to primary teachers teaching LOTE include general classroom teachers who indicated they were currently teaching LOTE as these numbers were low and comparable to the previous SiAS surveys. As Table 1.2 indicates, 4.7% of primary teachers reported that they had specialist teaching responsibilities in Literacy, 3.9% in LOTE, 3.5% in Numeracy, 2.8% in Special Needs, and 2.1% in Computing. Literacy was the most frequently reported area of specialist teaching at primary level as was the case in 2007 and 2010 (see Table 5.19 of the Main Report for a fuller listing of specialist areas). The proportion of primary teachers who reported teaching in the area of LOTE increased 1.6 percentage points between 2010 and 2013.

Table 1.2: Primary teachers: proportions teaching in specified curriculum areas

	Proportion of all primary teachers who reported teaching in the area (weighted) %			N (survey respondents: unweighted)		
Currently teaching in area:	**2013**	**2010**	**2007**	**2013**	**2010**	**2007**
Literacy	4.7	8.8	14.5	171	395	738
Numeracy	3.5	7.4	12.5	122	296	621
LOTE	3.9	2.3	2.6	192	123	168
Computing (/IT 2013)	2.1	6.1	9.9	69	214	509
Special Needs	2.8	5.5	n/a	106	247	n/a

Note: The proportion of the primary teacher sample who reported teaching in a specialist area in 2013 includes only those teachers who said they are not currently generalists: those who indicated that they are both generalist and specialist teachers are not included in these figures, with the exception of LOTE. LOTE figures include all teachers who indicated that they are 'currently teaching' a LOTE. The 2013 sample of the teaching population included teachers in Special Schools, which were included in 2007 but not in 2010. The 'Special Needs' 2013 proportions exclude teachers in Special Schools. They are included in all other areas. The areas of 'computing' and 'IT' were separated for the primary level in 2013 (IT was not included as a separate area in 2010). As with secondary in 2007 and 2010, the 2013 primary area includes computing and IT as one variable.

The actual (unweighted) number of survey forms returned by primary teachers currently teaching in many specialist areas was quite small, especially in Computing/IT (69), Special Needs (106), and Numeracy (122). This means that particular care is needed in interpreting the primary data on these curriculum areas that is reported later in the report. It also means that it is not possible to provide all of the cross-tabulations provided in the main SiAS report (which discussed all teachers) as the cell sizes would be too small when examining individual learning areas.

Comparisons are made throughout the report between primary teachers teaching in these five areas and "all primary teachers". The large majority of "all primary teachers" are in fact involved in "general classroom teaching" (84.9%). In effect, therefore, the comparisons that are made in this report between teachers in the specialist primary areas and all primary teachers can be interpreted as comparing the specialists with general classroom teachers.

Of the five primary specialist areas included in this report, the largest (unweighted) number of survey forms was returned by those teaching in the area of LOTE (192). As Table 1.3 indicates, these include 102 generalist primary teachers who were teaching LOTE (2.1% of primary teachers, weighted), 65 specialist primary teachers who were teaching LOTE (1.1% of primary teachers, weighted), and a further 25 teachers who did not indicate whether they were general primary teachers but did indicate that they were teaching LOTE (0.7% of primary teachers, weighted). Appendix 2 provides more details on LOTE teachers in primary schools.

Table 1.3: Primary teachers: proportions teaching LOTE

Primary LOTE teachers	Weighted % of primary teachers	N (survey respondents: unweighted)
Specialist currently teaching LOTE	1.1	65
Generalist currently teaching LOTE	2.1	102
Unknown and currently teaching LOTE	0.7	25
Total	*3.9*	*192*

Note: 'Specialist LOTE teachers' here includes individual respondents only as an aggregate total: in the main report, respondents who indicated more than one language have been counted twice (Table 5.19, specialists currently teaching LOTE: 1.3%).

The survey also asked secondary teachers to indicate the specialist areas in which they were currently teaching. Given the nature of secondary schooling, secondary teachers were provided with a much larger number of specialist areas (39) from which to choose. For this report, 12 specialist areas were the focus at secondary level, and these are listed in Table 1.4.[5]

The table includes the largest areas of teaching at secondary school level: Mathematics (20.9% of secondary teachers reported they were teaching in this area in 2013), English (19.9%), Science-General (14.5%), and History (12.6%). It also includes some of the smallest areas of teaching: Special Needs (6.2%), LOTE (5.2%), Computing/IT (5.1%), Biology (4.7%), Chemistry (4.4%), and Physics (3.9%). The relatively small proportion of teachers working in the latter areas indicates that caution is needed in interpreting their results throughout the report. Appendix 3 includes information on LOTE teachers in secondary schools.

Table 1.4: Secondary teachers: proportions currently teaching in specified curriculum areas

	Proportion of all secondary teachers who reported teaching in the area (weighted) %			N (survey respondents: unweighted)		
Currently teaching in area:	**2013**	**2010**	**2007**	**2013**	**2010**	**2007**
English	19.9	23.7	19.9	2022	2622	1094
LOTE	5.2	5.5	4.7	524	613	281
Mathematics	20.9	24.9	20.5	2021	2649	1155
Biology	4.7	8.3	6.4	453	908	344
Chemistry	4.4	7.5	5.7	406	814	309
Physics	3.9	6.7	5.5	367	730	284
Science – General	14.5	17.6	14.2	1287	1922	803

[5] Computing and Information Technology were listed as separate areas in the questionnaire, but they have been combined for the purposes of this report.

Geography	8.8	12.1	8.4	759	1157	434
History	12.6	15.4	11.2	1165	1494	570
Computing/IT	5.1	10.5	9.1	452	1086	505
VET	9.6	6.7	6.3	874	723	306
Special Needs	6.2	4.8	n/a	618	514	n/a

Note: The 2013 sample of the teaching population included teachers in Special Schools, which were included in 2007 but not in 2010. The 'Special Needs' 2013 proportion excludes teachers in Special Schools. They are included in all other areas. 'LOTE teachers' here includes individual respondents only as an aggregate total: in the main report, respondents who indicated more than one language have been counted twice (Table 5.22, total currently teaching LOTE: 6.0%).

1.5 Reporting and interpreting the survey data

While the number of responding teachers across Australia is very substantial, the overall response rates of 32.8% for primary teachers and 31.4% for secondary teachers are lower than was intended. Relatively low response rates were evident at both stages of the sample design: (1) when schools were invited to take part (70.7% of primary schools and 67.2% of secondary schools in the teacher survey responded with valid teacher lists); and (2) when teachers were sampled within schools (46.4% of sampled primary teachers responded and 46.7% of sampled secondary teachers) (Table 1.1). The response rates also varied by state and territory, and school sector.

Statistics computed on the SiAS teacher sample provide accurate accounts of the sample to which they refer. But they can only provide *estimates* of what the summary statistics would be if we had data from the complete population. These estimates can never be perfectly precise, and the degree of imprecision they contain is captured by a statistic known as the *standard error* (SE). The SEs are reported in the same unit of measurement as the variable concerned. For example, Table 3.3 reports the proportions of female teachers in percentages and so the SEs in that table are also percentages.

If we were to draw several samples from the same population, using the same procedures and the same sampling frame, any statistic that we calculate (whether it be a percentage, a mean, or some other statistic) would vary a little from sample to sample. At the centre of the distribution would be the population value; surrounding it would be a number of sample estimates. If we were able to take hundreds (or even thousands) of repeated samples, we could calculate the standard deviation of those sample estimates with precision. The standard deviation of estimates that would be obtained by taking repeated samples in the same way is known as the *standard error*. It captures the amount of variation that we would expect to find among similarly-designed samples. In general, the sample estimate would be within one standard error of the population value *more often than not* (precisely, with probability 0.68). *Almost all* sample estimates would be within 1.96 standard errors of the population value (precisely, with probability 0.95).

Consequently, knowledge of standard errors enables us to construct confidence intervals around any reported statistic. A 95% confidence interval would extend from 1.96 standard errors below the sample value to 1.96 standard errors above the sample value, and would enable us to say that the population value is *almost certainly* (i.e. with 95% probability) within that range. A 68% confidence interval would extend from 1 standard error below the sample value to 1 standard error above the sample value, and would enable us to say that the population value is *more likely than not* (68% probability) within the range. Although 95% confidence intervals are more commonly used, we should be aware that they span a very wide range in order to capture the population value with a high degree of certainty.

For example, it will be reported in Table 3.7 that 83.6% of primary Literacy specialist teachers were born in Australia. The standard error of this statistic is 5.5%. It follows, then, that there would be a 68% probability that the actual value lies within 1 standard error of 83.6% (i.e. between 78.1% and 89.1%) and a 95% probability that the actual value lies within 1.96 standard errors of 83.6% (i.e.

between 72.8% and 94.4%). The 95% confidence interval locates the population value with a high degree of confidence, but within a very wide range. The 68% confidence interval locates where the population value probably lies, but with less confidence.

For the data reported here, the issue is compounded by the fact that the subgroups being reported are in some cases quite small. Among secondary teachers, the actual sample sizes range from 367 (for those currently teaching Physics) to 2022 (currently teaching English), which would, in general, yield estimates of reasonable precision. However, for primary teachers, the sample sizes range from 69 (specialist teachers of Computing/IT) to 192 (teachers of LOTE), reflecting the fact that the large majority of primary teachers are general classroom teachers. Standard errors and therefore confidence intervals are considerably larger for the primary specialist subject groups than for the secondary subject teacher groups.

Particular caution needs to be exercised in interpreting small percentages. A simple example can be used to illustrate why this is so. Suppose that one person in 100 has a particular characteristic – say, for example, susceptibility to a relatively rare disease. In randomly-chosen samples of 100 persons, you might expect to find, on average, one susceptible person. But you will not find one in each sample – many samples will fail to find even one, and some may find two or (rarely) three. If a sample of 100 includes no susceptible persons, we cannot conclude that there are none in the population – there may be 1, 2 or even 3%. In terms of standard errors, we might find a sample estimate of 0, 1 or perhaps 2%, with a standard error of 1 or 2%. Clearly the sample estimate tells us that the percentage is very small, but it does not estimate the percentage with precision.

Situations like this occur frequently in the chapters that follow, particularly with the primary teacher subject groups. In Table 2.1, for example, it is estimated that 3.0% of primary Computing/IT teachers are located in remote areas. But the estimate is based on a sample of just 69 primary Computing/IT teachers, and the standard error of this estimate is 2.0%. What the survey tells us is that the percentage of Computing/IT teachers located in remote areas is very small (which would have been anticipated); it does not (and cannot) give an accurate fix on the actual number.

2. SCHOOL LOCATION AND SECTOR

This section analyses the distribution of the teachers currently teaching in the specified curriculum areas according to the geographic location of the school where they are working, the sector of schooling concerned (government, Catholic, and independent), and the socio-economic composition of the area served by the school. Such data can indicate the extent to which the demand for particular types of teachers is likely to vary by school type, as well as whether certain types of school are less likely to offer particular curriculum areas. The latter would raise questions about the extent to which such schools have difficulty in recruiting teachers in the areas concerned.

2.1 Geographic location of the school

Table 2.1 reports on the distribution of primary teachers who were currently teaching in one of the five specified areas according to whether their school was in a metropolitan, provincial, or remote location.[6] As a point of comparison, the distribution of all primary teachers by geographic location is also shown. The distribution of LOTE primary teachers across geographic regions (75.0% metropolitan, 22.2% provincial, and 2.8% remote) is similar to that of all primary teachers (73.6%, 23.3% and 3.1%, respectively). In contrast, in metropolitan primary schools, there are higher proportions of teachers teaching in the specialist areas of Literacy (85.7%), Special Needs (85.6%), Numeracy (85.1%), and Computing/IT (84.0%) than might be anticipated given the overall distribution of teachers across school locations (73.6% of all primary teachers are located in metropolitan areas). Conversely, in provincial primary schools, there are lower proportions of teachers in these four specialist areas (12.2-13.1%) than might be anticipated given the overall proportion of primary teachers in provincial areas (23.3%). As anticipated, small proportions of specialist teachers are found in primary schools located in remote areas.

Table 2.1: Geographic location of school: for primary teachers currently teaching in specified areas

Currently teaching in area:	Location of school (%)						
	Metropolitan	***SE***	**Provincial**	***SE***	**Remote**	***SE***	**Total**
Literacy	85.7	*3.4*	12.2	*3.1*	2.1	*0.9*	100
Numeracy	85.1	*3.9*	12.2	*3.6*	2.7	*1.2*	100
LOTE teachers	75.0	*5.8*	22.2	*5.4*	2.8	*1.2*	100
Computing/IT	84.0	*4.8*	13.1	*4.2*	3.0	*2.0*	100
Special Needs	85.6	*4.0*	12.8	*3.8*	1.6	*0.8*	100
All primary teachers	73.6	*2.9*	23.3	*2.8*	3.1	*0.7*	100

Note: Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

[6] School postcode was used to classify the location of schools according to the ABS (2011) *Australian Standard Geographical Classification*, and then to group the geographic locations into three broad categories (metropolitan; provincial; and remote) based on the *Geographical Location Classification for Reporting Purposes* (Jones, 2004; MCEETYA, 2011).

In 2007, it was reported that LOTE teachers were more likely to be in metropolitan areas and less likely to be in remote areas than were other primary teachers. In 2010, it was again reported that LOTE teachers were more likely to be in metropolitan areas but that they were also more likely to be in remote areas and less likely to be in provincial areas. In contrast, in 2013, the geographic distribution of LOTE teachers was closer to what you would anticipate given the overall distribution of teachers across school locations. This underlines the caution needed in interpreting these results due to the low number of actual responses within individual specialist areas.

Table 2.2 reports on the distribution of secondary teachers who were currently teaching in one of the 12 specified areas according to whether their school was in a metropolitan, provincial, or remote location. As a point of comparison the distribution of all secondary teachers by geographic location is also shown. Compared to primary teachers, slightly lower proportions of secondary teachers were located in metropolitan and remote schools, and slightly more were teaching in schools located in provincial cities, a pattern similar to that found in 2007 and 2010. This would reflect the fact that provincial cities often provide secondary schooling for a region.

Table 2.2: Geographic location of school: for secondary teachers currently teaching in specified areas

Currently teaching in area:	Location of school (%)						Total
	Metropolitan	*SE*	Provincial	*SE*	Remote	*SE*	
English	70.9	*3.2*	27.0	*3.1*	2.0	*0.4*	100
LOTE	77.7	*3.2*	21.7	*3.1*	0.6	*0.3*	100
Mathematics	69.2	*3.3*	29.1	*3.3*	1.7	*0.4*	100
Biology	66.6	*4.3*	31.3	*4.2*	2.1	*0.6*	100
Chemistry	71.3	*4.0*	26.1	*3.9*	2.6	*0.7*	100
Physics	69.3	*4.2*	28.2	*4.1*	2.5	*0.8*	100
Science – General	70.1	*3.9*	28.2	*3.8*	1.6	*0.4*	100
Geography	69.9	*4.3*	28.6	*4.3*	1.5	*0.3*	100
History	70.2	*3.7*	27.8	*3.6*	2.0	*0.4*	100
Computing/IT	68.6	*4.7*	29.4	*4.7*	2.1	*0.5*	100
VET	69.0	*3.9*	28.9	*3.9*	2.1	*0.5*	100
Special Needs	69.1	*4.3*	28.5	*4.3*	2.4	*0.7*	100
All secondary teachers	71.4	*3.1*	27.2	*3.1*	1.5	*0.3*	100

Note: The 2013 sample of the teaching population included teachers in Special Schools, which were included in 2007 but not in 2010. The 'Special Needs' 2013 category excludes teachers in Special Schools. They are included in all other areas.

Most of the selected curriculum areas show a geographic distribution that is similar to that of secondary teachers as a whole (71.4% in metropolitan schools, 27.2% in provincial schools, and 1.5% in remote schools). However, as was the case in 2007 and 2010, a higher proportion of secondary teachers teaching LOTE were located in metropolitan schools (77.7%) and lower proportions of those teaching in LOTE were located in provincial (21.7%) and remote schools (0.6%) than other teachers.

The proportion of secondary teachers teaching VET who were located in metropolitan areas has continued to rise, from 54.9% in 2007, to 63% in 2010, to 69.0% in 2013. The proportion teaching VET in metropolitan areas is now similar to what may be anticipated given the overall distribution of secondary teachers across school locations (71.4% of all secondary teachers were located in metropolitan areas). The proportion of VET teachers in provincial areas has also become more similar to that of other teachers (falling from 9.3 percentage points above the overall proportion of teachers in provincial areas in 2007 to 1.7 percentage points above the overall proportion of teachers in provincial areas in 2013).

2.2 School sector

School sector is another important defining characteristic of the teacher workforce in Australia. At primary school level, government school teachers comprised a higher proportion (70.3%) of the final weighted SiAS sample than at secondary school level (58.8%) which reflects the distribution of student enrolments across the two levels.

Table 2.3 examines the sectoral distribution of primary teachers teaching in the five specified curriculum areas. The results reported in this table should be interpreted with caution due to the large standard errors. Nevertheless, a lower proportion of primary teachers in independent schools are teaching in the area of computing (2.4%) than may have been expected given the proportion of all primary teachers in independent schools (12.2%). This was also noted in SiAS 2010.

Table 2.3: School sector: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Sector (%)						Total
	Government	*SE*	Catholic	*SE*	Independent	*SE*	
Literacy	70.5	*7.0*	16.7	*5.2*	12.8	*4.9*	100
Numeracy	77.4	*5.8*	14.6	*4.8*	7.9	*3.1*	100
LOTE	70.3	*7.4*	17.8	*6.5*	11.9	*3.6*	100
Computing/IT	77.0	*6.8*	20.6	*6.5*	2.4	*1.6*	100
Special Needs	75.8	*7.4*	15.2	*6.6*	8.9	*3.5*	100
All primary teachers	70.3	*2.0*	17.5	*1.6*	12.2	*1.5*	100

Note: Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

In 2007 and 2010, LOTE stood out: the proportion of LOTE teachers who were in government schools was lower than for primary teachers as a whole; the proportion of LOTE teachers in independent schools was higher than for primary teachers as a whole; and the proportion of LOTE teachers in Catholic schools was also higher than for primary teachers as a whole in 2010. In 2013, however, the distribution of LOTE teachers across sectors reflected the distribution of primary teachers as a whole.

Table 2.4 examines the sectoral distribution of secondary teachers teaching in the 12 specified curriculum areas. The proportions of those teaching in the 'shortage' areas of Mathematics, Physics, and Chemistry in the three school sectors are broadly consistent with the overall distribution of secondary teachers across the sectors (although the proportions in Physics and Chemistry are a little lower in the government sector, and a little higher in the independent sector). This pattern was also reported in 2010.

Secondary teachers teaching LOTE were less likely to be located in government schools than were teachers in other curriculum areas and secondary teachers overall. Conversely, secondary teachers teaching LOTE were more likely to be located in independent schools than were other teachers. This pattern was also found in 2010.

The emphasis in government schools on VET, noted in 2007 and 2010, remains evident in 2013. Around three-quarters of those teaching VET were located in government schools, which is 16.4 percentage points higher than for secondary teachers overall. In contrast, 14.5% of those teaching in VET were in the Catholic sector (5.8 percentage points lower than for secondary teachers

overall) and 10.3% were in the independent sector (10.6 percentage points lower than for secondary teachers overall).

Table 2.4: School sector: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Sector (%)						Total
	Government	*SE*	Catholic	*SE*	Independent	*SE*	
English	58.0	*2.1*	21.9	*1.6*	20.1	*1.6*	100
LOTE	51.4	*3.5*	18.3	*2.7*	30.2	*3.2*	100
Mathematics	57.9	*2.2*	20.5	*1.6*	21.6	*1.9*	100
Biology	57.9	*3.5*	21.0	*2.6*	21.2	*2.9*	100
Chemistry	56.5	*3.4*	20.3	*2.7*	23.2	*2.8*	100
Physics	54.7	*4.0*	20.7	*2.8*	24.7	*3.1*	100
Science – General	59.8	*2.3*	20.7	*1.9*	19.4	*1.6*	100
Geography	56.8	*1.9*	20.7	*1.4*	22.5	*1.7*	100
History	57.5	*2.4*	22.1	*1.9*	20.5	*2.1*	100
Computing/IT	62.2	*3.9*	18.2	*3.3*	19.6	*2.9*	100
VET	75.2	*2.3*	14.5	*1.7*	10.3	*1.8*	100
Special Needs	60.8	*3.5*	20.1	*2.8*	19.1	*2.8*	100
All secondary teachers	58.8	*1.9*	20.3	*1.4*	20.9	*1.6*	100

Note: The 2013 sample of the teaching population included teachers in Special Schools, which were included in 2007 but not in 2010. The 'Special Needs' 2013 category excludes teachers in Special Schools. They are included in all other areas.

2.3 Socio-economic composition

The school postcode was used to develop an index of the socio-economic status (SES) of the area in which the school was located.[7] This involved linking the postcode to the ABS Socio-Economic Indices of Areas (SEIFA 2006) Index of Education and Occupation and allocating each school the SES decile associated with the postcode.

For the purposes of analysis the schools were grouped into three broad SES groups as follows:

- Low SES (25.0% of primary schools and 26.7% secondary schools)
- Medium SES (42.4% of primary schools and 36.2% of secondary schools); and
- High SES (32.5% of primary schools and 37.0% of secondary schools).

It should be noted that the SES data is not for the school itself (such as average SES based on student postcodes), but the area in which the school is located. As such, results disaggregated using this data within the report should be treated with caution, and the limitations of SES groupings should be considered.

Table 2.5 examines the distribution by school SES group of primary teachers teaching in the five curriculum areas. Medium SES schools have a higher proportion of Computing/IT teachers than would be expected given the distribution of teachers overall, while low and high SES schools have lower proportions of Computing/IT teachers than would be expected. While these results are not directly comparable to those reported for SIAS 2010, a lower than expected proportion of Computing/IT teachers in low SES schools was also noted in 2010.

[7] It was not possible to use a more finely grained measure of SES such as could be derived from students' home address or the occupations and/or education levels of their parents.

Table 2.5: School SES: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	School SES group (%)						Total
	Low	*SE*	Medium	*SE*	High	*SE*	
Literacy	30.9	*10.3*	43.3	*9.1*	25.8	*6.2*	100
Numeracy	29.0	*9.9*	47.2	*9.8*	23.7	*5.9*	100
LOTE	35.6	*10.6*	33.9	*9.4*	30.5	*7.6*	100
Computing/IT	15.0	*5.5*	68.7	*7.7*	16.3	*5.3*	100
Special Needs	35.4	*11.6*	38.7	*10.1*	26.0	*7.7*	100
All primary teachers	25.0	*3.2*	42.4	*3.7*	32.5	*3.5*	100

Note: The socioeconomic status (SES) measure is derived from the postcode of the school address. Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

The proportions of teachers in the remaining four areas of specialisation who taught in low SES schools were higher than expected, while the proportions who taught in high SES schools were lower than expected, given the distribution of teachers overall. However, these results should be interpreted with extreme caution due to the large standard errors.

Table 2.6 provides equivalent data on the SES distribution of secondary teachers currently teaching in the 12 designated subject areas. LOTE and VET stand out as areas in which the distribution of teachers currently working in the area is different to what would be expected from the distribution of secondary teachers overall.

Table 2.6: School SES: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	School SES group (%)						Total
	Low	*SE*	Medium	*SE*	High	*SE*	
English	28.4	*3.1*	37.6	*3.6*	33.9	*3.4*	100
LOTE	20.6	*3.3*	26.9	*3.6*	52.6	*4.6*	100
Mathematics	29.1	*3.2*	34.9	*3.5*	36.1	*3.6*	100
Biology	30.8	*4.5*	39.6	*4.8*	29.5	*4.0*	100
Chemistry	27.6	*4.3*	35.8	*4.7*	36.6	*4.7*	100
Physics	26.9	*4.4*	35.6	*4.8*	37.5	*5.3*	100
Science – General	28.4	*3.9*	38.4	*4.3*	33.1	*3.9*	100
Geography	28.7	*4.1*	37.0	*4.5*	34.3	*4.0*	100
History	28.3	*3.5*	38.0	*4.0*	33.7	*3.8*	100
Computing/IT	33.8	*5.2*	32.9	*4.6*	33.3	*5.1*	100
VET	32.4	*4.5*	41.3	*4.7*	26.3	*3.7*	100
Special Needs	31.3	*4.8*	33.8	*4.5*	34.8	*4.4*	100
All secondary teachers	26.7	*3.2*	36.2	*3.5*	37.0	*3.6*	100

Note: The socioeconomic status (SES) measure is derived from the postcode of the school address. The 2013 sample of the teaching population included teachers in Special Schools, which were included in 2007 but not in 2010. The 'Special Needs' 2013 category excludes teachers in Special Schools. They are included in all other areas.

The high SES group of schools contained about 52.6% of those currently teaching LOTE, which is 15.6 percentage points higher than would otherwise be expected. Correspondingly, the proportion of LOTE teachers working in medium SES schools was about 9.3 percentage points lower than would be expected on the basis of the distribution of secondary teachers overall. These differences had widened since 2010.

The proportion of VET teachers in high SES schools (26.3%) was 10.7 percentage points lower than the overall number of teachers in high SES schools. Similar results were found in relation to VET in 2010.

In 2010, it was also reported that there was a higher concentration of Special Needs teachers in low SES schools and a lower concentration of Special Needs teachers in high SES schools than would be expected given the distribution of all secondary teachers. In 2013, however, the distribution of Special Needs teachers was closer to the distribution of all secondary teachers.

The data about the distribution of teachers provided in this section may suggest that targeted staffing strategies could be considered, such as increasing the attractiveness for LOTE secondary teachers of working in government schools, and in non-metropolitan and medium-low SES locations.

3. DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND

This section presents information on the demographic characteristics of the teachers currently teaching in the specified curriculum areas. The variables examined are age, gender, country of birth, language background, and English language proficiency.

3.1 Age

The age distribution of the teacher workforce is important information for planning. The higher the proportion of teachers in their 50s, the greater the likely demand for replacement teachers in the near future as teachers retire. The age profile can also have implications for education budgets and the demand for professional learning.

Table 3.1 reports the distribution of primary teachers' age in three broad bands. Around one in five LOTE teachers were 35 years or younger, compared with one-third of all primary teachers. LOTE teachers were older on average than teachers in the other areas and primary teachers overall. This was also the case in 2007, but the opposite was found in 2010. As noted earlier in the report, this underlines the caution needed in interpreting the results in this report due to the low number of actual responses within individual specialist areas at primary level.

Table 3.1: Age distribution: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Age group (%)							2013 Average age (years)
	<=35 years	*SE*	36-50 years	*SE*	>=51 years	*SE*	Total	
Literacy	30.2	*9.7*	31.2	*5.4*	38.6	*6.9*	100	44.9
Numeracy	36.6	*9.1*	32.7	*6.1*	30.8	*6.5*	100	42.5
LOTE	19.9	*4.7*	40.8	*9.5*	39.2	*8.2*	100	46.3
Computing/IT	34.0	*8.7*	25.1	*6.8*	40.8	*10.4*	100	43.1
Special Needs	25.7	*11.3*	37.7	*8.1*	36.6	*8.7*	100	45.0
All primary teachers	33.1	*1.8*	35.7	*1.2*	31.2	*1.3*	100	43.3

Note: Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

Also of note in Table 3.1, there is a lower proportion of Computing/IT teachers in the 36-50 age range than teachers in the other areas and primary teachers as a whole. The age distribution varies somewhat by gender, and this is discussed later in this section.

Table 3.2 presents the age distribution data for secondary teachers currently teaching in the 12 specified areas. Overall, there are fewer secondary teachers aged 35 or under compared to primary, and correspondingly more secondary teachers aged 36 or over. Secondary teachers are slightly older (45.3 years on average, compared to 43.3 years for primary teachers), as was the case in 2007 and 2010.

Special Needs teachers at secondary level are 2.1 years older on average than secondary teachers overall. Over 45.6% of teachers currently working in Special Needs are aged over 50 years, which is higher than the proportions of teachers in the other specialist areas in that age group. This was also the case in 2010 and suggests that future replacement demand, as teachers retire, may be stronger in Special Needs than in other curriculum areas.

Table 3.2: Age distribution: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Age group (%)							Average age (years)	
	<=35 years	*SE*	36-50 years	*SE*	>=51 years	*SE*	Total	2013	2010
English	31.3	*1.4*	36.5	*1.4*	32.2	*1.5*	100	43.7	43.1
LOTE	27.2	*3.0*	38.4	*3.3*	34.4	*2.9*	100	44.7	45.3
Mathematics	24.4	*1.5*	35.6	*1.6*	40.1	*1.8*	100	46.0	45.1
Biology	34.2	*3.6*	41.6	*3.6*	24.2	*2.7*	100	42.3	43.2
Chemistry	23.2	*3.0*	41.6	*3.6*	35.2	*4.0*	100	45.9	44.2
Physics	21.4	*3.2*	38.5	*4.3*	40.1	*5.0*	100	46.9	45.3
Science – General	29.7	*2.1*	39.5	*2.1*	30.8	*2.0*	100	43.6	43.4
Geography	31.5	*2.4*	38.3	*2.9*	30.2	*2.2*	100	43.4	43.3
History	29.4	*1.9*	37.3	*2.0*	33.2	*2.0*	100	44.1	43.3
Computing/IT	27.0	*3.0*	39.1	*3.5*	33.9	*3.5*	100	45.0	44.5
VET	21.7	*2.3*	39.9	*2.1*	38.4	*2.4*	100	46.0	46.0
Special Needs	19.0	*2.1*	35.3	*2.4*	45.6	*2.5*	100	47.4	47.2
All secondary teachers	25.3	*0.8*	38.4	*0.8*	36.3	*0.9*	100	45.3	44.5

Note: The 2013 sample of the teaching population included teachers in Special Schools, which were included in 2007 but not in 2010. The 'Special Needs' 2013 category excludes teachers in Special Schools. They are included in all other areas.

Table 3.2 also suggests that other curriculum areas in which concerns have been expressed about teacher supply – Mathematics and Physics – have workforces at secondary level that are older on average than secondary teachers overall. Teachers working in VET are also older, on average. These patterns were also noted in 2010.

In contrast, the areas of English, Biology, Science (General), History, and Geography have higher than average proportions of teachers aged 35 years or less and lower than average proportions of teachers aged over 50 years, as reported in 2010.

3.2 Gender

There are substantial gender differences between the primary and secondary school teacher workforces, and among the specified curriculum areas. Table 3.3 shows that overall 19.9% of primary teachers are males. The proportion of teachers who are male is lowest in LOTE (6.1%) and Special Needs (11.7%), and highest in Computing/IT (21.4%) and Numeracy (21.1%).

Table 3.3: Proportions of male and female teachers: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Male	Female	Total	*SE*
Literacy	15.2	84.8	100	*4.9*
Numeracy	21.1	78.9	100	*6.2*
LOTE	6.1	93.9	100	*2.2*
Computing/IT	21.4	78.6	100	*8.9*
Special Needs	11.7	88.3	100	*4.0*
All primary teachers	19.9	80.1	100	*1.2*

Note: Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

Table 3.4 shows that over twice the proportion of secondary teachers (42.2%) are males than primary teachers (19.9%) and that there are large gender differences according to the curriculum area in which teachers are teaching. As in primary schools, the two areas with the lowest proportions of male secondary teachers are Special Needs (20.2%) and LOTE (23.0%). Relatively low proportions of male secondary teachers are also found in English (27.5%) and History (36.6%). In contrast, there are high proportions of male teachers in Physics (76.5%), Computing/IT (59.9%), Chemistry (57.3%), Mathematics (51.6%), VET (51.4%) and Science (General) (48.7%). Given that there are such large gender differences across curriculum areas, such disaggregated data needs to be taken into account by workforce planners in considering factors influencing teacher supply in these areas.

Table 3.4: Proportions of male and female teachers: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

Currently teaching in	Proportion of teachers who are male (%)				Proportion of teachers who are female (%)		
area:	2013	*SE*	2010	2007	2013	2010	2007
English	27.5	*1.5*	29.2	28.9	72.5	70.8	71.1
LOTE	23.0	*2.6*	23.6	26.4	77.0	76.4	73.6
Mathematics	51.6	*1.9*	51.7	51.7	48.4	48.3	48.3
Biology	41.9	*3.4*	47.0	44.0	58.1	53.0	56.0
Chemistry	57.3	*4.1*	52.7	58.3	42.7	47.3	41.7
Physics	76.5	*3.3*	64.4	72.8	23.5	35.6	27.2
Science – General	48.7	*2.2*	48.5	53.4	51.3	51.5	46.6
Geography	39.2	*2.5*	39.8	39.8	60.8	60.2	60.2
History	36.6	*2.1*	38.9	36.5	63.4	61.1	63.5
Computing/IT	59.9	*3.1*	60.2	62.5	40.1	39.8	37.5
VET	51.4	*3.1*	45.7	51.6	48.6	54.3	48.4
Special Needs	20.2	*2.2*	22.0		79.8	78.0	
All secondary teachers	42.2	*1.2*	42.7	43	57.8	57.3	57

Note: Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

The gender distribution varies somewhat by age. As Table 3.5 shows, while the average age of male primary teachers is similar to that of female primary teachers, there is a higher proportion of males than females aged 35 years or less, and a lower proportion of males aged 36-50 years.

Table 3.5: Age distribution by gender: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in	Age group (%)						Average age (years)	
	<=35 years		36-50 years		>=51 years			
area:	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Literacy	21.9	31.7	20.1	33.2	58.0	35.2	47.7	44.4
Numeracy	24.9	39.7	24.2	34.9	50.9	25.4	46.6	41.4
LOTE	39.5	18.5	28.4	41.9	32.1	39.7	43.7	46.5
Computing/IT	32.0	34.6	12.3	28.6	55.7	36.8	45.9	42.3
Special Needs	1.2	29.0	15.9	40.6	82.9	30.4	52.6	44.0
All primary teachers	35.9	32.5	33.1	36.3	31.0	31.2	43.1	43.4

Note: The proportions of male teachers in the three age groups in each area each sum to 100 across the row, as do the proportions of female teachers. Standard errors are not shown however they are very high (±10% or higher in many cases). The standard error for average age is about ±3.5 years for males, ±2 years for females. Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

In contrast, males in the specialist areas of Special Needs, Literacy, Numeracy and Computing/IT were older on average than their female counterparts, and LOTE is the only specialist area examined that has a higher proportion of males than females aged 35 years or less. Also of note, only 1.2% of male Special Needs teachers in primary schools were aged 35 years or less.

Table 3.6 shows that male secondary teachers are older on average than female teachers overall (by 1.3 years). Within each of the 12 curriculum areas, males are also older or a similar average age to females. The data suggest that future replacement demand may be higher for male teachers than female teachers as they retire in the next few years. This may particularly be the case in the areas of Mathematics, Physics and General Science where the proportions of males aged 50 and over are 10.1-14.5 percentage points higher than for their female counterparts.

Table 3.6: Age distribution by gender: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Age group (%)						Average age (years)	
	<=35 years		36-50 years		>=51 years			
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
English	31.1	31.4	38.6	35.7	30.3	32.9	43.8	43.7
LOTE	22.6	28.6	37.7	38.5	39.7	32.9	46.1	44.3
Mathematics	22.4	26.5	30.6	40.9	47.1	32.6	47.3	44.5
Biology	35.1	33.8	38.2	43.8	26.7	22.5	42.6	42.0
Chemistry	22.0	25.0	40.2	43.6	37.8	31.4	46.9	44.5
Physics	19.4	28.1	37.2	42.7	43.3	29.2	47.8	43.8
Science – General	27.7	31.8	36.4	42.5	35.9	25.8	44.8	42.4
Geography	29.5	32.8	42.7	35.4	27.8	31.8	43.9	43.1
History	25.7	31.8	38.5	36.5	35.7	31.7	45.1	43.4
Computing/IT	23.6	32.2	43.7	31.9	32.7	35.8	45.4	44.3
VET	21.8	21.5	38.5	41.3	39.6	37.2	45.9	46.0
Special Needs	16.9	19.7	30.5	36.7	52.5	43.6	49.4	46.9
All secondary teachers	23.5	26.7	37.5	39.1	39.0	34.2	46.0	44.7

Note: The proportions of male teachers in the three age groups in each area each sum to 100 across the row, as do the proportions of female teachers. Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

3.3 Country of birth

The teacher workforce has a lower proportion who were born overseas (15.3% for primary teachers, and 19.4% for secondary teachers) than the Australian population as a whole (27.7%) (ABS, 2013b). As Table 3.7 shows, at primary school level it is only LOTE teachers who have a markedly higher proportion born overseas (40.5%), compared to other teachers (and the Australian population). Furthermore, the proportion of LOTE primary teachers born overseas was higher in 2013 than in 2007 and 2010.

Table 3.7: Proportion of teachers born in Australia: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Proportion of teachers who were born in Australia (%)			
	2013	*SE*	2010	2007
Literacy	83.6	*5.5*	89.0	89.1
Numeracy	84.2	*4.8*	88.4	88.4
LOTE	59.5	*7.5*	72.9	67.1
Computing/IT	88.3	*5.4*	90.4	88.5
Special Needs	87.7	*4.7*	87.0	
All primary teachers	84.7	*1.1*	87.2	86

Note: Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

It is a similar picture at secondary school level (Table 3.8) with about 36.8% of LOTE teachers born overseas compared with 19.4% of all secondary teachers. The differences between the proportions teaching in the other curriculum areas who were born overseas and secondary teachers overall were far smaller. For example, somewhat higher proportions of those teaching in Mathematics (23.4%) and somewhat lower proportions of those teaching in English (17.0), History (16.4%) and VET (14.2%) were born overseas.

The data in Tables 3.7 and 3.8 indicate that Australia has a relatively high reliance on teachers born overseas for its LOTE teacher workforce although, as noted in the main SiAS report, most of those teachers who were born overseas appear to have spent a lengthy time in Australia, as was the case in 2007 and 2010. This suggests that overseas-born (and possibly overseas-qualified) teachers are an important source of teacher supply in LOTE.

Table 3.8: Proportion of teachers born in Australia: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

	Proportion of teachers who were born in Australia (%)			
Currently teaching in area:	**2013**	***SE***	**2010**	**2007**
English	83.0	*1.3*	81.0	81.9
LOTE	63.2	*2.6*	53.1	60.2
Mathematics	76.6	*1.8*	75.3	78.3
Biology	83.2	*2.3*	76.0	79.7
Chemistry	77.5	*3.2*	75.3	77.9
Physics	79.3	*3.0*	77.1	75.7
Science – General	80.5	*1.7*	78.2	79.6
Geography	79.0	*2.2*	82.1	82.0
History	83.6	*1.5*	83.2	85.8
Computing/IT	80.2	*2.8*	78.2	82.8
VET	85.8	*1.7*	78.5	84.6
Special Needs	79.3	*2.5*	76.2	
All secondary teachers	80.6	*0.9*	79.6	81

Note: Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

3.4 Teachers' self-assessment of their English language proficiency

As shown in Tables 3.9 and 3.10, the proportion of teachers who spoke a language other than English at home was 8.7% in primary schools and 10.9% in secondary schools, which is considerably lower than for the Australian population as a whole (19% in 2011) (ABS, 2013a). Those teaching LOTE were the only specialists that were more likely to speak a language other than English at home (49.5% of LOTE primary teachers and 39.3% of LOTE secondary teachers). Those in the remaining areas of specialisation at primary level (Table 3.9) and secondary level (Table 3.10) were less likely than the Australian population as a whole to speak a language other than English at home.

Tables 3.9 and 3.10 also show self-assessed proficiency levels in English. The vast majority of teachers considered their proficiency to be 'very good'; about 20% of primary LOTE teachers and less than 6% of secondary LOTE teachers considered their proficiency to be 'good'. Very

few teachers considered their English proficiency to be only 'satisfactory'; none at primary level, about 1.5% of LOTE and Mathematics teachers at secondary level, and about 1% of teachers in other subject areas.

Table 3.9: Proportion of teachers who speak a LOTE at home: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Proportion of teachers who speak a LOTE at home (%)		Self assessment of English-language proficiency (%)	
	2013	*SE*	Very good	Good
Literacy	2.7	*1.7*	2.7	--
Numeracy	1.2	*0.8*	1.2	--
LOTE	49.5	*9.9*	39.8	9.6
Computing/IT	2.8	*2.5*	2.8	--
Special Needs	1.5	*1.2*	1.5	--
All primary teachers	8.7	*1.6*	7.7	0.9

Note: Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

Table 3.10: Proportion of teachers who speak a LOTE at home: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Proportion of teachers who speak a LOTE at home (%)		Self assessment of English-language proficiency (%)		
	2013	*SE*	Very good	Good	Satisfactory
English	9.2	*1.1*	8.9	0.2	0.1
LOTE	39.3	*3.3*	36.5	2.2	0.6
Mathematics	12.6	*1.4*	9.8	0.4	0.2
Biology	7.5	*2.0*	7.1	0.4	0.1
Chemistry	14.1	*2.8*	11.3	2.7	0.1
Physics	9.8	*2.3*	9.6	0.2	--
Science – General	10.4	*1.6*	9.4	1.0	0.1
Geography	10.4	*1.9*	9.9	0.4	0.1
History	9.6	*1.2*	8.9	0.5	0.1
Computing/IT	10.4	*2.3*	10.3	0.1	--
VET	8.8	*1.9*	8.6	0.0	0.1
Special Needs	10.4	*1.7*	9.9	0.3	--
All secondary teachers	10.9	*0.8*	10.2	0.6	0.1

Note: Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

4. QUALIFICATIONS AND TERTIARY STUDY

This section presents information on the qualifications and tertiary study of teachers in the specified curriculum areas.

4.1 Types of initial teacher education program

The type of initial teacher education programs undertaken by primary teachers currently teaching in the five specified curriculum areas is reported in Table 4.1. Around 48.5% of primary LOTE teachers reported that their initial teacher education program was a graduate program, which was 17.9% higher than for primary teachers overall. Larger than average proportions of primary teachers teaching in the areas of Computing/IT (42.6%), Literacy (34.7%), and Numeracy (33.7%) also reported that their initial teacher education program was a graduate program, although these results should be treated with caution due to the large standard errors. As information on type of initial education program was collected for the first time in SiAS 2013, comparisons cannot be made previous SiAS cycles.

Table 4.1: Proportion of teachers by type of initial teacher education program: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Undergraduate program %	Graduate program %	*SE*
Literacy	65.3	34.7	*7.7*
Numeracy	66.3	33.7	*8.0*
LOTE	51.5	48.5	*4.9*
Computing/IT	57.4	42.6	*11.0*
Special Needs	74.2	25.8	*9.0*
All primary teachers	69.4	30.6	*1.5*

Note: Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

A comparison of Table 4.1 and 4.2 shows that overall secondary teachers are more likely than primary teachers to undertake a graduate-level initial education program (51.2% secondary teachers; 30.6% primary teachers). However, there is variation across curriculum areas at secondary level (Table 4.2). Areas with relatively high proportions of teachers reporting a graduate-level initial education program included Physics (71.8%), Biology (68.1%), Chemistry (67.0%), LOTE (64.3%), Science – General (62.2%), and Mathematics (59.7). The proportions of those teaching in the areas of Geography (52.2%), History (52.1%), and English (50.4%) who had undertaken a graduate-level initial education program were similar to the proportion for secondary teachers overall (51.2%). Other curriculum areas, however, had relatively low proportions of teachers who had undertaken a graduate-level initial education program, including Computing/IT (44.7%), VET (42.1%), and Special Needs (37.3%).

Table 4.2: Proportion of teachers by type of initial teacher education program: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Undergraduate program %	Graduate program %	*SE*
English	49.6	50.4	*1.9*
LOTE	35.7	64.3	*3.1*
Mathematics	40.3	59.7	*1.7*
Biology	31.9	68.1	*3.7*
Chemistry	33.0	67.0	*3.5*
Physics	28.2	71.8	*3.3*
Science – General	37.8	62.2	*1.9*
Geography	47.8	52.2	*2.6*
History	47.9	52.1	*2.1*
Computing/IT	55.3	44.7	*3.5*
VET	57.9	42.1	*2.8*
Special Needs	62.7	37.3	*2.7*
All secondary teachers	48.8	51.2	*0.9*

Note: Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

4.2 Qualifications in Education

Teachers were asked to indicate their highest qualification in Education in the SiAS 2013 survey and could choose between one of five graduate-level qualifications (doctoral degree, masters degree, graduate diploma, graduate certificate, and bachelor (honours) degree), an undergraduate bachelor degree, or specify another undergraduate program. To simplify the presentation of results, bachelor (honours) degrees and undergraduate bachelor degrees have been grouped together. As Table 4.3 indicates, 58.2% of primary teachers held either a bachelor or honours degree as their highest qualification in Education, 2.7% held a graduate certificate, 25.0% a graduate diploma, 10.5% a masters degree, 0.2% a doctoral degree, and 3.5% another qualification.

Table 4.3: Proportions who hold qualifications in Education: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

	Type of qualification											
Currently teaching	Bachelor/ honours degree		Graduate certificate		Graduate diploma		Masters degree		Doctoral degree		Other	
in area:	%	*SE*	%	*SE*	%	*SE*	%	*SE*	%	*SE*	%	*SE*
Literacy	48.9	*7.4*	2.8	*1.6*	21.2	*5.5*	24.8	*10.1*	--	--	2.3	*1.6*
Numeracy	53.9	*7.3*	2.5	*1.3*	14.7	*4.4*	25.3	*9.5*	--	--	3.6	*2.1*
LOTE	45.9	*4.4*	1.3	*0.6*	38.4	*5.2*	9.7	*3.8*	--	--	4.8	*3.1*
Computing/IT	71.2	*7.5*	1.1	*0.8*	11.4	*3.8*	15.5	*7.3*	--	--	0.8	*0.8*
Special Needs	32.7	*7.1*	2.2	*1.6*	17.1	*4.6*	41.1	*10.0*	--	--	6.9	*5.5*
All primary teachers	58.2	*1.5*	2.7	*0.3*	25.0	*1.1*	10.5	*1.1*	0.2	*0.1*	3.5	*0.4*

Note: Respondents were asked to indicate the highest qualification they hold in Education, and could only indicate one qualification. Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

In 2013, the highest proportion of primary teachers with a Masters degree was in the area of Special Needs (Table 4.3). Around 41.1% of Special Needs teachers held a masters degree, which was 30.6 percentage points higher than for teachers overall. In contrast, the highest qualification

of 32.7% of Special Needs teachers was a bachelor/honours qualification, which was 25.5 percentage points lower than for primary teachers overall. The highest qualification of Special Needs teachers was also somewhat less likely than teachers overall to be a graduate diploma.

Masters degrees were the highest qualification in Education for approximately one-quarter of primary teachers in the curriculum areas of Literacy and Numeracy in 2013, which is around 2.4 times higher than for primary teachers overall (Table 4.3). In contrast, Literacy teachers were substantially less likely than primary teachers overall to have a bachelors/honours degrees as their highest qualification in Education, and Numeracy teachers were substantially less likely than primary teachers overall to have a graduate diploma as their highest qualification.

A higher proportion of LOTE primary teachers than primary teachers overall held a graduate diploma, while a smaller proportion LOTE teachers than teachers overall had a bachelor degree as their highest qualification in Education. Conversely, Computing/IT teachers were more likely than teachers overall to have a bachelors/honours degree in Education and less likely than teachers overall to have a graduate diploma

The highest qualifications of secondary teachers are reported in Table 4.4. Compared with primary teachers, smaller proportions of secondary teachers hold bachelor/honours qualifications in Education (58.2% primary; 42.1% secondary), but there are more secondary teachers with a graduate diploma (25.0% primary, 39.3% secondary) or masters or doctoral degree in Education (10.7% primary, 13.0% secondary).

Table 4.4: Proportions who hold qualifications in Education: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

	Type of qualification											
Currently teaching	**Bachelor/ honours degree**		**Graduate certificate**		**Graduate diploma**		**Masters degree**		**Doctoral degree**		**Other**	
in area:	**%**	***SE***	**%**	***SE***	**%**	***SE***	**%**	***SE***	**%**	***SE***	**%**	***SE***
English	40.8	*1.6*	2.8	*0.5*	40.6	*1.5*	13.6	*1.1*	0.2	*0.1*	2.0	*0.5*
LOTE	28.7	*2.9*	4.2	*1.6*	49.5	*2.9*	13.5	*1.8*	1.0	*1.0*	3.0	*1.2*
Mathematics	37.5	*1.6*	2.6	*0.5*	44.1	*1.6*	12.9	*1.1*	0.4	*0.2*	2.6	*0.5*
Biology	31.9	*3.8*	4.9	*1.3*	51.8	*3.6*	8.6	*1.9*	--	--	2.8	*1.0*
Chemistry	34.1	*3.5*	5.5	*1.5*	47.5	*3.5*	11.3	*2.1*	0.4	*0.4*	1.2	*0.8*
Physics	25.0	*3.0*	4.8	*1.6*	60.3	*3.5*	8.0	*2.1*	0.1	*0.1*	1.7	*1.0*
Science – General	34.6	*1.9*	3.3	*0.6*	48.1	*2.0*	10.2	*1.2*	0.4	*0.2*	3.4	*0.9*
Geography	37.6	*2.7*	3.2	*0.8*	42.1	*2.4*	14.4	*2.2*	0.1	*0.1*	2.5	*0.9*
History	40.5	*2.1*	3.7	*0.8*	41.9	*2.0*	11.9	*1.5*	0.1	*0.1*	1.8	*0.6*
Computing/IT	43.5	*3.9*	1.3	*0.5*	41.8	*3.9*	12.6	*2.0*	--	--	0.8	*0.3*
VET	52.2	*2.8*	3.1	*0.9*	30.6	*2.3*	11.2	*1.8*	0.1	*0.1*	2.8	*0.5*
Special Needs	34.6	*2.1*	5.0	*1.4*	34.5	*2.8*	23.3	*2.8*	0.4	*0.3*	2.3	*0.6*
All secondary teachers	42.1	*0.8*	2.9	*0.2*	39.3	*0.9*	12.6	*0.6*	0.4	*0.1*	2.7	*0.2*

Note: Respondents were asked to indicate the highest qualification they hold in Education, and could only indicate one qualification. Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

Among the secondary curriculum areas, teachers in LOTE, Mathematics, and the sciences stand out as holding fewer bachelor/honours qualifications in Education and a greater percentage of graduate diplomas in Education than secondary teachers overall (Table 4.4). This was also evident in 2010.

The proportion of Special Needs teachers with a bachelor/honours degree as their highest qualification was also lower than for secondary teachers overall, while the proportion of Special

Needs teachers with a masters degree was higher than for secondary teachers overall (Table 4.4). These differences had widened since 2010.

VET was the only curriculum area considered in this report where the proportion of teachers with a bachelor/honours degree as their highest qualification in Education in 2013 was substantially higher than for secondary teachers overall (Table 4.4). Of the 12 curriculum areas, VET also had the lowest proportion of teachers with a graduate diploma as their highest qualification in Education. This pattern was also apparent in 2010.

4.2 Qualifications in fields other than Education

Teachers were also asked to indicate their highest qualification in a field other than Education. Overall, 52.5% of primary teachers in 2013 held a qualification in a field other than Education (Table 4.5), as did 79.4% of secondary teachers (Table 4.6). The difference between primary and secondary proportions is mainly due to the fact that secondary teachers are more likely to complete a degree in an area like Arts or Science before undertaking a graduate qualification in Education.

Table 4.5 analyses the distribution of highest qualifications in fields other than Education for primary teachers working in the specified curriculum areas. The most notable difference is that higher proportions of LOTE and Computing/IT teachers held qualifications in fields other than Education than primary teachers overall, as well as teachers in the other areas. Above average proportions of LOTE teachers held bachelor/honours and masters or doctoral level qualifications, while above average proportions of Computing/IT teachers held graduate certificate and masters or doctoral level qualifications in a non-Education field. In 2010, a similar pattern was noted for LOTE teachers (the only primary-level curriculum area which can be compared between 2010 and 2013). The 2013 results suggest that those teaching LOTE and Computing/IT at primary level are comparatively well qualified.

Table 4.5: Proportions who hold qualifications in fields other than Education: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

	Type of qualification											
	None[1]		Bachelor/ honours degree		Graduate certificate		Graduate diploma		Masters or doctoral degree		Other	
Currently teaching in area:	**%**	***SE***	**%**	***SE***	**%**	***SE***	**%**	***SE***	**%**	***SE***	**%**	***SE***
Literacy	46.9	*8.6*	36.4	*8.0*	2.5	*1.2*	2.7	*1.2*	5.2	*4.0*	6.2	*2.5*
Numeracy	47.4	*8.1*	37.0	*8.3*	2.8	*1.5*	2.2	*1.2*	5.7	*5.2*	4.8	*2.4*
LOTE	35.1	*7.9*	40.9	*6.0*	1.5	*0.9*	5.0	*1.6*	7.0	*2.8*	10.5	*4.0*
Computing/IT	31.5	*8.6*	36.1	*10.3*	13.4	*8.4*	3.1	*1.8*	10.5	*8.6*	5.4	*3.0*
Special Needs	58.3	*9.6*	30.7	*9.3*	4.4	*2.2*	3.2	*1.5*	--	--	3.4	*1.6*
All primary teachers	47.5	*1.4*	31.9	*1.2*	3.0	*0.4*	8.6	*0.8*	2.7	*0.5*	6.3	*0.8*

Note: Respondents were asked to indicate the highest qualification they hold in fields other than Education, and could only indicate one qualification. Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

1. This column reflects the fact that teachers do not necessarily need a qualification in a field other than Education if their Education qualifications meet the requirements for registration.

At secondary school level, the pattern of highest qualifications in fields other than Education varied across curriculum areas (see Table 4.6). As was the case in 2010, those teaching in the

sciences were more likely than teachers in the other areas and primary teachers overall to hold a qualification in a non-Education field, especially a bachelor/honours degree (all Science curriculum areas) or a masters or doctoral degree (Chemistry and Physics teachers). Although the proportions of those teaching Mathematics, History, Geography, and English who held a qualification in a non-Education field were similar to secondary teachers overall, teachers in these four curriculum areas were also somewhat more likely than secondary teachers overall to hold a bachelor/honours degree in a non-Education field.

LOTE and Computing/IT teachers were somewhat more likely to hold a qualification in a non-Education field than secondary teachers overall, although the levels of the highest qualifications differed (Table 4.6). LOTE teachers were more likely to hold a masters or doctoral degree than teachers in other curriculum areas and secondary teachers overall, while Computing/IT teachers were more likely to hold a graduate certificate or an 'other' qualification.

Although the proportion of VET teachers who held a qualification in a non-Education field was similar to secondary teachers overall, VET teachers were less likely to have a bachelor/honours degree in a non-Education field than secondary teachers overall, and more likely to have a graduate diploma or 'other' qualification in other fields than secondary teachers overall (Table 4.6).

Also of note, Special Needs teachers were the group that was least likely to hold any qualification in a non-Education field, and the group which was least likely to hold a bachelor/honours degree outside the field of Education (Table 4.6).

Table 4.6: Proportions who hold qualifications in fields other than Education: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

	Type of qualification											
	None[1]		Bachelor/ honours degree		Graduate certificate		Graduate diploma		Masters or doctoral degree		Other	
Currently teaching in area:	**%**	***SE***	**%**	***SE***	**%**	***SE***	**%**	***SE***	**%**	***SE***	**%**	***SE***
English	21.7	*1.4*	56.4	*1.4*	2.0	*0.4*	9.1	*1.0*	6.8	*0.7*	3.9	*0.7*
LOTE	16.2	*2.7*	51.2	*3.6*	2.7	*0.9*	9.9	*1.5*	16.4	*2.7*	3.6	*0.9*
Mathematics	21.0	*1.3*	55.8	*1.7*	2.5	*0.4*	9.3	*1.0*	8.7	*1.0*	3.6	*0.6*
Biology	9.2	*1.6*	70.0	*3.3*	3.9	*1.5*	5.5	*1.6*	9.4	*1.9*	2.0	*0.6*
Chemistry	10.4	*2.7*	65.1	*3.6*	3.4	*1.5*	6.3	*1.5*	13.9	*2.2*	1.0	*0.5*
Physics	10.8	*2.4*	67.5	*3.2*	3.5	*1.5*	6.1	*1.4*	11.0	*2.1*	1.3	*0.5*
Science – General	13.6	*1.3*	64.3	*1.8*	2.1	*0.6*	7.3	*1.0*	8.9	*1.2*	3.8	*0.7*
Geography	20.4	*2.2*	56.0	*2.4*	1.6	*0.6*	11.4	*1.6*	5.5	*1.1*	5.1	*1.3*
History	20.1	*1.6*	57.1	*2.1*	2.8	*0.8*	8.4	*1.0*	7.4	*1.1*	4.2	*0.9*
Computing/IT	17.1	*2.1*	49.1	*3.2*	6.3	*1.6*	9.5	*1.8*	6.0	*1.4*	12.0	*2.8*
VET	21.3	*2.3*	41.1	*2.8*	4.2	*0.9*	11.8	*1.4*	4.7	*0.9*	17.0	*2.5*
Special Needs	28.8	*2.8*	40.5	*2.9*	2.9	*1.0*	11.2	*2.1*	8.2	*1.6*	8.4	*1.5*
All secondary teachers	20.6	*0.6*	52.5	*0.7*	3.0	*0.3*	9.7	*0.4*	7.9	*0.5*	6.2	*0.4*

Note: Respondents were asked to indicate the highest qualification they hold in fields other than Education, and could only indicate one qualification. Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

1. This column reflects the fact that teachers do not necessarily need a qualification in a field other than Education if their Education qualifications meet the requirements for registration.

4.3 Tertiary study in the curriculum area

In terms of curriculum provision it is important to know not just what level of qualifications teachers hold, but also whether they have studied in the areas that they are now teaching, and to what extent. Such questions are concerned with 'out-of-field' teaching and are examined in the first two parts of this section.

The third part examines the concept of a potential 'reserve pool' of teachers -- those who have studied a given area at tertiary level and who could therefore potentially teach in that area but are not currently doing so.

'Out-of-field' teaching – primary schools

For the purposes of the analysis, teachers are assumed to be *notionally qualified* in an area if they have *studied the area for at least one semester at (at least) second year tertiary or have trained at tertiary level in teaching methodology in the area concerned*.[8]

Table 4.7 examines this issue for the five specified primary areas. The final column shows the proportion of all primary teachers who are currently teaching in the specialist area concerned. This ranges from 4.7% for Literacy down to 2.1% for Computing/IT. The other two columns indicate which of those teachers are notionally qualified to teach in the area, as measured by the extent of tertiary study in the area. The column that is *italicised* indicates the proportion of teachers who are teaching in the area and who appear to be doing so without either extensive tertiary study or teaching methodology in the area.

Table 4.7: Primary teachers currently teaching in specified areas, by extent of tertiary study in the area

	Teachers who are teaching in the area as a proportion of all teachers (%) (and as a proportion of specialist teachers of that subject area %)		
Specialist subject area	**Have at least second year level tertiary study in the area or tertiary training in teaching methodology in the area**		
	Yes	***No***	**Total**
Literacy	4.1 (87.2)	*0.6 (12.8)*	4.7 (100)
Numeracy	2.9 (82.9)	*0.6 (17.1)*	3.5 (100)
LOTE	2.6 (66.7)	*1.3 (33.3)*	3.9 (100)
Computing/IT	1.2 (57.1)	*1.0 (42.9)*	2.1 (100)
Special Needs	1.6 (57.1)	*1.2 (42.9)*	2.8 (100)

Note: In the 2013 survey (as in 2010), primary and secondary teachers filled out the same question on tertiary studies. Primary teachers in Numeracy could indicate that they had tertiary-level studies in Numeracy and/or Mathematics, and teachers in Computing that they had tertiary-level studies in Computing and/or IT. As such, Numeracy figures above include teachers who have second year level tertiary study in Mathematics, and Computing/IT figures include teachers who have second year level tertiary study and/or teaching methodology in either Computing or IT.

[8] The term 'notionally qualified' is used because information is not available from the SiAS survey on whether teachers have satisfied the qualification requirements of the relevant employer and registration bodies for teaching in different curriculum areas. The analysis assumes that having studied an area for at least one semester at (at least) second year tertiary level or undertaken training at tertiary level in teaching methodology in the area concerned would satisfy most accreditation requirements for teaching in the area. In some instances a principal or other relevant authority may judge that extensive experience in teaching an area and/or relevant professional learning activities are adequate substitutes if the teacher concerned has undertaken only limited tertiary study in the area. The effect of encompassing these less formal aspects would be to increase the pool of teachers who are considered qualified to teach in an area, and thereby reduce the incidence of what appears to be out-of-field teaching.

The data indicate that in three of the specialist areas, two-thirds or fewer of the teachers have studied the area for at least one semester at second year at tertiary level or have trained at tertiary level in teaching methodology in the area concerned: LOTE (66.7%); Computing/IT (57.1%); and Special Needs (57.1%). In other words, one-third or more of those teaching in these three areas appear to be teaching out-of-field. In the case of Literacy and Numeracy, the proportion of primary teachers who are notionally qualified in the terms used here is considerably higher (over 80%) and hence less than one-fifth of these teachers could be considered to be teaching out-of-field.

'Out-of-field' teaching – secondary schools

At least one-third of those teaching in each of the secondary curriculum areas have undertaken at least second year level tertiary study in the area or tertiary training in teaching methodology in that field. The detailed information is provided in Table 4.8.

A high proportion of the secondary teachers teaching Biology, Chemistry, LOTE, English, Science – General, Mathematics, and Physics have undertaken at least two years tertiary study in the area or tertiary training in teaching methodology in that field. There would appear to be relatively little out-of-field teaching in these areas. History also had a relatively high proportion of the teachers that were notionally qualified as defined here. Areas in which lower proportions of teachers were notionally qualified (and hence out-of-field teaching is likely to be higher) were Computing/IT, Geography, Special Needs, and VET.

Table 4.8: Secondary teachers currently teaching in specified areas, by extent of tertiary study in the area

	Teachers who are teaching in the area as a proportion of all teachers (%) (and as a proportion of specialist teachers of that subject area %)					
	Have at least second year level tertiary study in the area or tertiary training in teaching methodology in the area					
Area (years 7-12)	**Yes**		***No***		**Total**	
English	17.0	(85.4)	*2.8*	*(14.6)*	19.9	(100)
LOTE	4.5	(86.5)	*0.7*	*(13.5)*	5.2	(100)
Mathematics	16.8	(80.4)	*4.2*	*(19.6)*	20.9	(100)
Biology	4.3	(91.5)	*0.4*	*(8.5)*	4.7	(100)
Chemistry	4.0	(90.9)	*0.4*	*(9.1)*	4.4	(100)
Physics	3.1	(79.5)	*0.8*	*(20.5)*	3.9	(100)
Science General	12.0	(82.8)	*2.5*	*(17.2)*	14.5	(100)
Geography	5.3	(60.2)	*3.5*	*(39.8)*	8.8	(100)
History	9.4	(74.6)	*3.2*	*(25.4)*	12.6	(100)
Computing/IT	3.5	(68.6)	*1.6*	*(31.4)*	5.1	(100)
VET	3.4	(35.4)	*6.2*	*(64.6)*	9.6	(100)
Special Needs	2.4	(38.7)	*3.7*	*(61.3)*	6.2	(100)

Note: VET and Special Needs are not subject areas so respondents were not asked if they had teaching methodology in these areas. Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

'Reserve pool' of teachers – secondary schools

Table 4.9 indicates the notional reserve pool of teachers at secondary level. In areas such as the sciences, fewer than one-third of teachers who are notionally qualified to teach in the area are doing so (Physics (32.6%), Chemistry (29.6%) and Biology (28.7%)). Whether this is due to

those subjects not being offered in the schools concerned, or there being higher priority areas for the teachers' services, cannot be ascertained from these data. Nevertheless, the fourth column of Table 4.9 implies that in some areas of reputed teacher shortage there is a reasonably large group of teachers who could, in principle, be deployed to teach in those areas. However, in all three of the above cases, the majority of those not teaching in one of these areas are teaching Mathematics, General Science or another of the sciences. This was also the case in 2007 and 2010, and suggests a major barrier to redeployment, given that the subjects these reserve pool teachers are currently teaching are also those likely to be experiencing shortages.

Mathematics is a curriculum area that is taught throughout all year levels of secondary schools, and on the basis of these data it seems that the supply of qualified Mathematics teachers needs to be increased, as was noted in 2010. This strategy may have beneficial effects on other areas. As Table 4.9 shows, the area most, or second-most commonly taught by teachers in the 'reserve pool' in nearly all analysed areas is Mathematics, as was the case in 2007 and 2010. A significant proportion of those qualified in Physics, General Science, Computing/IT, Chemistry and Biology reported that they were teaching mathematics. An increase in the supply of Mathematics teachers could contribute to reducing shortages of teachers in other areas by allowing some of those currently teaching Mathematics to be deployed to the other areas in which they are trained.

The potential size of the reserve pool of secondary teachers is relatively small in the curriculum areas examined here, and to draw on those teachers would often mean deploying them away from other areas that are also experiencing shortages.

In summary, Table 4.9 indicates that, as was the case in 2010, for all the secondary learning areas specified in this report:

- the total of those notionally qualified *exceeds* the total of those actually teaching; and
- a significant proportion is not actually teaching in the area in which they are notionally qualified, but in most areas, many have instead been allocated to teaching mathematics.

This suggests that maximising the allocation of teachers to their main area of qualification may be an important component in effectively addressing shortages.

Table 4.9: Secondary teachers who are qualified to teach in specified curriculum areas but are not doing so – the other areas in which they are teaching

Area	Teachers who are teaching in the area as a % of all teachers	Teachers who are notionally qualified to teach in the area as a % of all teachers[1]			Other areas being taught by teachers in the 'reserve pool' as a % of all teachers[2]	
		Total	Are teaching in the area	*Are not teaching in the area (i.e. are in the 'reserve pool')*		
English	19.9	31.3	17.0	*14.2*	*History* *Mathematics* *Geography*	*2.2* *1.5* *1.0*
LOTE	5.2	8.2	4.5	*3.7*	*English* *History* *Mathematics*	*1.3* *0.6* *0.5*
Mathematics	20.9	29.3	16.8	*12.5*	*Science – General* *English* *Physics* *Chemistry*	*3.2* *1.5* *1.5* *1.4*
Biology	4.7	15.0	4.3	*10.8*	*Science – General* *Mathematics* *Chemistry*	*5.1* *3.5* *1.7*
Chemistry	4.4	13.5	4.0	*9.5*	*Science – General* *Mathematics* *Biology*	*4.7* *4.0* *1.6*
Physics	3.9	9.5	3.1	*6.4*	*Mathematics* *Science – General* *Chemistry*	*3.1* *2.5* *0.9*
Science General	14.5	26.2	12.0	*14.3*	*Mathematics* *English* *Physics*	*5.0* *1.2* *0.9*
Geography	8.8	15.5	5.3	*10.2*	*English* *History* *Mathematics*	*3.0* *1.5* *1.1*
History	12.6	24.1	9.4	*14.7*	*English* *Geography* *Mathematics*	*6.3* *1.2* *1.1*
Computing/IT	5.1	14.2	4.2	*10.1*	*Mathematics* *Science – General* *English*	*3.3* *1.4* *1.0*
VET	9.6	5.4	3.4	*2.0*	*Mathematics* *Science – General* *Wood or metal tech*	*0.3* *0.2* *0.2*
Special Needs	6.2	4.8	2.4	*2.3*	*English* *History* *Science – General*	*0.5* *0.3* *0.3*

Note: VET and Special Needs are not subject areas so respondents were not asked if they had teaching methodology in these areas. Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

1 Defined as those teachers who have completed at least a semester of second year tertiary study in the area or have received tertiary training in teaching methodology in the area.

2. The table shows only the three most frequent other areas of teaching for teachers in the 'reserve pool' in each area. Teachers can be teaching in more than one other area, and so the sum of all the other areas exceeds the proportion of teachers in the pool.

5. PROFESSIONAL LEARNING ACTIVITIES

This section presents information on teachers' professional learning (PL) in terms of the extent of participation, the proportions of teachers who engaged in PL activities, the perceived benefits of PL, and perceptions of the need for further PL. The focus is on the experiences of the teachers working in the specified curriculum areas.

5.1 Extent of participation in professional learning

Primary teachers indicated that they engaged in an average of 10 days PL in the past 12 months, and secondary teachers 8.2 days. The SiAS survey used a broad definition of PL and so this included formal and informal activities provided out-of-school and at school.

Table 5.1 indicates that primary teachers in Literacy, Numeracy and Special Needs reported higher participation in PL than primary teachers overall, by 2-3 days. This higher participation rate follows a similar pattern to that of 2010. LOTE teachers reported lower participation than primary teachers overall, on average, as was the case in 2010, while Computing/IT were at the average, slightly higher than was the case in 2010.

Table 5.1: Average number of days of professional learning in past 12 months: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Average no. days PL in past 12 months			
	2013	***SE***	**2010**	**2007**
Literacy	12.0	*1.5*	10.3	10.7
Numeracy	12.4	*1.6*	10.2	10.2
LOTE	8.8	*0.7*	7.0	10.4
Computing/IT	10.2	*1.3*	7.5	11.1
Special Needs	13.7	*1.7*	10.1	
All primary teachers	10.1	*0.4*	9.0	10

Note: Professional learning activities were defined as structured learning activities intended to develop the respondent's knowledge and skills as a teacher and leader. They include formal and informal activities provided out-of-school and at school. Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

At secondary level, Table 5.2 shows that the majority of teaching areas reported were at or above the average of 8.2 days. The exception was mathematics and the sciences: physics, chemistry and biology, which were lower than the average. The pattern is broadly similar to that of 2010, although overall, slightly more time was reported in 2013 across all subject areas.

Table 5.2: Average number of days of professional learning in past 12 months: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Average no. days PL in past 12 months			
	2013	*SE*	2010	2007
English	8.4	*0.2*	8.1	8.0
LOTE	9.0	*0.5*	8.6	8.2
Mathematics	7.7	*0.2*	7.4	7.6
Biology	7.5	*0.5*	6.8	7.4
Chemistry	6.9	*0.5*	6.7	8.1
Physics	7.3	*0.5*	7.2	8.7
Science – General	8.0	*0.3*	7.1	7.9
Geography	8.2	*0.4*	7.7	7.7
History	8.6	*0.4*	7.8	7.8
Computing/IT	8.3	*0.4*	8.4	8.9
VET	9.4	*0.5*	9.3	9.1
Special Needs	9.3	*0.7*	10.3	
All secondary teachers	8.2	*0.1*	7.6	9

Note: Professional learning activities were defined as structured learning activities intended to develop the respondent's knowledge and skills as a teacher and leader. They include formal and informal activities provided out-of-school and at school.

Table 5.3 indicates that about three-quarters of primary specialists in numeracy and computing/IT, and high proportions in literacy and special needs have engaged in professional learning within their area. These figures are higher than previously, however this is likely to be because previous figures would have included specialists who also undertook a generalist role, whereas in 2013, generalists with a dual role have been excluded.

Table 5.3: Proportions who have engaged in professional learning activities in the past 12 months, and who have >5 years teaching experience in the area: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in the area:	Have > 5 years teaching experience in the area (%)				Have done professional learning in the past 12 months in the area (%)			
	2013	*SE*	2010	2007	2013	*SE*	2010	2007
Literacy	82.3	*4.6*	56.2	56.2	83.9	*4.3*	63.9	69.3
Numeracy	68.0	*7.8*	48.9	51.8	72.7	*7.1*	52.8	57.7
LOTE	65.8	*7.5*	61.1	56.0	64.3	*7.5*	41.5	55.4
Computing/IT	71.0	*10.2*	48.5	48.6	76.9	*7.4*	36.5	48.6
Special Needs	83.2	*6.1*	61.0		84.9	*5.1*	54.7	

Note: Professional learning activities were defined as structured learning activities intended to develop the respondent's knowledge and skills as a teacher and leader. They include formal and informal activities provided out-of-school and at school. Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included in 2013). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

Table 5.4 shows considerable difference in the extent of PL activity in the area by secondary teachers currently teaching in the specified subject areas. Lower proportions of teachers in Geography, History and the sciences had undertaken PL in their field, which follows the 2010 pattern, although proportions are generally higher in 2013.

Table 5.4: Proportions who have engaged in professional learning activities in the past 12 months, and who have >5 years teaching experience in the area: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

Currently teaching in the	Have > 5 years teaching experience in the area (%)				Have done professional learning in the past 12 months in the area (%)			
area:	2013	*SE*	2010	2007	2013	*SE*	2010	2007
English	81.0	*1.4*	67.4	59.1	79.3	*1.3*	61.9	57.8
LOTE	72.1	*2.9*	74.3	65.3	70.4	*2.6*	63.3	61.5
Mathematics	74.8	*1.5*	70.3	67.2	74.4	*1.4*	50.1	58.2
Biology	57.4	*3.7*	68.8	60.0	55.7	*3.4*	34.1	37.1
Chemistry	58.3	*5.0*	74.3	58.1	56.8	*4.3*	32.4	42.7
Physics	60.4	*4.2*	70.7	61.2	59.2	*3.9*	31.5	41.8
Science – General	59.2	*2.4*	70.2	56.7	57.2	*2.2*	32.3	38.2
Geography	42.3	*2.9*	61.1	57.8	38.8	*2.6*	27.4	30.6
History	60.3	*2.6*	64.8	54.6	57.1	*2.3*	32.5	39.7
Computing	67.0	*4.9*	65.0	62.3	61.8	*4.3*	40.9	50.9
Information Tech	73.6	*3.3*	63.2	58.8	68.8	*3.1*	51.5	56.7
VET	84.7	*1.9*	65.7	52.7	83.9	*1.8*	59.0	63.6
Special Needs	75.3	*2.3*	63.2		72.0	*2.3*	52.8	

Note: Professional learning activities were defined as structured learning activities intended to develop the respondent's knowledge and skills as a teacher and leader. They include formal and informal activities provided out-of-school and at school.

5.2 Perceived benefits of professional learning

The main SiAS survey reported that primary teachers were generally more positive than secondary teachers in their assessments of the benefits of professional learning. This pattern was also reported in SiAS 2007 and SiAS 2010 across a different set of professional learning areas. Over one-half of primary teachers reported that their professional learning activities over the past 12 months had improved their capabilities to a moderate or major extent in 22 of the 23 areas assessed in the 2013 questionnaire, compared with in 13 of the 23 areas for secondary teachers. This section examines perceived benefits from the perspective of those teaching in the specified areas.

The Australian Professional Standards for Teachers (APST) cover three domains of teaching – Professional Knowledge; Professional Practice; and Professional Engagement – and comprise seven Standards. Professional learning activities in areas related to the Standards are reported in Table 5.5. Teachers were asked whether they had participated in learning activities concerned with 23 different aspects of teaching and whether the activities had been part of a tertiary qualification or through other (organised or self-directed) professional learning. As the aspects of teaching included in SiAS 2013 were selected to reflect the teaching standards developed by AITSL in 2011, the results cannot be compared with earlier SiAS surveys.

Some caution should be exercised when interpreting the data obtained from this question in 2013. While the questions appearing immediately prior and after this question were limited to the past 12 months, this question did not include a time limitation and the results, particularly the proportion of teachers who ticked 'tertiary', suggest that some teachers have included PD beyond the last 12 months.

Table 5.5 shows that teachers in the specified primary specialist areas participated in PL at the same rates, on average, as the general primary teacher population (shown in the final column).

Table 5.5: Professional learning participation: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

	Proportion of teachers in specified area who have undertaken specific PL activities					
Specific PL activities:	Literacy	Numeracy	LOTE	Computing / IT	Special Needs	All primary
1. Know students and how they learn						
Teaching students with a wide range of backgrounds and abilities	74.3	66.5	78.6	66.6	73.8	65.2
Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students	54.1	54.5	42.4	51.5	57.6	41.6
Supporting students with disabilities	77.2	70.9	66.0	64.6	90.0	58.3
2. Know the content and how to teach it						
Developing and teaching a unit of work	76.8	70.8	79.9	71.3	71.6	69.2
Developing subject content knowledge appropriate for school curriculum	79.9	74.8	74.0	77.9	77.3	72.2
Developing strategies for teaching numeracy	73.7	73.6	55.7	62.7	67.8	66.5
Developing strategies for teaching literacy	83.3	76.0	73.0	76.0	83.0	72.7
Making effective use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT)	68.2	62.5	76.6	76.4	70.2	68.0
3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning						
Learning about resources available for my teaching areas	76.3	68.6	75.0	69.9	75.7	63.8
Developing my skills in classroom communication	66.9	59.6	74.9	64.4	59.1	59.1
Learning how to evaluate and improve my own teaching	78.3	71.3	82.0	69.3	81.3	69.1
Involving parents/guardians in the educative process	64.5	57.7	64.6	54.7	72.6	50.9
4. Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments						
Managing classroom activities to keep students on task	66.1	56.4	67.7	66.1	57.7	60.2
Dealing with difficult student behaviour	74.5	68.4	68.8	61.5	80.3	61.7
5. Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning						
Making effective use of student assessment information	75.4	70.3	76.7	65.5	75.5	66.1
Ensuring that my assessments are consistent and comparable with those of other teachers	68.2	58.9	76.1	64.5	62.4	63.4
Interpreting achievement reports from national or statewide assessments	67.8	60.7	71.0	57.7	68.5	59.8
6. Engage in professional learning						
Developing my own literacy skills	63.3	51.2	65.2	58.8	59.6	53.1
Developing my own numeracy skills	55.0	48.5	46.8	51.4	41.5	48.3
7. Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and the community						
Meeting my professional and ethical responsibilities as a teacher	75.3	67.2	78.8	65.5	79.9	63.5
Complying with legislative, administrative and organisational requirements	73.4	68.0	73.3	69.9	77.3	59.8
Developing contacts with professional teaching networks	73.7	66.3	74.9	66.3	76.0	58.4
Engaging with performance and development plans	71.5	69.4	71.4	68.8	76.5	62.2

Note: Professional learning activities were defined as structured learning activities intended to develop the respondent's knowledge and skills as a teacher and leader. They include formal and informal activities provided out-of-school and at school. Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

Table 5.6 shows the perceived impact of PL; the extent to which teachers considered that activities in a given area increased their capacity (to a moderate or major extent). Caution should be exercised in reading these responses, as low impact could mean one of two things: either the PL did not greatly assist in improving capacity, or teachers felt that they were already highly capable in the area and so the impact of even excellent PL would have been viewed as minimal.

LOTE teachers were more positive than the average about areas of *2. Know the content and how to teach it*, *3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning*, and *5. Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning*. Computing/IT teachers were also more positive about areas 2 and 3. Over 80% of Literacy and Numeracy teachers, and all specialist areas were higher than the average for the impact of *'Learning about resources available for my teaching areas'* for increasing capacity.

'Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students' had a higher participation rate than the average for the specialist areas under consideration (Table 5.5), however the impact for those who participated was lower than the average for Literacy (22.5%), Numeracy (18%) and Special Needs (15%), and the average itself was the lowest recorded for any item (33%).

Table 5.6: Professional learning impact: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

	Extent to which PL activities engaged in over the past 12 months increased capacity: (% rating either 'Major extent' or 'Moderate extent')					
Specific PL activities:	Literacy	Numeracy	LOTE	Computing / IT	Special Needs	All primary
1. Know students and how they learn						
Teaching students with a wide range of backgrounds and abilities	62.2	55.8	79.4	60.2	69.4	62.1
Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students	22.5	17.8	45.4	34.8	14.8	33.2
Supporting students with disabilities	66.3	66.1	65.2	63.6	81.0	60.4
2. Know the content and how to teach it						
Developing and teaching a unit of work	59.0	57.6	77.1	66.6	46.9	68.4
Developing subject content knowledge appropriate for school curriculum	68.9	69.6	73.8	86.5	75.0	74.3
Developing strategies for teaching numeracy	70.9	74.3	64.0	67.3	65.5	69.1
Developing strategies for teaching literacy	82.5	76.0	67.6	81.9	75.8	74.0
Making effective use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT)	62.0	66.9	81.6	84.5	58.2	64.0
3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning						
Learning about resources available for my teaching areas	79.6	82.9	74.6	74.1	77.3	66.4
Developing my skills in classroom communication	58.2	53.8	70.7	78.8	48.4	62.1
Learning how to evaluate and improve my own teaching	60.4	57.6	73.1	60.4	57.0	64.9
Involving parents/guardians in the educative process	50.5	48.5	49.3	52.3	51.8	49.6
4. Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments						
Managing classroom activities to keep students on task	51.2	51.0	61.5	63.7	44.3	60.2
Dealing with difficult student behaviour	63.2	63.1	61.4	70.1	70.3	59.0
5. Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning						
Making effective use of student assessment information	66.1	63.2	74.2	70.5	67.6	67.6
Ensuring that my assessments are consistent and comparable with those of other teachers	68.7	66.4	84.5	66.9	53.1	67.3
Interpreting achievement reports from national or statewide assessments	51.5	46.3	66.5	61.7	34.9	57.6

Specific PL activities:	Extent to which PL activities engaged in over the past 12 months increased capacity: (% rating either 'Major extent' or 'Moderate extent')					
	Literacy	Numeracy	LOTE	Computing / IT	Special Needs	All primary
6. Engage in professional learning						
Developing my own literacy skills	55.4	46.0	67.3	58.6	38.1	60.6
Developing my own numeracy skills	47.5	42.5	59.4	57.3	46.3	60.3
7. Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and the community						
Meeting my professional and ethical responsibilities as a teacher	55.8	48.2	70.7	66.1	63.9	57.5
Complying with legislative, administrative and organisational requirements	55.2	53.8	63.3	66.2	64.7	53.1
Developing contacts with professional teaching networks	59.6	60.9	53.6	73.3	54.3	57.9
Engaging with performance and development plans	51.2	46.7	64.9	60.8	45.8	56.6

Note: Professional learning activities were defined as structured learning activities intended to develop the respondent's knowledge and skills as a teacher and leader. They include formal and informal activities provided out-of-school and at school. Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

Tables 5.7 and 5.8 provide information on the proportion of teachers in the specified secondary areas who have participated in PL. The proportions for each area are very similar to the overall proportions (reported in Table 5.8).

Table 5.7: Professional learning participation: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers, group A

Specific PL activities:	Proportion of teachers in specified area who have undertaken specific PL activities						
	English	**LOTE**	**Maths**	**Biology**	**Chemistry**	**Physics**	**Science General**
1. Know students and how they learn							
Teaching students with a wide range of backgrounds and abilities	74.0	69.5	70.3	70.6	64.7	68.0	70.9
Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students	44.5	31.0	36.1	36.7	41.2	35.9	41.0
Supporting students with disabilities	62.0	47.2	53.9	53.6	56.7	51.6	59.2
2. Know the content and how to teach it							
Developing and teaching a unit of work	79.7	76.2	75.2	75.0	76.4	76.2	78.2
Developing subject content knowledge appropriate for school curriculum	80.4	73.8	76.1	73.1	74.6	79.9	77.1
Developing strategies for teaching numeracy	34.1	33.7	69.6	46.9	55.3	54.3	56.1
Developing strategies for teaching literacy	76.1	56.3	55.3	59.4	64.4	60.0	64.0
Making effective use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT)	77.9	74.5	76.9	74.9	82.0	78.7	77.8
3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning							
Learning about resources available for my teaching areas	75.7	77.0	73.5	65.0	75.3	75.7	73.8
Developing my skills in classroom communication	68.4	66.6	66.3	63.4	64.6	69.9	66.4
Learning how to evaluate and improve my own teaching	77.9	73.8	74.3	69.2	72.7	72.7	74.3
Involving parents/guardians in the educative process	56.9	49.9	48.8	43.5	49.8	46.2	51.3

Specific PL activities:	Proportion of teachers in specified area who have undertaken specific PL activities						
	English	LOTE	Maths	Biology	Chemistry	Physics	Science General
4. Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments							
Managing classroom activities to keep students on task	70.7	69.1	66.8	66.5	70.6	68.2	70.9
Dealing with difficult student behaviour	70.5	65.2	66.5	66.9	71.1	67.9	70.5
5. Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning							
Making effective use of student assessment information	72.0	65.7	65.6	63.6	70.2	69.5	67.0
Ensuring that my assessments are consistent and comparable with those of other teachers	72.6	63.4	66.2	67.1	69.8	65.0	68.3
Interpreting achievement reports from national or statewide assessments	67.0	55.4	57.6	58.0	64.5	61.7	60.3
6. Engage in professional learning							
Developing my own literacy skills	58.5	43.4	39.0	40.9	43.6	41.1	45.9
Developing my own numeracy skills	27.7	24.9	47.4	41.2	40.2	38.1	42.5
7. Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and the community							
Meeting my professional and ethical responsibilities as a teacher	72.2	67.1	66.5	64.2	68.7	68.9	67.4
Complying with legislative, administrative and organisational requirements	69.2	63.7	64.2	64.6	68.5	68.9	67.3
Developing contacts with professional teaching networks	65.0	65.9	60.7	59.2	63.2	59.4	60.5
Engaging with performance and development plans	69.3	59.1	63.6	57.5	62.3	57.7	63.1

Note: Professional learning activities were defined as structured learning activities intended to develop the respondent's knowledge and skills as a teacher and leader. They include formal and informal activities provided out-of-school and at school.

Table 5.8: Professional learning participation: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers, group B

Specific PL activities:	Proportion of teachers in specified area who have undertaken specific PL activities					
	Geog-raphy	History	Comput-ing / IT	VET	Special Needs	All secondary
1. Know students and how they learn						
Teaching students with a wide range of backgrounds and abilities	73.3	73.4	68.2	75.7	83.2	68.7
Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students	46.5	47.2	44.9	53.0	52.6	40.2
Supporting students with disabilities	64.3	62.5	61.3	69.3	82.6	56.8
2. Know the content and how to teach it						
Developing and teaching a unit of work	78.7	79.0	76.5	81.0	79.8	74.4
Developing subject content knowledge appropriate for school curriculum	78.8	79.5	80.7	82.5	79.3	75.3
Developing strategies for teaching numeracy	44.5	39.7	54.1	58.4	60.3	45.9
Developing strategies for teaching literacy	70.6	71.0	69.0	72.7	77.1	62.5
Making effective use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT)	79.6	78.8	83.9	83.2	80.9	75.3
3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning						
Learning about resources available for my teaching areas	76.8	76.1	77.6	79.8	79.1	72.3
Developing my skills in classroom communication	70.6	69.1	69.3	72.4	69.8	65.4
Learning how to evaluate and improve my own teaching	78.8	77.5	74.4	78.6	80.6	72.7
Involving parents/guardians in the educative process	58.8	57.5	49.5	61.1	68.1	50.7

Specific PL activities:	Proportion of teachers in specified area who have undertaken specific PL activities					
	Geog-raphy	History	Comput-ing / IT	VET	Special Needs	All secondary
4. Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments						
Managing classroom activities to keep students on task	71.8	71.1	68.5	71.4	75.4	66.3
Dealing with difficult student behaviour	71.7	69.0	68.8	72.6	78.8	65.6
5. Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning						
Making effective use of student assessment information	69.5	69.0	67.1	72.3	71.2	64.9
Ensuring that my assessments are consistent and comparable with those of other teachers	71.5	70.7	64.0	75.1	67.6	65.6
Interpreting achievement reports from national or statewide assessments	67.4	65.9	57.5	67.2	66.0	58.5
6. Engage in professional learning						
Developing my own literacy skills	57.3	55.5	48.6	60.9	56.7	47.8
Developing my own numeracy skills	38.0	32.9	39.4	50.4	47.5	35.5
7. Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and the community						
Meeting my professional and ethical responsibilities as a teacher	72.2	71.5	67.9	75.1	77.9	67.5
Complying with legislative, administrative and organisational requirements	69.9	67.6	67.2	77.4	76.2	65.7
Developing contacts with professional teaching networks	66.7	65.7	68.6	76.7	73.3	63.5
Engaging with performance and development plans	69.1	68.8	65.9	76.2	72.1	64.4

Note: Professional learning activities were defined as structured learning activities intended to develop the respondent's knowledge and skills as a teacher and leader. They include formal and informal activities provided out-of-school and at school.

Tables 5.9 and 5.10 indicate the perceived impact of PL: the extent to which secondary teachers in the specified areas considered that activities in a given area increased their capacity (to a moderate or major extent). Secondary teachers as a whole were less positive about the benefits of their PL than primary teachers, and secondary teachers in the Sciences were less positive than teachers in other areas, as was the case (albeit with different questions) in 2007 and 2010.

The one area excepted from this was *'Making effective use of ICT'*, for which teachers in all areas recorded about the same impact as the average (about 65%). *'Developing and teaching a unit of work'* and *'Developing subject content knowledge appropriate for school curriculum'* also recorded impacts closer to the average across all areas. Teachers of English, LOTE, Geography and History were more positive about their PL in *2. Know the content and how to teach it* and most areas of *3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning*.

As was the case at primary level, *'Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students'* had the lowest level of impact on average across all PL areas (31%), although most specified areas had an impact of about the same proportion as the average.

Table 5.9: Professional learning impact: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers, group A

	Extent to which PL activities engaged in over the past 12 months increased capacity: (% rating either 'Major extent' or 'Moderate extent')						
Specific PL activities:	**English**	**LOTE**	**Maths**	**Biology**	**Chemistry**	**Physics**	**Science General**
1. Know students and how they learn							
Teaching students with a wide range of backgrounds and abilities	57.2	55.2	47.7	53.9	43.6	42.1	47.8
Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students	35.4	37.2	32.3	37.1	30.1	21.4	25.5
Supporting students with disabilities	50.6	54.2	42.2	39.4	43.4	36.6	42.8
2. Know the content and how to teach it							
Developing and teaching a unit of work	67.9	69.4	57.2	58.2	56.8	56.8	61.4
Developing subject content knowledge appropriate for school curriculum	73.9	73.0	62.2	62.0	57.8	60.7	63.5
Developing strategies for teaching numeracy	33.5	38.1	48.6	40.1	33.3	40.2	46.2
Developing strategies for teaching literacy	65.0	57.9	42.0	39.9	38.0	39.9	47.5
Making effective use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT)	64.6	73.7	61.1	63.0	65.2	61.9	65.3
3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning							
Learning about resources available for my teaching areas	65.9	71.8	58.2	61.1	54.9	50.5	58.1
Developing my skills in classroom communication	59.9	63.4	48.1	51.4	46.5	42.0	51.0
Learning how to evaluate and improve my own teaching	61.7	63.1	51.4	52.2	44.7	48.5	51.5
Involving parents/guardians in the educative process	47.3	49.3	38.7	36.2	39.0	42.5	39.1
4. Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments							
Managing classroom activities to keep students on task	58.1	58.1	47.6	48.7	44.1	38.6	49.3
Dealing with difficult student behaviour	54.1	54.1	44.7	45.4	38.1	33.4	45.1
5. Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning							
Making effective use of student assessment information	60.1	57.5	46.8	46.2	41.2	47.5	46.4
Ensuring that my assessments are consistent and comparable with those of other teachers	63.1	60.4	51.5	49.6	47.9	45.5	49.4
Interpreting achievement reports from national or statewide assessments	55.8	54.6	43.9	44.8	46.7	39.7	46.8
6. Engage in professional learning							
Developing my own literacy skills	55.5	49.2	44.0	43.8	48.8	39.8	49.2
Developing my own numeracy skills	33.2	39.9	48.3	39.1	40.0	34.9	43.5
7. Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and the community							
Meeting my professional and ethical responsibilities as a teacher	54.5	53.8	44.1	41.7	40.1	38.5	45.7
Complying with legislative, administrative and organisational requirements	53.2	52.9	40.2	39.1	37.1	34.8	43.7
Developing contacts with professional teaching networks	53.3	56.5	43.5	48.4	43.4	37.6	45.4
Engaging with performance and development plans	54.7	53.7	39.7	40.0	40.4	43.0	44.6

Note: Professional learning activities were defined as structured learning activities intended to develop the respondent's knowledge and skills as a teacher and leader. They include formal and informal activities provided out-of-school and at school.

Table 5.10: Professional learning impact: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers, group B

Specific PL activities:	Extent to which PL activities engaged in over the past 12 months increased capacity: (% rating either 'Major extent' or 'Moderate extent')					
	Geog-raphy	History	Comput-ing / IT	VET	Special Needs	All secondary
1. Know students and how they learn						
Teaching students with a wide range of backgrounds and abilities	56.9	56.8	49.4	54.2	66.5	52.4
Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students	32.2	33.3	31.9	33.5	40.9	31.4
Supporting students with disabilities	50.2	49.1	47.7	45.2	73.8	47.8
2. Know the content and how to teach it						
Developing and teaching a unit of work	68.7	69.3	59.2	63.8	56.1	63.0
Developing subject content knowledge appropriate for school curriculum	72.0	77.2	62.2	69.1	62.4	68.4
Developing strategies for teaching numeracy	43.5	37.1	41.4	45.1	39.7	41.5
Developing strategies for teaching literacy	62.6	57.6	51.5	54.7	59.4	53.5
Making effective use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT)	68.9	67.9	70.2	67.1	66.0	65.5
3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning						
Learning about resources available for my teaching areas	68.0	70.6	67.0	64.1	63.9	63.7
Developing my skills in classroom communication	60.7	62.1	56.7	56.9	61.5	55.3
Learning how to evaluate and improve my own teaching	59.5	61.3	57.8	56.9	57.5	57.5
Involving parents/guardians in the educative process	46.1	45.2	40.4	43.0	51.4	42.4
4. Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments						
Managing classroom activities to keep students on task	57.1	55.3	48.7	51.4	53.2	52.9
Dealing with difficult student behaviour	51.6	50.1	47.2	46.2	54.9	47.3
5. Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning						
Making effective use of student assessment information	58.0	55.4	53.0	51.7	57.0	52.7
Ensuring that my assessments are consistent and comparable with those of other teachers	62.6	60.9	52.2	59.1	55.1	56.6
Interpreting achievement reports from national or statewide assessments	56.0	56.0	53.9	54.9	52.2	50.1
6. Engage in professional learning						
Developing my own literacy skills	54.4	51.9	44.8	46.9	56.3	48.8
Developing my own numeracy skills	42.3	35.0	37.1	40.5	42.5	40.1
7. Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and the community						
Meeting my professional and ethical responsibilities as a teacher	50.6	50.4	45.0	46.1	54.7	48.9
Complying with legislative, administrative and organisational requirements	48.9	49.7	49.9	52.2	54.0	48.4
Developing contacts with professional teaching networks	52.0	49.9	60.2	64.4	50.1	52.7
Engaging with performance and development plans	51.6	55.0	49.1	53.0	50.0	49.2

Note: Professional learning activities were defined as structured learning activities intended to develop the respondent's knowledge and skills as a teacher and leader. They include formal and informal activities provided out-of-school and at school.

5.3 Perceived needs for professional learning

Table 5.11 shows the proportions of teachers who indicated that they would like more opportunities for PL. The area receiving the highest proportion of primary teachers on average was *'Making effective use of ICT'* (51%) and for all specified specialist areas except LOTE, the proportions who wanted more PL in this area were higher (Literacy, Numeracy and Special Needs were about 60%). The area *'Learning about resources available for my teaching areas'* and *'Dealing with difficult student behaviour'* also received higher proportions across the specialist areas (about 50% and 45% respectively) than general primary (30.5% and 35.4% respectively).

Very few respondents considered they had a need to develop their own literacy or numeracy skills, and this was also the case for *'Meeting my professional and ethical responsibilities as a teacher'* and *'Complying with legislative, administrative and organisational requirements'*.

Proportions indicating a need for more PL in 'Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students' were higher than the average in all cases except LOTE.

Table 5.11: Perceived needs for more professional learning: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

	Areas in which you feel you need more opportunities for PL: (% rating 'Yes')					
Specific PL activities:	Literacy	Numeracy	LOTE	Computing / IT	Special Needs	All primary
1. Know students and how they learn						
Teaching students with a wide range of backgrounds and abilities	38.7	36.2	38.6	24.4	32.9	32.3
Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students	35.4	28.6	12.6	25.6	28.5	21.0
Supporting students with disabilities	43.5	39.0	44.0	31.7	51.0	35.7
2. Know the content and how to teach it						
Developing and teaching a unit of work	23.8	23.2	14.8	13.0	19.2	15.9
Developing subject content knowledge appropriate for school curriculum	24.6	25.5	31.9	35.7	23.4	24.4
Developing strategies for teaching numeracy	31.1	31.4	20.6	15.6	28.5	26.0
Developing strategies for teaching literacy	30.0	30.4	25.7	22.9	25.5	26.4
Making effective use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT)	60.2	60.4	48.9	54.7	63.2	51.2
3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning						
Learning about resources available for my teaching areas	49.7	51.3	42.0	53.0	49.5	30.5
Developing my skills in classroom communication	33.5	28.8	16.6	33.4	28.0	14.2
Learning how to evaluate and improve my own teaching	35.4	38.1	14.2	24.7	32.5	22.0
Involving parents/guardians in the educative process	19.4	19.8	17.5	7.4	16.1	16.6
4. Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments						
Managing classroom activities to keep students on task	28.1	28.2	22.3	19.8	34.5	19.3
Dealing with difficult student behaviour	48.2	50.1	40.9	46.9	43.2	35.4
5. Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning						
Making effective use of student assessment information	32.1	35.9	18.2	24.5	26.6	28.7
Ensuring that my assessments are consistent and comparable with those of other teachers	33.6	34.7	27.6	29.2	24.8	26.1
Interpreting achievement reports from national or statewide assessments	29.2	29.1	35.1	33.5	23.4	20.7

Specific PL activities:	Areas in which you feel you need more opportunities for PL: (% rating 'Yes')					
	Literacy	Numeracy	LOTE	Computing / IT	Special Needs	All primary
6. Engage in professional learning						
Developing my own literacy skills	9.6	11.2	7.3	13.6	3.8	9.5
Developing my own numeracy skills	10.5	13.8	5.8	6.7	4.7	9.1
7. Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and the community						
Meeting my professional and ethical responsibilities as a teacher	12.2	14.0	8.6	10.9	10.7	6.7
Complying with legislative, administrative and organisational requirements	16.1	16.7	8.6	14.3	15.4	11.2
Developing contacts with professional teaching networks	26.0	26.2	27.6	28.1	30.3	20.5
Engaging with performance and development plans	27.3	31.0	21.7	25.7	29.4	19.5

Note: Professional learning activities were defined as structured learning activities intended to develop the respondent's knowledge and skills as a teacher and leader. They include formal and informal activities provided out-of-school and at school. Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

Tables 5.12 and 5.13 detail perceived needs for more PL for secondary teachers in the specified areas. The most commonly requested areas were *'Making effective use of ICT'* (48.3%), *'Teaching students with a wide range of backgrounds and abilities'* (33.9%), *'Dealing with difficult student behaviour'* (30.7%) and *'Supporting students with disabilities'* (29.7%). About the same proportions of teachers in the specified areas identified these areas as in secondary teachers generally. There was no noticeable difference in preferences across the sciences.

As with primary teachers, very few respondents considered they had a need to develop their own literacy or numeracy skills, or for PL around *'Meeting my professional and ethical responsibilities as a teacher'* and *'Complying with legislative, administrative and organisational requirements'*.

Table 5.12: Perceived needs for more professional learning: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers, group A

Specific PL activities:	Areas in which you feel you need more opportunities for PL: (% rating 'Yes')						
	English	**LOTE**	**Maths**	**Biology**	**Chemistry**	**Physics**	**Science General**
1. Know students and how they learn							
Teaching students with a wide range of backgrounds and abilities	38.0	34.8	35.6	32.8	36.3	34.9	38.2
Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students	27.3	19.5	18.3	18.6	21.0	16.9	21.2
Supporting students with disabilities	35.0	25.8	27.1	27.2	31.5	23.7	32.7
2. Know the content and how to teach it							
Developing and teaching a unit of work	18.4	18.7	16.4	16.7	23.4	18.8	19.9
Developing subject content knowledge appropriate for school curriculum	25.1	20.7	20.2	19.7	19.3	25.8	22.7
Developing strategies for teaching numeracy	15.9	13.1	25.5	20.8	19.8	20.9	26.1
Developing strategies for teaching literacy	29.3	19.9	17.2	17.9	24.8	22.8	25.5
Making effective use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT)	49.7	51.4	46.7	44.6	51.9	51.2	49.3

Specific PL activities:	Areas in which you feel you need more opportunities for PL: (% rating 'Yes') English	LOTE	Maths	Biology	Chemistry	Physics	Science General
3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning							
Learning about resources available for my teaching areas	35.1	34.4	38.2	33.0	37.0	43.8	39.5
Developing my skills in classroom communication	13.9	17.4	15.7	14.1	16.0	20.2	17.7
Learning how to evaluate and improve my own teaching	21.7	23.0	23.9	20.8	24.2	26.3	26.1
Involving parents/guardians in the educative process	19.8	21.5	17.8	20.7	20.6	20.5	23.4
4. Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments							
Managing classroom activities to keep students on task	24.1	27.3	28.0	28.1	27.0	27.1	29.3
Dealing with difficult student behaviour	29.5	33.7	35.9	33.3	31.4	34.1	36.2
5. Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning							
Making effective use of student assessment information	26.4	23.6	24.9	24.9	24.2	29.0	29.9
Ensuring that my assessments are consistent and comparable with those of other teachers	21.4	13.8	15.2	22.9	20.8	19.9	21.1
Interpreting achievement reports from national or statewide assessments	25.3	19.1	17.6	16.1	23.4	25.1	22.0
6. Engage in professional learning							
Developing my own literacy skills	12.2	6.9	9.0	7.9	9.1	11.0	10.8
Developing my own numeracy skills	10.7	6.8	7.9	7.7	6.4	7.6	9.0
7. Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and the community							
Meeting my professional and ethical responsibilities as a teacher	6.0	3.5	5.6	6.5	7.4	5.4	5.4
Complying with legislative, administrative and organisational requirements	12.3	10.9	9.2	7.9	11.6	7.4	10.0
Developing contacts with professional teaching networks	23.2	15.7	20.4	20.1	29.0	28.3	26.4
Engaging with performance and development plans	20.9	16.7	19.7	17.7	22.4	19.1	24.1

Note: Professional learning activities were defined as structured learning activities intended to develop the respondent's knowledge and skills as a teacher and leader. They include formal and informal activities provided out-of-school and at school.

Table 5.13: Professional learning impact: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers, group B

Specific PL activities:	Areas in which you feel you need more opportunities for PL: (% rating 'Yes') Geog-raphy	History	Comput-ing / IT	VET	Special Needs	All secondary
1. Know students and how they learn						
Teaching students with a wide range of backgrounds and abilities	40.7	41.6	33.9	30.3	34.5	33.9
Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students	23.7	25.4	20.4	20.1	30.7	20.4
Supporting students with disabilities	33.1	35.4	36.9	27.5	43.4	29.7
2. Know the content and how to teach it						
Developing and teaching a unit of work	21.1	19.4	17.8	17.7	15.5	16.8
Developing subject content knowledge appropriate for school curriculum	24.2	26.1	28.1	25.9	20.0	22.0
Developing strategies for teaching numeracy	19.3	18.3	21.4	20.9	25.4	17.7
Developing strategies for teaching literacy	27.4	28.2	23.4	25.6	25.1	21.8
Making effective use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT)	49.8	50.8	43.9	48.1	51.1	48.3

Specific PL activities:	Areas in which you feel you need more opportunities for PL: (% rating 'Yes')					
	Geog-raphy	**History**	**Comput-ing / IT**	**VET**	**Special Needs**	**All secondary**
3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning						
Learning about resources available for my teaching areas	40.5	37.5	37.6	35.3	38.0	35.8
Developing my skills in classroom communication	13.6	15.6	17.7	11.0	11.8	14.2
Learning how to evaluate and improve my own teaching	25.4	24.3	24.9	22.7	20.0	22.8
Involving parents/guardians in the educative process	22.7	20.4	22.4	23.9	18.3	19.2
4. Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments						
Managing classroom activities to keep students on task	24.6	23.4	27.9	23.5	20.3	23.0
Dealing with difficult student behaviour	30.8	33.1	37.6	31.4	38.4	30.7
5. Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning						
Making effective use of student assessment information	28.2	28.0	22.4	20.9	26.2	24.6
Ensuring that my assessments are consistent and comparable with those of other teachers	24.1	21.1	18.5	18.3	16.7	18.3
Interpreting achievement reports from national or statewide assessments	20.6	23.0	12.9	20.0	20.0	19.8
6. Engage in professional learning						
Developing my own literacy skills	10.8	10.5	10.8	12.3	8.4	9.7
Developing my own numeracy skills	8.0	10.0	9.1	8.9	11.1	8.0
7. Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and the community						
Meeting my professional and ethical responsibilities as a teacher	6.5	6.4	8.0	7.8	6.5	5.8
Complying with legislative, administrative and organisational requirements	13.2	11.0	15.3	15.9	13.9	11.3
Developing contacts with professional teaching networks	26.3	23.9	30.5	24.4	24.3	22.9
Engaging with performance and development plans	24.8	21.0	21.0	21.3	21.0	20.1

Note: Professional learning activities were defined as structured learning activities intended to develop the respondent's knowledge and skills as a teacher and leader. They include formal and informal activities provided out-of-school and at school.

6. EMPLOYMENT BASIS AND WORKLOAD

This section presents information on teachers' employment (time fraction and contractual basis) and workload (hours per week on all school-related activities). The focus is on the experiences of the teachers working in the specified curriculum areas.

6.1 Basis of employment

Full-time employment is the most common time fraction for both primary teachers (73.0%) and secondary teachers (80.5%). However, the main SiAS report noted that there are some notable gender differences in time fractions: in both primary and secondary schools females are much more likely to be employed part-time than are male teachers.

Table 6.1 examines the extent to which primary teachers currently working in the five specified areas were employed full-time. The proportion of LOTE teachers employed full-time increased by 11.1 percentage points between 2010 and 2013, while the proportion of primary teachers employed full-time in the remaining four areas declined across the three surveys. The lower figures in 2013 may be due to the narrower definition of specialist teachers in the 2013 survey, which does not include specialists who also have a general classroom teacher role (see Chapter 1). In 2013, the proportions of teachers working in LOTE (57.1%), Literacy (59.6%), and Special Needs (63.0%) that were employed full-time were lower than for primary teachers overall (73.0%). In contrast, the proportions of teachers working in Computing/IT (68.2%) and Numeracy (73.5%) that were full-time were similar to primary teachers overall.

Table 6.1: Proportion employed full-time: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Proportion of teachers employed full-time (%)			
	2013	***SE***	**2010**	**2007**
Literacy	59.6	*4.6*	74.8	78.0
Numeracy	73.5	*5.4*	78.3	81.4
LOTE	57.1	*9.0*	46.0	48.7
Computing	68.2	*9.6*	75.9	81.9
Special Needs	63.0	*7.0*	73.3	
All primary teachers	73.0	*1.3*	77.1	73

Note: Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included in 2013). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

These different patterns of employment are likely to relate both to the nature of the specialist role, and the gender of the teachers who usually take those roles. For example, primary schools may not be able to sustain a full-time LOTE teacher due both to their relatively small size and the fact that LOTE may only be taught in a few year levels, while areas like Numeracy and Computing are more likely to be taught across all year levels and therefore necessitate a full-time teacher at any one school.

The data in Table 6.1 are also likely to be influenced by gender differences in the proportion who work full-time. As noted in Section 3, almost all LOTE primary teachers are females (the specialist area with the lowest proportion of full-time teachers), whereas the highest proportion of males are found in Numeracy and Computing/IT (the specialist areas which also have the highest proportions of full-time teachers).

Table 6.2 examines the extent to which secondary teachers in the specified areas are employed full-time. In 10 of the 12 areas there are higher proportions working full-time than among secondary teachers as a whole (80.5%). LOTE (71.5%) and Special Needs (73.2%) are the exception, although the differences are not as marked as in primary schools: the larger size of secondary schools and the fact that most curriculum areas are taught across several year levels if not all means that full-time employment is more common than in primary education.

Table 6.2: Proportion employed full-time: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Proportion of teachers employed full-time (%)			
	2013	*SE*	2010	2007
English	83.0	*1.1*	84.2	86.1
LOTE	71.5	*3.0*	74.1	73.0
Mathematics	84.5	*1.2*	84.6	87.0
Biology	88.1	*2.1*	87.4	85.5
Chemistry	90.9	*1.5*	87.5	89.4
Physics	90.7	*2.2*	88.0	90.8
Science – General	87.2	*1.2*	84.3	89.6
Geography	83.3	*1.8*	85.7	90.9
History	85.2	*1.6*	86.3	91.2
Computing/IT	89.0	*1.7*	87.5	89.3
VET	87.1	*1.5*	86.3	83.0
Special Needs	73.2	*2.7*	77.7	
All secondary teachers	80.5	*0.8*	82.4	82

Note: Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

Information on the proportions of teachers employed on an on-going or contractual basis is shown in Table 6.3 (primary teachers) and Table 6.4 (secondary). The overall proportions of primary and secondary teachers employed on an on-going basis are similar to the results reported in 2010. Most teachers are employed on an on-going/permanent basis, and this is more common among secondary (85.8%) than primary teachers (77.6%). Conversely, a higher proportion of primary teachers are employed on contracts of 3 years or less (19.1%) than are secondary teachers (11.9%). The more extensive use of part-time employment and contract work among primary teachers suggests that their career path is likely to differ from secondary teachers.

Table 6.3: Proportion employed on an on-going or contractual basis: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Type of position							
	On-going/ permanent		Contract: <1 year		Contract: 1-3 years		Contract: >3 years	Casual/ relief
	%	*SE*	%	*SE*	%	*SE*	%	%
Literacy	84.6	*3.9*	8.9	*3.0*	6.1	*2.1*	0.4	--
Numeracy	83.8	*4.4*	9.6	*3.8*	6.0	*2.3*	0.5	--
LOTE	77.8	*4.0*	10.5	*4.4*	9.0	*2.6*	2.2	0.5
Computing/IT	78.5	*8.8*	6.6	*5.2*	14.9	*8.6*	--	--
Special Needs	89.6	*4.4*	9.1	*4.4*	1.2	*1.0*	--	--
All primary teachers	77.6	*1.1*	8.2	*0.8*	10.9	*0.9*	1.4	1.8

Note: Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included in 2013). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

Table 6.3 examines whether the likelihood of on-going employment differs among primary teachers working in the five specified areas. The proportions of LOTE (77.8%) and Computing/IT (78.5) teachers who are employed on an on-going basis are similar to primary teachers overall (77.6%). In contrast, higher proportions of teachers in Special Needs (89.6%),

Literacy (84.6%), and Numeracy (83.8%) are employed on an on-going basis. Between 2010 and 2013, the overall proportion of primary teachers employed on an on-going basis remained stable, but within each of the five specified areas the proportions employed on an on-going basis increased.

At secondary school level, Table 6.4 shows that slightly higher than average proportions of teachers in the areas of Physics (92.3%), Chemistry (92.1%), VET (90.0%), and Biology (88.9%) are employed on an on-going basis. Conversely, the proportion of Special Needs teachers (78.6%) who are employed on an on-going basis is lower than for secondary teachers overall (85.8%).

Table 6.4: Proportion employed on an on-going or contractual basis: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

	Type of position (%)							
Currently teaching in area:	**On-going/ permanent**		**Contract: <1 year**		**Contract: 1-3 years**		**Contract: >3 years**	**Casual/ relief**
	%	***SE***	**%**	***SE***	**%**	***SE***	**%**	**%**
English	84.9	*1.0*	6.0	*0.6*	7.5	*0.8*	0.7	1.0
LOTE	82.8	*2.8*	7.5	*1.7*	5.2	*1.2*	1.7	2.8
Mathematics	86.2	*1.1*	4.7	*0.6*	7.0	*0.8*	0.5	1.5
Biology	88.9	*2.1*	4.5	*1.3*	4.2	*1.4*	0.9	1.5
Chemistry	92.1	*1.8*	2.8	*1.2*	3.5	*1.1*	1.4	0.2
Physics	92.3	*1.7*	1.2	*0.5*	4.9	*1.3*	0.6	1.0
Science – General	85.2	*1.4*	5.8	*0.9*	6.0	*0.8*	0.9	2.1
Geography	83.0	*2.2*	7.0	*0.3*	8.3	*1.7*	0.6	1.1
History	84.2	*1.6*	7.4	*1.1*	7.0	*1.0*	0.8	0.6
Computing/IT	88.3	*2.0*	3.4	*1.2*	5.7	*1.4*	0.3	2.3
VET	90.0	*1.3*	4.2	*0.8*	3.9	*0.8*	1.0	0.9
Special Needs	78.6	*2.4*	9.5	*1.8*	8.7	*1.8*	1.5	1.8
All secondary teachers	85.8	*0.6*	5.4	*0.4*	6.5	*0.4*	0.9	1.5

Note: Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

6.2 Workload

Information on teachers' workloads is shown in Table 6.5 (primary teachers) and Table 6.6 (secondary). The data are reported only for full-time teachers because the time fractions worked by part-time teachers vary so widely.

On average, full-time primary school teachers report that they spent 47.9 hours per week on all school-related activities, and secondary teachers an average of 47.6 hours per week, in both cases slightly higher than in 2010 but similar to or slightly lower than in 2007. The Main Report noted that within this total workload, full-time primary teachers reported an average of 23.8 hours per week of face-to-face teaching in 2013, and secondary teachers 19.6 hours.

Table 6.5 shows that the number of hours worked by teachers in each of the specified areas declined across surveys. In 2010, in four of the five specified primary areas teachers reported working much the same hours per week as primary teachers overall, while LOTE teachers worked fewer hours. By 2013, however, teachers in all five areas reported working fewer hours per week than primary teachers overall. The average number of hours worked by teachers in the specialist areas ranged from 36.3 hours (Special Needs) to 44.0 (Computing/IT), compared with 47.9 hours for primary teachers overall.

Table 6.5: Hours per week on all school-related activities by full-time teachers: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	In a typical week how long do you spend on all school-related activities? Average no. hours			
	2013	*SE*	2010	2007
Literacy	41.2	*1.7*	44.8	49.7
Numeracy	42.3	*1.9*	45.2	50.0
LOTE	38.7	*1.6*	41.2	45.7
Computing	44.0	*3.6*	45.8	51.7
Special Needs	36.3	*2.6*	45.5	
All primary teachers	47.9	*0.6*	45.8	48

Note: Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included in 2013). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

Table 6.6 shows that at secondary school level there are only small differences in the average number of hours reported by teachers in the various curriculum areas and secondary teachers overall, with average hours ranging from 44.0 hours (LOTE) to 47.8 hours (VET). Hours are slightly lower than average in LOTE, Mathematics, the sciences, Computing/IT, and Special Needs (44.0-45.8 hours), while hours in English, Geography, History, and VET (47.4-47.8 hours) are similar to secondary teachers overall (47.6 hours). The lack of marked differences suggests that the different areas are structured in broadly similar ways within secondary schools.

Table 6.6: Hours per week on all school-related activities by full-time teachers: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	In a typical week how long do you spend on all school-related activities? Average no. hours			
	2013	*SE*	2010	2007
English	47.4	*0.5*	46.6	49.6
LOTE	44.0	*0.9*	46.1	48.0
Mathematics	45.0	*0.4*	46.2	49.6
Biology	45.5	*0.7*	46.7	49.2
Chemistry	45.7	*0.8*	46.6	49.8
Physics	44.9	*0.9*	45.4	51.0
Science – General	45.3	*0.5*	45.5	48.8
Geography	47.4	*0.8*	46.1	50.5
History	47.6	*0.7*	46.9	49.7
Computing/IT	45.7	*0.9*	46.4	50.7
VET	47.8	*0.6*	46.6	49.4
Special Needs	45.8	*0.9*	44.1	
All secondary teachers	47.6	*0.3*	46.0	49

Note: Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

7. CAREER PATHS

This section presents information on the teaching experience and career paths of the teachers working in the specified curriculum areas.

7.1 Age started teaching

The Main Report noted that the majority of teachers had started teaching by the age of 25 years (73.3% of primary teachers and 70.0% of secondary teachers), indicating that most people start their teaching career quite young. On average, secondary teachers were slightly older (26.0 years) than primary teachers (25.3 years) when they started teaching, as was the case in 2007 and 2010.

Tables 7.1 and 7.2 indicate that there are only small differences in the average age at which teachers in the specified curriculum areas started teaching. The average age of teachers when they commenced teaching ranged from 24.4-25.5 years for primary teachers in the specified areas, and 25.9-26.9 years for secondary teachers. At primary school level in 2013, primary Literacy teachers were 0.9 younger on average when they started teaching than primary teachers overall, whereas in 2007 LOTE teachers were 2.0 years older on average than primary teachers overall (Table 7.1). At secondary level, VET, Physics, LOTE, Chemistry, and Mathematics teachers started at a slightly older age on average than secondary teachers overall, which is somewhat similar to the patterns in 2007 and 2010 (Table 7.2). It is possible that such teachers were more likely to enter teaching after experience in another occupation than secondary teachers overall.

Table 7.1: Average age started teaching: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Average age started teaching (years)			
	2013	***SE***	**2010**	**2007**
Literacy	24.4	*0.5*	24.6	23.4
Numeracy	24.7	*0.6*	25.0	23.8
LOTE	25.5	*1.1*	25.1	25.5
Computing	24.6	*1.0*	24.2	23.6
Special Needs	24.6	*0.7*	25.5	
All primary teachers	25.3	*0.2*	24.9	23.5

Note: Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included in 2013). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

Table 7.2: Average age started teaching: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Average age started teaching (years)			
	2013	*SE*	2010	2007
English	25.9	*0.2*	26.0	25.1
LOTE	26.7	*0.5*	27.1	25.6
Mathematics	26.4	*0.2*	25.8	25.1
Biology	25.9	*0.4*	26.5	25.1
Chemistry	26.7	*0.5*	26.7	25.7
Physics	26.8	*0.5*	26.8	25.3
Science – General	26.4	*0.3*	26.4	25.5
Geography	26.2	*0.3*	26.3	24.6
History	26.3	*0.4*	26.1	25.0
Computing/IT	26.8	*0.7*	26.5	26.3
VET	26.9	*0.4*	27.1	26.1
Special Needs	26.5	*0.5*	25.6	
All secondary teachers	26.0	*0.1*	25.8	25.0

Note: Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

7.2 Length of teaching experience

In 2007, both primary and secondary teachers had been teaching for 17 years, on average. In 2010 and 2013, however, the average length of experience of primary teachers was lower than for secondary teachers. For example, in 2013 the average length of teaching experience was 16.1 years for primary teachers (lower than in 2007) and 17.3 years for secondary teachers (slightly higher than in 2007) (Table 7.3 and Table 7.4).

At the primary school level in the specified areas, the average length of teaching experience ranged from 15.9 years (Numeracy teachers) to 18.8 years (LOTE teachers) (Table 7.3). This reflects the average age of teachers in each of the specified areas: Numeracy teachers have the youngest average age, while LOTE teachers have the oldest average age, as reported in Section 3.

Table 7.3: Average length of teaching experience: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Average length of teaching experience (years)			
	2013	*SE*	2010	2007
Literacy	18.0	*1.9*	14.8	16.4
Numeracy	15.9	*2.1*	12.7	14.8
LOTE	18.8	*2.0*	13.9	15.4
Computing/IT	17.5	*3.0*	13.0	15.2
Special Needs	18.4	*2.3*	15.3	
All primary teachers	16.1	*0.4*	15.9	17

Note: Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included in 2013). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

At the secondary school level in the specified areas, the average length of teaching experience ranged from 15.2 years (Biology teachers) to 19.2 years (Physics teachers) (Table 7.4), again reflecting the average age of teachers in each of the specified areas. (Biology teachers have the youngest average age, while Physics teachers have the second oldest average age, as reported in Section 3). In 2013, teachers of Physics, Special Needs, and Mathematics had slightly more teaching experience on average than secondary teachers overall, while teachers of Biology, Geography, Science – General, History, English, and LOTE had slightly less teaching experience

on average. Broadly similar patterns were evident in 2007 and 2010 for most of the specified areas.

Table 7.4: Average length of teaching experience: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

Currently teaching in	Average length of teaching experience (years)			
area:	2013	*SE*	2010	2007
English	16.1	*0.4*	16.1	15.7
LOTE	16.3	*0.7*	17.0	17.7
Mathematics	18.1	*0.4*	18.2	17.5
Biology	15.2	*0.7*	16.6	15.9
Chemistry	17.9	*1.0*	17.2	16.3
Physics	19.2	*1.2*	18.3	18.1
Science – General	15.9	*0.5*	16.2	14.8
Geography	15.5	*0.5*	16.0	15.8
History	16.0	*0.5*	16.2	15.4
Computing/IT	16.6	*0.6*	17.4	16.5
VET	17.8	*0.6*	18.2	18.6
Special Needs	18.3	*0.7*	19.1	
All secondary teachers	17.3	*0.2*	17.6	17

Note: Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

7.3 Schools worked in

Table 7.5 examines the extent to which primary teachers in the specified areas are working in their first school: the lower the proportion the more mobile teachers in that area are likely to be. As can be seen, the overall proportion of primary teachers working in their first school in 2013 (17.3%) was lower than in 2010 (21.5%) but similar to 2007 (16.3%). In 2013, teachers of Special Needs, LOTE, and Literacy had lower proportions working in their first school (4.5%-11.0%) than was the case for primary teachers overall (17.3%). This differs from previous survey years, where in all areas except Special Needs (in 2010) and LOTE (in 2007), higher proportions of specialist teachers were working in their first school than for primary teachers overall.

Table 7.5: Proportion who are currently working in their first school: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in	Proportion working in first school (%)			
area:	2013	*SE*	2010	2007
Literacy	11.0	*4.1*	26.9	19.1
Numeracy	16.4	*5.5*	30.5	22.6
LOTE	8.7	*3.0*	29.2	16.1
Computing	20.6	*9.7*	33.9	20.1
Special Needs	4.5	*2.1*	20.9	
All primary teachers	17.3	*1.2*	21.5	16.3

Note: Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included in 2013). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

Table 7.6 provides equivalent data for secondary schools. Overall, 18.1% of secondary teachers were currently working in their first school, which is slightly lower than in previous survey years (21.2% in 2010 and 20.9% in 2007). There is considerable variation among secondary fields, ranging from a low of 14.2% for Special Needs teachers through to 22.6% for LOTE teachers. In each of the specified areas except VET and Special Needs, proportions of teachers working in their first school have decreased across survey years.

Table 7.6: Proportion who are currently working in their first school: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Proportion working in first school (%)			
	2013	***SE***	**2010**	**2007**
English	19.1	*1.3*	21.0	23.8
LOTE	22.6	*2.4*	24.8	23.6
Mathematics	17.8	*1.3*	21.0	22.4
Biology	21.2	*2.8*	23.0	29.7
Chemistry	17.1	*2.7*	21.2	23.8
Physics	16.2	*3.4*	20.1	24.3
Science – General	21.5	*2.0*	21.7	26.2
Geography	20.0	*2.2*	22.6	24.6
History	20.9	*1.7*	22.6	27.7
Computing/IT	20.6	*2.7*	21.9	27.4
VET	20.0	*2.3*	19.5	17.7
Special Needs	14.2	*1.8*	13.4	
All secondary teachers	18.1	*0.8*	21.2	20.9

Note: Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

7.4 School sectors and locations worked in

The SiAS Main Report noted considerable mobility of teachers between schools. The primary teachers who had worked in more than one school (82.7% of all primary teachers) had taught in an average of 5.6 schools. The secondary teachers who had worked in more than one school (81.9% of secondary teachers) had taught in an average of 4.8 schools.

Table 7.7 shows that considerable movement of teachers also occurs between school sectors and, to a lesser extent, between states and territories. Of those primary teachers who had worked in more than one school, 17.1% were currently working in a different school sector from their first school (compared to 19.4% in 2010 and 29% in 2007), as were 30.9% of secondary teachers (compared to 32.6% in 2010 and 40% in 2007). The most marked movement has been from the government to the non-government sector, accounting for about 63.2% of primary teachers and 66.7% of secondary teachers who have moved sectors, similar to 2010 (66.0-67.5%) but slightly lower than was reported in 2007 (70%).

In terms of geographic location, about 16.5% of the primary teachers who have worked in more than one school are now working in a different state/territory from their first school (9.1% have moved from another state/territory, and 7.3% from another country). Among secondary teachers there is slightly more geographic mobility: 21.9% of those who have worked in more than one school are now working in a different state/territory from their first school (12.2% have moved from another state/territory, and 9.6% from another country). Again, these figures are similar to the 2007 and 2010 figures.

Table 7.7: Proportions of teachers who had worked in more than one school by the sector and location of their current and first schools

		Primary		Secondary	
		2013 %	***2010 %***	**2013 %**	***2010 %***
School sector	Yes, the same sector	82.9	*80.6*	69.1	*67.4*
	No, a Government school	10.8	*13.1*	20.6	*21.5*
	No, a Catholic school	3.3	*3.9*	5.7	*6.2*
	No, an Independent school	3.1	*2.4*	4.6	*4.9*
		100	***100***	**100**	***100***
State/territory	Yes, the same state/territory	83.5	*84.2*	78.1	*79.0*
	No, another state/territory	9.1	*9.8*	12.2	*11.1*
	No, another country	7.3	*6.0*	9.6	*9.9*
		100	***100***	**100**	***100***
Capital city	Yes	46.0	*38.8*	47.2	*46.0*
	No	54.0	*61.2*	52.8	*54.0*
		100	***100***	**100**	***100***

Table 7.8 examines whether the pattern for primary teachers as a whole applies to those teaching in the five specified areas. It shows that teachers in the areas considered are slightly less likely to move sectors than primary teachers in general. While these results should be treated with caution due to the large standard errors in this table, similar results were also found in 2010, with the exception of LOTE teachers who then displayed notably higher movement sectors. The proportion of LOTE teachers whose first and current schools were in different sectors declined from 26.9% in 2010 to 11.7% in 2013. Table 7.8 also shows that the proportions of primary teachers in the selected areas that started teaching in a different state/territory or country ranged from 16.4% (Numeracy teachers) to 21.8% (Literacy teachers), although again these results have high standard errors.

Table 7.8: Sector and location of current and first schools for those who have worked in more than one school: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	**Current school is in a different sector from first school (%)**			**Current school is in a different State/Territory or country from first school[1] (%)**		
	2013	***SE***	**2010**	**2013**	***SE***	**2010**
Literacy	15.9	*4.8*	17.5	21.8	*6.5*	11.1
Numeracy	10.8	*4.1*	15.9	16.4	*5.5*	14.3
LOTE	11.7	*4.2*	26.9	18.8	*9.8*	17.4
Computing	14.7	*6.4*	15.4	19.0	*7.2*	14.3
Special Needs	15.2	*7.4*	16.7	17.0	*5.4*	15.9
All primary teachers	17.1	*1.6*	19.4	16.5	*1.2*	15.8

1. Includes those who started teaching in another country: Literacy 5.3%; Numeracy 5.0%; LOTE 16.0%; Computing 2.2%; Special Needs 4.3%; all primary teachers 7.3%.

Note: Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included in 2013). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

Table 7.9 provides equivalent data on teacher mobility for the secondary teachers teaching in the specified curriculum areas. Overall, secondary teachers exhibit more mobility between sectors than primary teachers. Nevertheless, there is considerable variation among fields in the extent of this mobility. About 43.6% of the LOTE teachers and 38.6% of the Physics teachers who have changed schools are now working in a different school sector to their first school. In contrast, less than one-quarter of the VET teachers who have changed schools are now working in a different

school sector to their first school. Other areas have a similar level of movement between sectors as secondary teachers in general.

Secondary teachers also exhibit more mobility between jurisdictions than primary teachers, although Table 7.9 shows considerable variation in the extent to which different types of secondary teachers have changed state/territory or country in their teaching career. Of those who have taught in more than one school, relatively high proportions of teachers in the following areas have changed jurisdictions or countries: Chemistry (31.3%); Biology (27.3%); Physics (27.2%); Mathematics (26.6%); LOTE (26.1%); and Special Needs (25.8). Conversely, relatively low proportions of teachers in the following fields have changed jurisdictions: VET (15.3%); Geography (15.9%); Computing/IT (16.5%); and History (18.0%); The reasons may be to do with more vacancies being available in some fields than in others and, in the case of LOTE, the advantage of having lived in another country.

Table 7.9: Sector and location of current and first schools for those who have worked in more than one school: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

Currently teaching in	Current school is in a different sector from first school (%)			Current school is in a different State/Territory or country from first school[1] (%)		
area:	**2013**	***SE***	**2010**	**2013**	***SE***	**2010**
English	29.9	*1.9*	35.5	20.6	*1.5*	19.9
LOTE	43.6	*4.1*	40.2	26.1	*2.9*	28.8
Mathematics	31.0	*2.2*	31.3	26.6	*1.6*	24.9
Biology	33.8	*4.1*	28.7	27.3	*4.0*	24.3
Chemistry	31.3	*4.2*	27.4	31.3	*4.1*	24.1
Physics	38.6	*4.8*	30.5	27.2	*4.3*	23.6
Science – General	30.9	*2.3*	29.1	24.8	*2.0*	24.1
Geography	29.0	*3.0*	31.9	15.9	*2.2*	20.6
History	29.8	*2.3*	32.8	18.0	*2.0*	19.4
Computing/IT	27.4	*3.4*	29.8	16.5	*2.4*	21.4
VET	24.9	*2.5*	29.6	15.3	*1.8*	21.5
Special Needs	34.0	*3.7*	26.2	25.8	*2.9*	28.3
All secondary teachers	31.0	*1.5*	32.6	21.9	*0.9*	21.0

1. Includes those who started teaching in another country: English 9.2%; LOTE 15.1%; Mathematics 12.3%; Biology 10.8%; Chemistry 15.5%; Physics 10.4%; Science – General 10.7%; Geography 8.7%; History 8.1%; Computing/IT 5.6%; VET 4.9%; Special Needs 11.2%; All secondary teachers 9.6%.

Note: Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

8. CAREER INTENTIONS

This section presents information on the career intentions of the teachers working in the specified curriculum areas. The issues examined are whether teachers intend to leave teaching permanently prior to retirement, and the number of years they intend to keep working in schools. Such information is important for estimating the likely turnover of teachers and the scale of replacements that will need to be recruited.

8.1 Intention to leave teaching

The SiAS survey indicated that 5.1% of primary teachers and 7.7% of secondary teachers intend to leave teaching permanently prior to retirement, representing a small downward trend from 2007 and 2010. Around 58.5-63.5% of teachers indicated that they do not intend to leave teaching prior to retirement. However, roughly one-third of primary and secondary teachers were unsure about their intentions in this regard. This section examines the extent to which these patterns vary according to the field in which teachers are currently working.

Table 8.1 reports the intentions of primary teachers in the five specified areas. In 2013, similar or slightly lower proportions those teaching in the specified areas indicated that they intended to leave teaching permanently prior to retirement compared with primary teachers overall. In contrast, the intentions of LOTE teachers changed between 2010 and 2013: the proportion that did not intend to leave teaching rose 22.5 percentage points, while the proportion that intended to leave fell by 5.0 percentage points and the proportion that was unsure fell by 17.5 percentage points.

Table 8.1: Proportions of teachers who intend to leave teaching permanently prior to retirement: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

	Do you plan to leave teaching permanently prior to retirement? (%)								
Currently teaching	**2013**						**2010**		
in area:	**Yes**	***SE***	**No**	***SE***	**Unsure**	***SE***	**Yes**	**No**	**Unsure**
Literacy	2.5	*1.4*	68.9	*4.4*	28.7	*4.3*	4.0	61.8	34.2
Numeracy	2.7	*1.7*	63.8	*6.2*	33.5	*6.1*	5.6	61.4	33.1
LOTE	3.9	*1.5*	72.9	*6.2*	23.2	*5.5*	8.9	50.4	40.7
Computing/IT	5.2	*3.0*	62.0	*9.2*	32.8	*8.7*	3.0	61.9	35.0
Special Needs	1.3	*0.9*	71.0	*7.1*	27.8	*7.1*	3.5	61.1	35.4
All primary teachers	5.1	*0.6*	63.5	*1.4*	31.4	*1.3*	6.6	58.7	34.6

Note: Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included in 2013). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

Among secondary teachers, those working in Computing/IT reported a slightly greater likelihood of leaving teaching permanently than did other teachers, as was also the case in 2010 (see Table 8.2). However, the differences between the remaining fields in this regard are fairly small and they do not differ greatly from secondary teachers as a whole. Notably, among those teaching Mathematics and Science (areas that are commonly cited as facing shortages) the proportions planning to leave permanently prior to retirement are little different from in other areas. As noted above, the issue of concern across all areas is the fact that at about one third of teachers are uncertain about whether they will continue in the profession.

Table 8.2: Proportions of teachers who intend to leave teaching permanently prior to retirement: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Do you plan to leave teaching permanently prior to retirement? (%)								
	2013						2010		
	Yes	*SE*	No	*SE*	Unsure	*SE*	Yes	No	Unsure
English	7.4	*0.8*	56.5	*1.6*	36.0	*1.4*	10.8	54.0	35.2
LOTE	7.2	*1.7*	58.0	*3.4*	34.8	*3.3*	9.6	55.7	34.8
Mathematics	7.0	*0.8*	63.4	*1.6*	29.6	*1.3*	9.8	57.2	33.0
Biology	9.1	*2.2*	52.8	*3.2*	38.1	*3.4*	9.7	56.1	34.2
Chemistry	9.6	*2.4*	61.0	*3.7*	29.3	*3.6*	10.3	58.0	31.7
Physics	7.5	*2.0*	62.0	*3.5*	30.5	*3.8*	8.9	57.7	33.3
Science – General	9.3	*1.5*	56.1	*2.2*	34.7	*2.1*	10.2	55.6	34.1
Geography	8.6	*1.5*	58.1	*2.8*	33.3	*2.8*	10.2	55.3	34.5
History	7.6	*1.1*	55.8	*2.2*	36.5	*2.0*	11.7	51.7	36.6
Computing/IT	11.5	*2.5*	58.4	*3.9*	30.1	*3.5*	11.0	55.6	33.4
VET	9.1	*1.8*	60.3	*2.4*	30.7	*2.5*	9.0	56.3	34.7
Special Needs	8.0	*1.5*	65.3	*2.9*	26.7	*2.4*	6.0	62.9	31.1
All secondary teachers	7.7	*0.5*	58.5	*0.9*	33.8	*0.8*	9.7	56.6	33.7

Note: Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

8.2 Number of years teachers intend to keep working in schools

On average, primary teachers intend to continue working in schools for another 13.7 years and secondary teachers for another 13.0 years. Given the average age of teachers, this implies that most intend to continue to retirement in their mid to late 50s.

Table 8.3 indicates that primary teachers in the five specified areas intend to keep working in schools for roughly the same length of time as primary teachers overall. (These data exclude the relatively large proportions of teachers who were unsure about how much longer they intend to continue working in schools.) In each of the five areas, the average number of years teachers intend to keep working in schools was lower than in 2010 (but similar to the 2007 figures). The largest change was in LOTE, the only area which is directly comparable across surveys: the average was 13.8 years in 2007, rising to 18.9 years in 2010, then declining to 12.4 years in 2013.

Table 8.3: Average number of years teachers intend to keep working in schools: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Primary teachers

Currently teaching in area:	Average no. years intend to keep working in schools			
	2013	*SE*	2010	2007
Literacy	13.3	*1.9*	15.4	12.5
Numeracy	14.2	*2.9*	16.1	13.6
LOTE	12.4	*1.8*	18.9	13.8
Computing/IT	11.8	*4.3*	17.9	14.3
Special Needs	12.6	*2.4*	14.5	
All primary teachers	13.7	*0.5*	14.7	12

Note: Excludes those who indicated they were unsure about how much longer they intended to continue teaching. Proportions of Literacy, Numeracy, Computing/IT and Special Needs are of Primary Specialist Teachers in these areas (Generalists who indicated that they were teaching in these areas are not included in 2013). LOTE teacher proportions include those who also indicated they were generalists and those who did not indicate whether or not they were generalists (but who did indicate that they currently taught LOTE). Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

At secondary school level, the length of time that teachers intended to keep working in schools ranged from an average of 11.8 years for Physics teachers through to 15.3 years for English teachers (Table 8.4). The average number of years that teachers in the areas of English, Science – General, Geography and History intended to remain in schools was slightly higher than for

secondary teachers overall. LOTE and Biology teachers also intended to remain in schools for slightly longer duration, although the relatively large standard errors associated with the latter estimates mean that these results should be treated with caution. The length of time that teachers in each of the selected areas intended to keep working in schools was similar to or slightly higher than in 2010. This is in contrast to primary teachers, who reported lower intended durations in 2013 than in 2010.

Table 8.4: Average number of years teachers intend to keep working in schools: for teachers currently teaching in specified areas, Secondary teachers

	Average no. years intend to keep working in schools			
Currently teaching in area:	**2013**	***SE***	**2010**	**2007**
English	15.3	*0.6*	12.5	12.0
LOTE	14.4	*1.7*	11.6	10.6
Mathematics	13.1	*0.6*	12.1	11.4
Biology	14.9	*1.7*	13.1	11.6
Chemistry	13.3	*1.3*	13.0	12.8
Physics	11.8	*1.3*	12.2	12.6
Science – General	14.3	*0.9*	12.9	13.0
Geography	14.3	*0.8*	14.0	11.9
History	14.2	*0.6*	13.6	13.0
Computing/IT	13.6	*0.9*	11.9	11.5
VET	13.3	*0.6*	12.1	11.2
Special Needs	12.9	*0.7*	12.8	
All secondary teachers	13.0	*0.3*	12.2	12

Note: Excludes those who indicated they were unsure about how much longer they intended to continue teaching. Special Needs proportions and denominator does not include teachers in Special Schools.

APPENDIX 1: THE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

***TEACHER* SURVEY**

Australian Government Statistical Clearing House Approval Number 01874 -- 04

The paper version of this survey is for information, NOT for completion. The online version can be completed by invitation.
Notes in green identify conditions in use to filter questions

YOUR BACKGROUND

1. Please indicate your age as of May 1 this year: _____ years _____ months

2. Are you male or female? ○ Male ○ Female

3. Do you identify as being of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin?

- ○ No
- ○ Yes, Aboriginal
- ○ Yes, Torres Strait Islander
- ○ Yes, both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander

4. In which country were you born?

- ○ Australia
- ○ Canada
- ○ Germany
- ○ Greece
- ○ India
- ○ Italy
- ○ Malaysia
- ○ New Zealand
- ○ Republic of Ireland
- ○ South Africa
- ○ United Kingdom
- ○ United States of America
- ○ Other *(please specify)* _____

Please answer Question 5 only if you were not born in Australia.

5. For how many years have you lived in Australia? _____ *years*

6a. Do you speak a language other than English at home?

- ○ YesContinue to Q6b
- ○ NoGo straight to Q7

6b. What is that language? _____

6c. How good is your spoken English?

- ○ Very good
- ○ Good
- ○ Satisfactory

YOUR PREPARATION FOR TEACHING

7. At what stage of your life did you first decide that you wanted to become a teacher?

- ○ While at school
- ○ During my first degree program at university
- ○ Upon completing my first degree
- ○ While in employment
- ○ Other (please describe) _____

8. Was your initial teacher education program

- ○ a graduate program (requiring a first degree as a prerequisite for entry?
- ○ an undergraduate program?

9. Was the institution from which you gained your initial (preservice) teacher education qualification located in:

a.

- ○ New South Wales?
- ○ Victoria?
- ○ Queensland?
- ○ Western Australia?
- ○ South Australia?
- ○ Tasmania?
- ○ Australian Capital Territory?
- ○ Northern Territory?
- ○ Overseas? (please specify the country) _____

b. A capital city?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

10. What is the level of the highest qualification you have *completed* in a field other than Education? (This may include degrees in Arts, Science, Commerce, etc. that you completed before or after entering your teacher preparation program.)

P*lease tick one box only.*

Graduate programs:

- ○ Doctoral degree
- ○ Masters degree
- ○ Graduate Diploma
- ○ Graduate Certificate
- ○ Bachelor (Honours) degree

Undergraduate Programs:

- ○ Bachelor degree
- ○ Other *(please specify)* _____

Neither

- ○ I have no formal qualifications outside education.

11. What is the level of the highest qualification you have *completed* in the field of Education?

Please tick one box only.

Graduate programs:

- ○ Doctoral degree
- ○ Masters degree
- ○ Graduate Diploma
- ○ Graduate Certificate
- ○ Bachelor (Honours) degree

Undergraduate Programs:

- ○ Bachelor degree
- ○ Other *(please specify)* _____

12.a. In what year did you commence your initial teacher education program? _____

b. In what year did you complete your initial teacher education program?_____

c. In what year did you take up your first appointment as a teacher?_____

d. For how many years have you been teaching in total (counting this year as one)? _____ years

If your answer to Question 12d is five years or less, continue with Question 13 through 17; otherwise go straight to Question 18.

13. Which of the following factors were important to you in your decision to become a teacher?
Please tick all boxes that apply.

a.	Love of teaching	☐
b.	Love of subject	☐
c.	Encouragement from teacher(s) while you were at school	☐
d.	Family role model(s)	☐
e.	Availability of employment	☐
f.	Attractiveness of the salary	☐
g.	Working conditions	☐
h.	Security of employment	☐
i	Holidays, hours of work	☐
k	Desire to contribute to society	☐
l	Desire to work with young people	☐
m	Status of the teaching profession	☐
n	Other *(please specify)* _____	☐

14. Which of the following was part of the application process for selection into your initial teacher education program?
Please tick all boxes that apply.

a.	Academic achievement in school (e.g. ATAR, ENTER, UAI, etc.)	☐
b.	Academic achievement in a university degree	☐
c.	Academic achievement in other post-secondary studies (e.g. TAFE)	☐
d.	Specific test results	☐
e.	A written submission	☐
f.	References	☐
g	Evidence of previous experience in working with children	☐
h	Evidence of work experience not specifically connected to teaching	☐
i	An interview	☐
j	Other (please describe)_____	☐

15. How helpful was your initial teacher education course in preparing you for: (*please tick one box in each row)*

		Not helpful	Of some help	Helpful	Very helpful
a.	Teaching students with a wide range of backgrounds and abilities	○	○	○	○
b.	Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students	○	○	○	○
c.	Supporting students with disabilities	○	○	○	○
d.	Developing and teaching a unit of work	○	○	○	○
e.	Developing subject content knowledge appropriate for school curriculum	○	○	○	○
f.	Developing strategies for teaching literacy	○	○	○	○
g.	Developing my own literacy skills	○	○	○	○
h.	Developing strategies for teaching numeracy	○	○	○	○
i	Developing my own numeracy skills	○	○	○	○
j	Making effective use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT)	○	○	○	○
k	Learning about resources available for my teaching areas.	○	○	○	○
l	Developing my skills in classroom communication	○	○	○	○
m	Learning how to your evaluate and improve my own teaching	○	○	○	○
n	Involving parents/guardians in the educative process	○	○	○	○
o	Managing classroom activities to keep students on task.	○	○	○	○
p	Dealing with difficult student behaviour	○	○	○	○
q	Making effective use of student assessment information	○	○	○	○
r	Ensuring that my assessments are consistent and comparable with those of other teachers	○	○	○	○
s	Interpreting achievement reports from national or statewide assessments	○	○	○	○
t	Meeting my professional and ethical responsibilities as a teacher	○	○	○	○
u	Complying with legislative, administrative and organisational requirements	○	○	○	○
v	Developing contacts with professional teaching networks	○	○	○	○
w	Engaging with performance and development plans	○	○	○	○

16. How helpful did you find each of the four components of your initial teacher education course listed below in preparing you for teaching? (P*lease tick one box in each row. Answer "Not applicable" if the component was not included as a part of your teacher education course)*

		Not helpful	**Of some help**	**Helpful**	**Very helpful**	**Not applicable**
a.	**Subject studies:** Learning the content of the subjects that you are likely to teach.	○	○	○	○	○
b.	**Teaching methods:** Learning how to teach the subjects that you are likely to teach.	○	○	○	○	○
c.	**Education studies:** Learning about the theories and context of education and schooling.	○	○	○	○	○
d.	**School experience:** Time spent in schools on teaching rounds, observation of classes, practicum and the like.	○	○	○	○	○

17. Since you began teaching, which of the following types of assistance have you been provided with by your school or employer, and how helpful were they?

For types of assistance that you did not receive, please tick "Not Applicable."

	How helpful was the assistance?				
	Not helpful	**Of some help**	**Helpful**	**Very helpful**	**Not Applicable**
An orientation program designed for new teachers	○	○	○	○	○
A designated mentor	○	○	○	○	○
A reduced face-to-face teaching workload	○	○	○	○	○
Follow-up from your teacher education institution	○	○	○	○	○
Structured opportunities to discuss your experiences with other new teachers	○	○	○	○	○
Observation of experienced teachers teaching their classes	○	○	○	○	○
Other assistance *(please specify)* _____	○	○	○	○	○

YOUR CURRENT POSITION

18. Is your current employment arrangement as a teacher:

- ○ On-going/Permanent
- ○ Fixed-term/Contract less than 1 year
- ○ Fixed-term/Contract 1– 3 years
- ○ Fixed-term/Contract more than 3 years
- ○ Casual/Relief (on call)
- ○ Casual/Relief (continuing appointment)

19. Is your current employment as a teacher full-time or part-time?

- ○ Full-time
- ○ Part-time *(please specify the time fraction; eg, 0.5 for half-time)* _____

20. Which of the following best characterises your position in the school? *(please tick one box)*

- ○ Mainly classroom teaching
- ○ Mainly managing an area or department in the school
- ○ Mainly providing specialist support to students
- ○ A combination of classroom teaching and management

21. To the nearest thousand dollars, what is your current annual salary?

Please refer to your gross (i.e., before tax) salary. If you work part-time, please express as a full-time equivalent salary.

$ _____ thousand

22. In a typical week, please estimate the number of hours that you spend on each of the following school-related activities for this school.

(This question concerns your work for this school only. Please do not include any work you may do for other schools or employers.) Please write a number in each row and round to the nearest hour

Teaching of students in school (either whole class, in groups or individually)	_____
Working as an individual on planning work or preparing lessons (including marking of student work)	_____
Working collaboratively with colleagues, including planning, assessing and mentoring	_____
Engaging with performance and development plans	_____
Administrative duties either in school or out of school (including school administrative duties, paperwork and other clerical duties you undertake in your job as a teacher)	_____
Engaging professionally with parents/carers and the community	_____
Other (please specify)_____	_____
Total hours spent on school-related work in a typical week:	_____

23. Has your school teaching experience been at

- ○ the Primary level only?
- ○ the Secondary level only?
- ○ both Primary and Secondary levels?

Skip 24 and 25 if answer 'secondary' to 23

24. Please indicate if you

currently teach as a generalist Primary teacher○Yes○No
have previously taught as a generalist Primary teacher○Yes○No
have completed a tertiary course that qualifies you to teach as a generalist Primary teacher○Yes○No

If not currently a primary teacher, skip 25b

25. a. How many years' experience do you have in generalist primary teaching?_____

b. As a primary teacher responsible for a single class, please indicate the number of students usually in that class:

___
___

YOUR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

26. Below is a list of subject areas. Please tick every subject for which at least one of the following applies:

- You are currently teaching the subject (at secondary or as a primary specialist)
- You have previously taught this subject
- You have completed at least one semester of tertiary studies
- You have completed tertiary studies in methods of teaching
- You have completed professional development studies

Language
- English ☐
- English as a Second Language ☐
- Literacy ☐
- Languages other than English: ☐

Mathematics
- Mathematics ☐
- Statistics ☐
- Numeracy ☐

Sciences
- Biology ☐
- Chemistry ☐
- Earth sciences ☐
- Environmental sciences ☐
- Physics ☐
- Psychology/Behavioural studies ☐
- Science – General ☐

The Creative and Performing Arts
- Visual Arts ☐
- Dance ☐
- Drama ☐
- Media Studies ☐
- Music ☐

Society and Environment Studies (SOSE)
- Accounting ☐
- Business studies ☐
- Civics and Citizenship ☐
- Economics ☐
- Geography ☐
- History ☐
- Legal studies ☐
- Politics ☐
- Religious studies ☐
- Social studies ☐

Health and Physical Education
- Health ☐
- Outdoor education ☐
- Physical education ☐

Technology ☐
- Computing ☐
- Food technology ☐
- Graphic communication ☐
- Information technology ☐
- Textiles ☐
- Wood or Metal technology ☐
- *Other* (please specify): _____ ☐

If LOTE is checked in Q26, respondents will be asked to identify the LOTE from a list provided, which includes Mandarin, Japanese, Indonesian, Hindi and Korean, or by writing in the name of the language.

27a. For each subject checked in Q26, respondents who are or have been Primary teachers will then be asked:

a. If they currently teach the subject as a primary subject specialist.
b. If they have previously taught the subject as a primary subject specialist.
c. If they have completed tertiary studies in methods of teaching the subject.
d. Whether they have undertaken professional development activities in the subject in the last 12 months.
e. The highest level at which they have completed at least one semester of tertiary studies in the subject (with the Year 1 option distinguishing between one semester completed and two semesters completed).
f. How many years of experience they have teaching the subject as a primary subject specialist

27b. For each subject checked in Q26, respondents who are have been Secondary teachers will then be asked:

a. If they currently teach the subject, and at what level (7/8-10, 11-12).
b. If they have previously taught the subject, and at what level (7/8-10, 11-12).
c. The highest level at which they have completed at least one semester of tertiary studies in the subject (with the Year 1 option distinguishing between one semester completed and two semesters completed).
d. If they have completed tertiary studies in methods of teaching the subject.
e. Whether they have undertaken professional development activities in the subject in the last 12 months.
f. How many years of experience they have teaching the subject
g. How many class groups they are currently teaching at each of years 7/8-10 and 11-12.
h. The average size of the class groups they currently teach at years 7/8-10 and 11-12.

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE IN SPECIALIST ROLES (PRIMARY AND/OR SECONDARY):

28. Please check any of the following specialist roles

- that you currently perform in a school, and/or
- that you have previously performed in a school, and/or
- in which you have completed at least one semester of tertiary studies.

Specialist roles

Library	☐
Special Needs	☐
Learning Support	☐
Behaviour Management	☐
School Counselling	☐
Career Education	☐
Vocational Education and Training	☐

29. For each specialist role checked, respondents will then be asked:

a. If they currently perform that role in their school○Yes○No
b. If they have previously performed that role in a school○Yes○No
c. How many years' experience they have in performing that role_____ years
d. Whether they have undertaken organized professional development activities relevant to that role ○Yes○No
e. The highest level at which they have completed at least one semester of tertiary studies in preparation for that role: ○First year○Second or third year○None

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING ACTIVITIES

Professional learning activities refer to structured activities intended to develop your knowledge and skills as a teacher. They include formal activities (e.g. conferences, workshops and courses of study) as well as informal activities (e.g. ongoing involvement in collegial teams, networks and mentoring). The learning activities include both those provided out-of-school and those provided at school.

30. Have you engaged in professional learning activities over the past 12 months?

☐ Yes If yes: Please indicate the number of days (full-time equivalent): _____.
☐ No If no go straight to final column in Question 31.

31. Please indicate by checking the appropriate boxes below the areas in which

- **you have undertaken professional learning as part of a tertiary qualification,**
- **you have undertaken professional learning through other activities (organised or self-directed), and**
- **you believe you need more opportunities for professional learning.**

(Check only the boxes applicable to you)

		Yes, I have undertaken professional learning in the past 12 months:		I need more opportunities for professional learning in this area
		as part of a tertiary qualification	through other activities	
a.	Teaching students with a wide range of backgrounds and abilities	☐	☐	☐
b.	Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students	☐	☐	☐
c.	Supporting students with disabilities	☐	☐	☐
d.	Developing and teaching a unit of work	☐	☐	☐
e.	Developing subject content knowledge appropriate for school curriculum	☐	☐	☐
f.	Developing strategies for teaching literacy	☐	☐	☐
g	Developing my own literacy skills	☐	☐	☐
h.	Developing strategies for teaching numeracy	☐	☐	☐
i	Developing my own numeracy skills	☐	☐	☐
j	Making effective use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT)	☐	☐	☐
k	Learning about resources available for my teaching areas.	☐	☐	☐
l	Developing my skills in classroom communication	☐	☐	☐
m	Learning how to your evaluate and improve my own teaching	☐	☐	☐
n	Involving parents/guardians in the educative process	☐	☐	☐
o	Managing classroom activities to keep students on task.	☐	☐	☐
p	Dealing with difficult student behaviour	☐	☐	☐
q	Making effective use of student assessment information	☐	☐	☐
r	Ensuring that my assessments are consistent and comparable with those of other teachers	☐	☐	☐
s	Interpreting achievement reports from national or statewide assessments	☐	☐	☐
t	Meeting my professional and ethical responsibilities as a teacher	☐	☐	☐
u	Complying with legislative, administrative and organisational requirements	☐	☐	☐
v	Developing contacts with professional teaching networks	☐	☐	☐
w	Engaging with performance and development plans	☐	☐	☐

32. To what extent have the professional learning activities you have engaged in over the past 12 months improved your capability in the following areas?

Please tick one box in each row.

		No improvement	Slight improvement	Moderate improvement	Major improvement
a.	(List of areas to be derived from the responses to Q30 (all those checked in column 1 or column 2).	○	○	○	○
b.		○	○	○	○
c.		○	○	○	○
d.		○	○	○	○
e.		○	○	○	○
f.		○	○	○	○
g.		○	○	○	○

YOUR CAREER IN TEACHING

33. Have you had any interruptions to your teaching career (e.g., leave, resignation and return)? If so, how many years have you been absent from teaching?

_____ years

34. In how many schools have you been employed as a teacher?

_____ schools

From the response to Question 34,

If this is the respondent's first school: Go straight to Question 43
If this is **not** the respondent's first school: Continue on to Question 35.

35. For how long did you teach at your first school?

_____ years and _____ months

36. For how long have you been teaching at your current school?

_____ years and _____ months

37. Where was the first school in which you worked?

- ○ Western Australia
- ○ South Australia
- ○ Northern Territory
- ○ Tasmania
- ○ Victoria
- ○ New South Wales
- ○ ACT
- ○ Queensland
- ○ Overseas (please specify): _____

If your first school was overseas, go straight to question 40

38. Was the first school in which you worked:

- ○ a Government school?
- ○ a Catholic school?
- ○ an Independent school?

39. Was the first school in which you worked located in:

- ○ a capital city?
- ○ a major or provincial city?
- ○ a rural area?
- ○ a remote area?

40. How many years of your employment as a school teacher have been spent:

In your current State/Territory?	_____ *years*
In another State/Territory?	_____ *years*
In another country?	_____ *years*

41. How many years of your employment as a school teacher in Australia have been spent:

In Government schools?	_____ *years*
In Catholic schools?	_____ *years*
In Independent schools?	_____ *years*

42. Which of the following factors were important influences on your decision to join your present school?
Please check as many boxes as apply.

a	Mandated school mobility requirements	☐
b	Dissatisfaction with my former school	☐
c	End of my contract at the former school	☐
d	Better pay and conditions	☐
e	Taking up a promotion	☐
f	More opportunity to teach in my preferred curriculum areas	☐
g	Positive school ethos and values	☐
h	Professional learning opportunities	☐
i	A more convenient school location	☐
j	Other factors *(please specify)* _____	☐

YOUR ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE TEACHING

43. Which of the following best characterises your main activity in the year before you commenced your teacher preparation program?
Please check one box only.

- ○ School student
- ○ Higher education student
- ○ TAFE student
- ○ Home duties (including caring for children)
- ○ Full-time employment
- ○ Part-time employment
- ○ Unemployed
- ○ Other (please specify) _____

44. Have you ever resigned from school teaching to take up another activity?
- ○ Yes If Yes continue on to Question 45
- ○ No If No go straight to Question 46.

45. Why did you return to school teaching?
Please tick all that apply.

- ☐ I missed teaching
- ☐ I missed the students
- ☐ I returned from extended travel
- ☐ The other job/activity was not what I had expected
- ☐ Teaching salary is higher than the salary I was getting
- ☐ Teaching working conditions are better
- ☐ Teaching gives more opportunity for personal growth
- ☐ I had changed personal or family circumstances
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

YOUR FUTURE CAREER INTENTIONS

46. Do you plan to leave teaching permanently prior to retirement?

- ○ Yes — If Yes continue on to Question 47.
- ○ No — If No, go straight to Question 48.
- ○ Unsure — If Unsure, go straight to Question 48.

47. You have indicated that you plan to leave teaching prior to retirement. Please indicate which of the following were important factors in your decision to leave teaching prior to retirement?

(Check only the factors that were important influences on your decision.)

I never intended teaching to be a long-term career	☐
I have found that I am not suited to teaching	☐
I was not enjoying teaching	☐
Family reasons	☐
Unsatisfactory relationships with other staff	☐
Better opportunities outside of schools	☐
Superannuation benefits from leaving teaching early	☐
The workload is too heavy	☐
Insufficient support staff	☐
Class sizes too large	☐
I had issues with student management	☐
Insufficient recognition or reward for teachers	☐
The poor public image of teachers	☐
Changes imposed on schools from outside	☐
Dissatisfaction with performance appraisal processes.	☐
Other *(please specify)* _____	☐

48. How much longer do you intend to work in schools? _____ *years* ☐ Unsure

If you intend to leave teaching in less than 3 years, please answer Question 49. Otherwise go to Question 50.

49. Your answer to Question 48 indicates that you intend to leave schools within the next 3 years. What do you intend to do then? *(Please tick any that apply.)*

- ☐ Seek employment elsewhere in Education, but not directly in schools
- ☐ Seek employment outside of Education
- ☐ Take study leave
- ☐ Take extended leave from teaching (12 months or more)
- ☐ Cease active employment
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

50. Within the next 3 years do you intend to do any of the following?
(Please tick any that apply.)

	YES
Apply for a Deputy/Vice Principal position	☐
Apply for a Principal position	☐
Continue in your current position at this school	☐
Seek promotion in this school	☐
Move to a similar position at another school	☐
Seek promotion to another school	☐
Move to another school sector (e.g, Government to Catholic)	☐
Train to enable you to teach in another subject area	☐
Train to enable you to teach in another stage of schooling	☐
Change from full-time to part-time employment	☐
Change from part-time to full-time employment	☐
Take extended leave (12 months or more)	☐

If you indicated by your answer to Question 50 that you do <u>not</u> intend to apply for a Principal or Deputy/Vice Principal position in the next three years, please proceed to Question 51; otherwise go straight to Question 53.

51. Do you consider yourself to be at an appropriate stage in your career to apply for a Principal or Deputy/Vice Principal position in the next three years?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

If the answer is "No", proceed to Question 55

52. Which of the following were important factors influencing your decision NOT to apply for a Deputy/Vice Principal or Principal position? *(Please tick any that apply.)*

The time demands of the job are too high	☐
I lack leadership experience	☐
The position requires too much responsibility	☐
I would have difficulty maintaining a satisfactory work/life balance	☐
The salary is not sufficient for the responsibilities	☐
I have not had encouragement and support from colleagues	☐
I have not had encouragement and support from my school leaders	☐
I have concerns with the selection process	☐
I do not have appropriate prior preparation and training	☐
I do not feel confident in my ability to do the job	☐
I want to remain working mainly in the classroom	☐
I have applied unsuccessfully in the past	☐
My personal or family circumstances	☐
Other (please specify) _____	☐

If your answer to Question 50 indicated that you do intend to apply for a Principal or Deputy/Vice Principal position in the next three years, please answer Questions 53 and 54; otherwise proceed straight to Question 55.

53. How important are the following factors in your intention to apply for a Deputy/Vice Principal or Principal position? *(Please tick any that apply.)*

I want challenges other than classroom teaching	☐
I have had encouragement and support from colleagues	☐
I have had encouragement and support from my school leaders	☐
I want to lead school development	☐
I have had successful experience in other leadership roles	☐
I am confident in my ability to do the job	☐
I was attracted by the salary and other financial benefits	☐
I was attracted by the high standing of school leaders in the community	☐
I have had helpful prior preparation and training	☐
I am at the right stage of my career to apply	☐
Other *(please specify)* _____	☐

54. How well prepared do you feel in the following aspects of school leadership? (*please mark one box in each row)*

	Poorly prepared	Somewhat prepared	Well prepared	Very well prepared
School goal-setting and development	○	○	○	○
School curriculum and assessment	○	○	○	○
Change management	○	○	○	○
Managing staff	○	○	○	○
Managing physical resources	○	○	○	○
Managing school budgets and finances	○	○	○	○
School accountability requirements	○	○	○	○
Student welfare and pastoral care	○	○	○	○
Relationships with families and the school community	○	○	○	○
Assessing teacher performance	○	○	○	○
Conflict resolution	○	○	○	○
Time management	○	○	○	○
Stress management	○	○	○	○

YOUR VIEWS ON THE APPRAISAL AND FEEDBACK YOU RECEIVE IN YOUR SCHOOL

55. Concerning the appraisal and/or feedback you have received at this school, to what extent have they directly improved your capability in any of the following areas? *(Please check one box in each row)*

	Not at all	A little	A lot	Have not received appraisal in this area
a. Knowing students and how they learn	○	○	○	○
b. Knowing the content and how to teach it	○	○	○	○
c. Planning and implementing effective teaching	○	○	○	○
d. Creating and maintaining supportive and safe learning environments	○	○	○	○
e. Assessing, providing feedback and reporting on student learning	○	○	○	○
f. Engaging with performance and development plans and/or professional development	○	○	○	○
g. Engaging professionally with colleagues	○	○	○	○
h Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students	○	○	○	○
i Supporting students with disabilities	○	○	○	○
j Developing strategies for teaching literacy	○	○	○	○
k Developing strategies for teaching numeracy	○	○	○	○
l Involving parents/guardians in the educative process	○	○	○	○
m Making effective use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT)	○	○	○	○

YOUR VIEWS ON TEACHING

56. How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job?
Please tick one box in each row.

		Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied
a.	The amount of teaching you are expected to do	○	○	○	○
b.	The amount of administrative and clerical work you are expected to do	○	○	○	○
c.	Your freedom to decide how to do your job	○	○	○	○
d.	Your opportunities for professional learning	○	○	○	○
e.	Your opportunities for career advancement	○	○	○	○
f.	The balance between your working time and your private life	○	○	○	○
g.	Your salary	○	○	○	○
h.	The rewards available to you for superior performance	○	○	○	○
i.	The feedback you receive on your performance	○	○	○	○
j.	Managing student behaviour	○	○	○	○
k.	What you are currently accomplishing with your students	○	○	○	○
l.	The number of staff available to your school	○	○	○	○
m.	The school's physical resources (e.g. buildings, grounds)	○	○	○	○
n	The school's educational resources (e.g. equipment, teaching materials).	○	○	○	○
o	The culture and organisation of your school	○	○	○	○
p	Your working relationships with your colleagues	○	○	○	○
q	Your working relationships with your Principal	○	○	○	○
	Overall, how satisfied are you with your current job?	○	○	○	○

57. At this stage, how do you see your future in the teaching profession?

- ○ I expect that teaching will be my lifetime career
- ○ I am unlikely to leave teaching
- ○ I am thinking about an alternative career
- ○ I am actively seeking an alternative career

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
All responses will be kept confidential.

APPENDIX 2: LOTE TEACHERS

This appendix reports on the profile of LOTE teachers in terms of those who are teaching Asian languages and those who are teaching non-Asian languages. There were only relatively small numbers of LOTE teachers in the SiAS survey and so the disaggregated analyses reported in this appendix need to be treated with great caution.

A.1 Identification of languages

As Section 1.4 of this report indicated, there were 192 primary teachers who indicated that they were teaching LOTE (or 3.9% of all primary teachers in weighted terms). There were 524 secondary teachers (5.2% of all secondary teachers in weighted terms) who indicated that they were teaching LOTE.

In the 2010 SiAS survey, LOTE teachers were asked to write in the name of any LOTE they had studied at tertiary level. In 2013, respondents were asked to indicate the languages they studied or taught. Thirteen common languages could be chosen separately, with a textbox marked 'Other' to capture additional languages. In all, primary teachers specified that they were currently teaching 19 different languages and secondary teachers 23. For the purposes of this analysis the languages were classified into two broad groups, Asian languages and non-Asian languages, using the framework in Table A.1. There were 6 languages classified into the Asian group and 18 into the non-Asian group.

Table A.1: LOTE teachers: classification of specified languages into Asian and Non-Asian groups

Asian languages		Non-Asian languages	
Selected languages	**'Other' languages**	**Selected languages**	**'Other' languages**
Chinese/Mandarin	Vietnamese	Aboriginal	Afrikaans
Hindi		Arabic	Dutch
Indonesian		Auslan	Farsi
Japanese		French	Hebrew
Korean		German	Latin
		Greek	Macedonian
		Italian	Portuguese
		Spanish	Russian
			Samoan
			Turkish

Note: The 'Selected languages' were provided with a separate tickbox in the survey. The 'Other languages' were written in by respondents. Only languages currently taught are included in the table. An additional 8 Asian languages and 21 non-Asian languages were named by at least one teacher that were not included in the table. These additional languages may have been studied or previously taught.

Most of the individual languages involved very few teachers. Using the weighted sample figures, the three largest languages at primary school level were Italian (16.6%), Japanese (16.2%), and Indonesian (14.3%). At secondary level, the two most common languages were French (29.2%) and Japanese (22.6%), followed by Italian (14.9%), Indonesian (13.1%) and German (11.9%).

At primary level, 50% of teachers were currently teaching one or more Asian languages, 48% one or more non-Asian languages, and 2% were teaching both an Asian and a non-Asian language. At secondary level, 37% were teaching Asian languages, 56% non-Asian languages and 7% both.

The following analyses are provided for three groups of LOTE teachers: those teaching an Asian language; those teaching a non-Asian language; and all LOTE teachers.

A.2 School location, sector and SES composition

Table A.2 reports on the distribution of LOTE teachers in terms of the geographic location of their school. The proportions teaching in metropolitan and provincial areas are very similar to those of 2010, suggesting that Asian languages at Primary level have a wider spread in provincial areas, although there are fewer teachers of Asian languages overall. Proportions teaching in remote locations at Primary level are much lower than was previously the case, although the high standard errors suggest this may be due to sample bias or weighting.

Table A.2: LOTE teachers: geographic location of school, by language group

Currently teaching in area:	Location of school (% *SE*)						Total
	Metropolitan		Provincial		Remote		
Primary							
Asian languages	69.3	*8.3*	29.5	*8.1*	1.2	*1.2*	100
Non-Asian languages	80.3	*5.0*	14.9	*4.0*	4.8	*2.2*	100
All LOTE teachers	75.1	*5.0*	21.9	*4.6*	2.9	*1.2*	100
Secondary							
Asian languages	74.8	*4.7*	24.6	*4.6*	0.6	*0.3*	100
Non-Asian languages	79.4	*3.9*	19.6	*3.9*	1.0	*0.6*	100
All LOTE teachers	76.5	*3.5*	22.5	*3.5*	0.9	*0.4*	100

Table A.3 reports on the distribution of LOTE teachers in terms of the school sector where they are currently teaching. The proportion of LOTE teachers in government schools is higher than was the case in 2010 at primary level and for Asian languages at secondary level. High standard errors suggest the difference may be a result of sample bias.

Table A.3: LOTE teachers: school sector, by language group

Currently teaching in area:	Sector of school (% *SE*)						Total
	Government		Catholic		Independent		
Primary							
Asian languages	73.7	*7.3*	23.2	*7.0*	3.3	*1.4*	100
Non-Asian languages	69.4	*7.7*	12.1	*5.7*	18.5	*4.7*	100
All LOTE teachers	70.2	*5.7*	17.4	*5.1*	12.3	*2.0*	100
Secondary							
Asian languages	64.9	*4.2*	13.1	*2.9*	22.0	*3.5*	100
Non-Asian languages	44.8	*4.2*	20.9	*3.2*	34.3	*3.8*	100
All LOTE teachers	51.3	*2.6*	18.2	*2.2*	30.5	*2.2*	100

Table A.4 reports on the distribution of LOTE teachers in terms of school SES (as measured by postcode address). Distributions are fairly even across SES groups at primary level. At secondary level, LOTE teachers are more likely to be found in high SES schools.

Table A.4: LOTE teachers: school SES composition, by language group

Currently teaching in area:	School SES group (% *SE*)						Total
	Low		Medium		High		
Primary							
Asian languages	35.6	*15.2*	29.3	*8.0*	35.1	*12.1*	100
Non-Asian languages	37.9	*11.7*	38.8	*14.3*	23.3	*7.1*	100
All LOTE teachers	36.1	*11.7*	33.3	*10.2*	30.6	*8.4*	100
Secondary							
Asian languages	21.7	*5.0*	29.7	*4.9*	48.7	*6.6*	100
Non-Asian languages	18.7	*3.7*	23.4	*4.3*	58.0	*5.4*	100
All LOTE teachers	20.1	*3.2*	27.2	*3.6*	52.7	*4.5*	100

A.3 Demographic characteristics of LOTE teachers

Table A.5 reports on the age distribution of LOTE teachers. There are fewer primary LOTE teachers in the 35 or under age bracket compared with 2010 and the average age of 46 is higher (40-43 in 2010). At secondary level there is a more even distribution across age groups, similar to the 2010 figures.

Table A.5: LOTE teachers: age distribution and average age, by language group

Currently teaching in area:	Age group (% *SE*)							Average age (years SE)	
	<=35 years		36-50 years		>=51 years		Total		
Primary									
Asian languages	18.5	*4.9*	44.2	*14.0*	37.3	*12.7*	100	46.1	*1.5*
Non-Asian languages	18.7	*6.1*	38.6	*7.4*	42.7	*7.7*	100	46.6	*2.1*
All LOTE teachers	20.1	*4.3*	40.7	*10.1*	39.2	*8.9*	100	46.2	*1.4*
Secondary									
Asian languages	29.1	*5.0*	36.0	*4.8*	34.9	*4.6*	100	44.3	*1.1*
Non-Asian languages	23.2	*3.3*	41.1	*4.0*	35.8	*3.6*	100	45.4	*0.7*
All LOTE teachers	26.2	*2.9*	39.3	*3.3*	34.5	*2.9*	100	44.8	*0.6*

Table A.6 reports on the gender composition of LOTE teachers. As was the case in 2010, there are almost no male teachers of non-Asian LOTE at the primary level. The proportion of male teachers at secondary level is about the same as in 2010 overall.

Table A.6: LOTE teachers: proportions of male and female teachers, by language group

Currently teaching in area:	Proportion of teachers who are male (%)	Proportion of teachers who are female (%)	*SE*
Primary			
Asian languages	11.2	88.8	*4.7*
Non-Asian languages	0.8	99.2	*0.6*
All LOTE teachers	6.1	93.9	*2.4*
Secondary			
Asian languages	22.0	78.0	*4.0*
Non-Asian languages	22.0	78.0	*3.3*
All LOTE teachers	22.9	77.1	*2.6*

Table A.7 reports on the proportions of LOTE teachers who were born in Australia in terms of the languages groups they are currently teaching. At primary level the proportions were about equal, although the standard errors are very high. At secondary level the proportions are also equal, as was the case in 2010, although the number of teachers born in Australia is high than in 2010 (53%).

Table A.7: LOTE teachers: proportion of teachers born in Australia, by language group

Currently teaching in area:	Proportion of teachers who were born in Australia (% *SE*)	
Primary		
Asian languages	59.5	*14.0*
Non-Asian languages	61.9	*14.8*
All LOTE teachers	59.6	*7.6*
Secondary		
Asian languages	67.0	*4.0*
Non-Asian languages	61.1	*3.3*
All LOTE teachers	62.8	*2.6*

A.4 Qualifications of LOTE teachers

Table A.8 reports on the proportions of LOTE teachers who hold different levels of qualifications in Education. As was noted in 2010, at primary level teachers of non-Asian languages are more likely to have a bachelor degree while teachers of Asian languages are more likely to have a graduate diploma. At secondary level a graduate diploma is the most common qualification in education.

Table A.8: LOTE teachers: proportions who hold qualifications in Education, by language group

	Type of qualification											
	Bachelor/ honours degree		Graduate certificate		Graduate diploma		Masters degree		Doctoral degree		Other	
Currently teaching in area:	%	*SE*	%	*SE*	%	*SE*	%	*SE*	%	*SE*	%	*SE*
Primary												
Asian languages	27.4	*6.9*	1.1	*0.7*	51.0	*7.4*	14.2	*7.9*	--	--	6.3	*6.1*
Non-Asian languages	62.8	*7.4*	1.5	*1.0*	27.4	*7.4*	5.1	*2.1*	--	--	3.1	*2.1*
All LOTE teachers	45.5	*4.0*	1.3	*0.6*	38.9	*5.4*	9.6	*4.2*	--	--	4.7	*3.2*
Secondary												
Asian languages	31.6	*4.2*	2.2	*0.9*	52.0	*4.6*	12.5	*2.9*	--	--	1.7	*0.9*
Non-Asian languages	28.7	*3.4*	3.6	*1.6*	49.7	*3.3*	12.7	*2.2*	1.7	*1.7*	3.6	*1.7*
All LOTE teachers	29.3	*2.7*	3.0	*1.1*	50.0	*2.8*	13.5	*1.8*	1.0	*1.0*	3.0	*1.2*

Table A.9 reports on the proportions of LOTE teachers who hold different levels of qualifications in fields other than Education. In general, teachers of Asian and non-Asian languages had similar qualifications at primary and at secondary levels, although at primary level a greater proportion of teachers of Asian languages had a masters or doctoral degree. At secondary level, fewer teachers indicated they had no qualification outside education (15%) than was the case in 2010 (38%).

Table A.9: LOTE teachers: proportions who hold qualifications in fields other than Education, by language group

	Type of qualification											
	None[1]		Bachelor/ honours degree		Graduate certificate		Graduate diploma		Masters or doctoral degree		Other	
Currently teaching in area:	%	*SE*	%	*SE*	%	*SE*	%	*SE*	%	*SE*	%	*SE*
Primary												
Asian languages	29.6	*12.6*	37.1	*7.2*	1.5	*1.4*	2.3	*1.3*	12.1	*5.9*	17.4	*8.1*
Non-Asian languages	41.5	*10.9*	44.9	*11.1*	1.7	*1.0*	7.2	*2.5*	1.4	*0.9*	3.2	*1.5*
All LOTE teachers	34.5	*8.8*	41.9	*6.6*	1.6	*0.9*	4.5	*1.4*	7.0	*3.1*	10.6	*4.4*
Secondary												
Asian languages	14.8	*4.5*	53.9	*6.1*	4.4	*1.4*	12.8	*3.0*	11.4	*2.8*	2.7	*1.0*
Non-Asian languages	15.1	*2.8*	51.3	*4.1*	1.8	*1.1*	9.4	*2.0*	18.6	*3.3*	3.8	*1.2*
All LOTE teachers	15.0	*2.5*	52.3	*3.5*	2.7	*0.9*	9.9	*1.5*	16.4	*2.6*	3.6	*0.9*

1. This column reflects the fact that teachers do not necessarily need a qualification in a field other than Education if their Education qualifications meet the requirements for registration.

A.5 Professional learning of LOTE teachers

Section 5 in this report indicated that Primary LOTE teachers had a lower than average number of days of professional learning (PL) activities over the previous 12 months while secondary LOTE teachers had a higher than average number of days. Table A.10 suggests that teachers of Asian languages undertaken slightly more PL activities than of teachers of non-Asian languages.

Table A.10: LOTE teachers: average number of days of professional learning in past 12 months, by language group

Currently teaching in area:	Average no. days PL in past 12 months	
Primary		
Asian languages	9.2	*1.0*
Non-Asian languages	8.4	*1.2*
All LOTE teachers	8.9	*0.8*
Secondary		
Asian languages	9.6	*0.8*
Non-Asian languages	8.9	*0.6*
All LOTE teachers	9.2	*0.5*

Note: Professional learning activities were defined as structured learning activities intended to develop the respondent's knowledge and skills as a teacher and leader. They include formal and informal activities provided out-of-school and at school.

Table A.11 shows LOTE teachers' views about their future professional learning needs. In general, proportions are in line with the averages of other teacher groups. In the area of 'knowing content and how to teach it', higher proportions of secondary teachers of Asian languages felt the need for more PL opportunities than did teachers of non-Asian languages. In most other areas, secondary teachers of Asian and non-Asian languages had similar responses.

Table A.11: LOTE teachers: Perceived needs for more professional learning, by language group

	Areas in which you feel you need more opportunities for PL: (% rating 'Yes')					
	Primary			*Secondary*		
Specific PL activities:	**Asian**	**Non-Asian**	**All**	**Asian**	**Non-Asian**	**All**
1. Know students and how they learn						
Teaching students with a wide range of backgrounds and abilities	30.2	48.6	38.5	38.8	31.2	34.5
Teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students	11.5	14.1	12.5	19.7	17.7	18.6
Supporting students with disabilities	37.4	54.3	44.8	30.6	20.6	24.9
2. Know the content and how to teach it						
Developing and teaching a unit of work	11.2	17.6	14.1	24.6	14.7	19.1
Developing subject content knowledge appropriate for school curriculum	34.8	31.4	32.5	25.2	17.1	20.7
Developing strategies for teaching numeracy	21.4	21.4	21.0	16.4	9.5	12.5
Developing strategies for teaching literacy	37.3	13.7	25.2	28.6	13.6	20.1
Making effective use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT)	45.0	55.7	49.3	56.1	48.2	51.6
3. Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning						
Learning about resources available for my teaching areas	35.8	50.2	42.0	36.5	33.6	34.8
Developing my skills in classroom communication	13.1	20.2	16.3	17.1	16.2	16.6
Learning how to evaluate and improve my own teaching	14.5	13.6	13.8	24.5	22.9	23.6
Involving parents/guardians in the educative process	11.3	23.0	16.7	23.4	21.1	22.1
4. Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments						
Managing classroom activities to keep students on task	19.2	26.2	22.2	33.3	21.7	26.7
Dealing with difficult student behaviour	36.2	47.5	41.0	40.2	28.1	33.3
5. Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning						
Making effective use of student assessment information	20.7	17.2	18.6	25.9	22.3	23.9
Ensuring that my assessments are consistent and comparable with those of other teachers	28.7	28.3	28.0	17.6	11.0	13.8
Interpreting achievement reports from national or statewide assessments	44.9	27.8	35.8	22.9	17.3	19.7
6. Engage in professional learning						
Developing my own literacy skills	11.3	1.2	6.2	11.8	3.7	7.2
Developing my own numeracy skills	0.6	11.3	5.7	9.0	3.3	5.7
7. Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and the community						
Meeting my professional and ethical responsibilities as a teacher	11.0	6.5	8.6	3.4	3.1	3.2
Complying with legislative, administrative and organisational requirements	2.2	15.7	8.7	10.1	12.3	11.3
Developing contacts with professional teaching networks	15.6	40.1	27.1	17.5	14.8	15.9
Engaging with performance and development plans	14.2	29.6	21.3	19.4	14.8	16.8

Standard errors at primary level were in the range of ±12-14 percentage points at 45-55% (smaller as proportions increased or decreased). At secondary level the standard errors were ±4-5 percentage points at 45-55%.

A.6 Employment basis of LOTE teachers

Section 6 of this report noted that, compared to teachers in other curriculum areas, LOTE teachers were less likely to be employed full-time and on an ongoing/permanent basis. Tables A.12 and A.13 examine the basis of LOTE teachers' employment in terms of language group.

Overall, the proportions of LOTE teachers employed full time at primary and secondary level are similar to 2010 (47% primary, 74% secondary). There is no difference between the language groups.

Table A.12: LOTE teachers: proportion employed full-time, by language group

Currently teaching in area:	Proportion of teachers employed full-time (% *SE*)	
Primary		
Asian languages	56.7	*12.9*
Non-Asian languages	55.5	*10.2*
All LOTE teachers	56.9	*9.4*
Secondary		
Asian languages	71.8	*5.0*
Non-Asian languages	72.2	*3.4*
All LOTE teachers	71.5	*2.9*

Table A.13 shows that at both primary and secondary levels, teachers of Asian and non-Asian languages are employed in on-going positions at about the same proportions.

Table A.13: LOTE teachers: proportion employed on an on-going or contractual basis, by language group

	Type of position							
Currently teaching in	On-going/ permanent		Contract: <1 year		Contract: 1-3 years		Contract: >3 years	Casual/ relief
area:	%	*SE*	%	*SE*	%	*SE*	%	%
Primary								
Asian languages	76.0	*7.1*	14.7	*7.8*	9.2	*2.8*	--	0.2
Non-Asian languages	79.3	*7.0*	7.3	*6.3*	9.3	*3.9*	3.2	0.9
All LOTE teachers	78.0	*4.2*	10.9	*4.7*	9.1	*2.4*	1.5	0.5
Secondary								
Asian languages	81.3	*4.9*	11.0	*3.0*	4.4	*2.1*	0.8	2.5
Non-Asian languages	84.9	*2.7*	6.5	*2.1*	5.6	*1.5*	2.2	0.8
All LOTE teachers	84.0	*2.6*	7.5	*1.7*	5.2	*1.2*	1.7	1.6

A.7 Career paths of LOTE teachers

As was the case in 2010, teachers of non-Asian languages tend to have more years teaching experience than teachers of Asian languages, on average (3-4 years in 2010).

Table A.14: LOTE teachers: average length of teaching experience, by language group

Currently teaching in area:	Average length of teaching experience (years *SE*)	
Primary		
Asian languages	17.9	*3.4*
Non-Asian languages	20.1	*2.6*
All LOTE teachers	18.9	*2.2*
Secondary		
Asian languages	15.6	*1.1*
Non-Asian languages	17.2	*0.7*
All LOTE teachers	16.4	*0.7*

Table A.15 shows similar results to those of 2010 for secondary teachers of LOTE, with the exception of the low proportion of teachers of Asian languages whose current school is in a different country from their first school. There is a similarly low proportion for primary teachers of Asian languages, however the proportion of primary teachers of non-Asian languages is considerably higher (27.6%) than in 2010. The very high standard error suggests that differences in this table at primary level are likely due to sample bias.

Table A.15: LOTE teachers: sector and location of current and first schools for those who have worked in more than one school, by language group

Currently teaching in area:	Current school is in a different sector from first school (% *SE*)		Current school is in a different State/Territory from first school (% *SE*)		Current school is in a different country from first school (% *SE*)	
Primary						
Asian languages	7.8	*4.5*	1.7	*1.0*	4.4	*3.1*
Non-Asian languages	14.8	*6.3*	4.3	*2.0*	27.6	*17.9*
All LOTE teachers	10.8	*4.0*	2.9	*1.1*	15.7	*10.8*
Secondary						
Asian languages	38.2	*5.7*	9.7	*2.9*	8.1	*2.2*
Non-Asian languages	41.3	*5.1*	12.3	*2.7*	18.8	*3.6*
All LOTE teachers	41.6	*3.7*	11.7	*2.1*	15.0	*2.3*

A.8 Career intentions of LOTE teachers

Table a.16 shows a marked rise in the number of primary teachers of LOTE who intend to remain in teaching, from 48% in 2010 to 72% in 2013: proportions who do intend to leave and who are unsure have fallen. The proportion of secondary teachers who intend to remain in teaching has also risen somewhat in comparison with 2010 (55%). There are differences in the proportions of language groups in terms of those indicating they plan to leave teaching permanently prior to retiring, however the proportions are low and the standard errors are high, suggesting that these differences are due to sample bias.

Table A.16: LOTE teachers: proportions who intend to leave teaching permanently prior to retirement, by language group

Currently teaching in area:	Do you plan to leave teaching permanently prior to retirement? (% *SE*)					
	Yes		No		Unsure	
Primary						
Asian languages	7.2	*3.3*	71.1	*8.1*	21.7	*6.2*
Non-Asian languages	0.8	*0.6*	73.5	*7.4*	25.7	*7.3*
All LOTE teachers	4.0	*1.6*	72.3	*5.6*	23.7	*4.7*
Secondary						
Asian languages	4.8	*1.8*	62.5	*5.2*	32.7	*4.8*
Non-Asian languages	8.0	*2.6*	57.7	*4.7*	34.3	*4.3*
All LOTE teachers	7.1	*1.7*	57.5	*3.4*	35.4	*3.4*

Another perspective on career intentions is provided by Table A.18 which reports on the average number of years LOTE teachers intend to keep working in schools. At primary level, teachers of Asian languages intend to teach about 5 years longer than teachers of non-Asian languages; a similar finding to 2010 (the difference in 2010 was 8 years). At secondary level the order is reversed, although the difference is small enough to be accounted for by the standard error.

Table A.17: LOTE teachers: average number of years that teachers intend to keep working in schools, by language group

Currently teaching in area:	Average no. years intend to keep working in schools	
Primary		
Asian languages	14.1	*2.1*
Non-Asian languages	9.6	*2.3*
All LOTE teachers	12.4	*2.0*
Secondary		
Asian languages	12.2	*1.4*
Non-Asian languages	13.3	*1.1*
All LOTE teachers	13.2	*1.1*

APPENDIX 3: TEACHERS IN SPECIAL SCHOOLS

Special schools were included in the sample of schools for the 2007 SiAS Survey, but not for 2010. They were included in the 2013 sample and a brief overview of respondents based in Special Schools to both the teacher and leader surveys is provided here.

The ABS definition of Special School is a school that 'requires one or more of the following characteristics to be exhibited by the student before enrolment is allowed:

- mental or physical disability or impairment
- slow learning ability
- social or emotional problems
- in custody, on remand or in hospital.

Special schools include Special Assistance Schools, as defined under the **Schools Assistance Act 2008 (Cwlth)**. These are non-government schools that are:

(a) likely to be recognised by the State Minister as a special assistance school, and (b) primarily established to cater for students with social, emotional or behavioural difficulties'.[9] Schools for students in custody, on remand or in hospital are not included in the SiAS sample.

The sample (including an extended sample of Victorian government schools) of primary schools across Australia numbered 876 in total, of which 27 were Special Schools (3.1%). Secondary schools numbered 760, of which 57 were Special Schools (7.5%). Of the primary schools that participated in the survey (619), 14 were Special Schools (2.3% of participating schools, 51.9% of the sample of primary Special Schools). Of the participating secondary schools (511), 13 were Special Schools (2.5% of participating schools, 22.8% of the sample of secondary Special Schools). The data presented below are weighted to provide national estimates, and 2013 standard errors are shown.

In terms of these data the main differences between Special Schools and other schools are:

- teachers and primary leaders in Special Schools are slightly older on average;
- fewer teachers and leaders in Special Schools identify as of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin;
- teachers as Special Schools have spent slightly less time at their current school and slightly less experience, while leaders have spent slightly more time;
- secondary leaders in Special Schools have slightly fewer years of teaching experience;
- a greater proportion of primary Special School teachers intend to stay in teaching until they retire, while a higher proportion of secondary teachers are unsure about their intentions; and
- a higher proportion of principals of Special Schools perceive major difficulties in filling vacancies and retaining suitable staff. About the same proportion also perceive little or no difficulty in these areas.

[9] ABS (2013) 4221.0 Schools, Australia: Glossary. Available from: http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Latestproducts/4221.0Glossary12013?opendocument&tabname=Notes&prodno=4221.0&issue=2013&num=&view=

Table A2.1: Average age of teachers and leaders by special schools

	Special schools (av. years)		Other schools (av. years)		All schools (av. years)	
	2013	***SE***	**2013**	***SE***	**2013**	**2010**
Teachers						
Primary	44.9	*0.5*	43.7	*0.4*	43.8	42.1
Secondary	46.3	*0.8*	45.0	*0.2*	45.0	44.5
Leaders						
Primary	52.3	*2.3*	50.6	*0.6*	50.7	49.3
Secondary	50.8	*1.4*	51.6	*0.5*	51.5	50.3

Table A2.2: Proportions of teachers and leaders in special schools by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander origin

	Special schools (% Indigenous origins)		Other schools (% Indigenous origins)		All schools (% Indigenous origins)	
	2013	***SE***	**2013**	***SE***	**2013**	**2010**
Teachers						
Primary	0.5	*0.4*	1.2	*0.3*	1.1	1.0
Secondary	--	--	0.8	*0.2*	0.8	0.6
Leaders						
Primary	--	--	1.2	*0.7*	1.1	0.1
Secondary	--	--	0.2	*0.1*	0.2	0.1

Table A2.3: Average number of years at current school, by special schools

	Special schools (av. no. years)		Other schools (av. no. years)		All schools (av. no. years)	
	2013	***SE***	**2013**	***SE***	**2013**	**2010**
Teachers						
Primary	7.2	*0.5*	8.0	*0.2*	7.5	7.2
Secondary	7.8	*0.5*	9.3	*0.2*	8.5	8.4
Leaders						
Primary	8.1	*1.1*	7.4	*0.4*	7.4	7.3
Secondary	10.7	*2.2*	9.5	*0.5*	9.6	8.1

Table A2.4: Average number of years of teaching experience, by special schools

	Special schools (av. no. years)		Other schools (av. no. years)		All schools (av. no. years)	
	2013	***SE***	**2013**	***SE***	**2013**	**2010**
Teachers						
Primary	15.0	*1.1*	16.2	*0.3*	16.1	15.9
Secondary	16.9	*0.7*	17.2	*0.2*	17.3	17.6
Leaders						
Primary	26.1	*2.1*	25.7	*0.6*	25.7	25.5
Secondary	24.3	*1.5*	26.5	*0.5*	26.4	26.0

Table A2.5: Proportion of teachers who intend to leave teaching permanently prior to retirement, by special schools

Do you plan to leave teaching permanently prior to retirement?	Special schools (%)		Other schools (%)		All schools (%)	
	2013	***SE***	**2013**	***SE***	**2013**	**2010**
Primary teachers						
Yes	1.8	*1.0*	5.2	*0.6*	5.1	6.6
No	76.4	*5.8*	63.1	*1.4*	63.5	58.7
Unsure	21.8	*5.7*	31.7	*1.3*	31.4	34.6
	100		**100**		**100**	**100**
Secondary teachers						
Yes	6.6	*1.6*	7.7	*0.5*	7.7	9.7
No	51.9	*5.4*	58.6	*0.9*	58.5	56.6
..Unsure	41.4	*5.4*	33.6	*0.8*	33.8	33.7
	100		**100**		**100**	**100**

Table A2.6: Principals' perceptions of difficulties in filling vacancies, by special schools

What degree of difficulty have you had in the past 12 months in suitably filling staff vacancies across all areas of	Special schools (%)		Other schools (%)		All schools (%)	
	2013	***SE***	**2013**	***SE***	**2013**	**2010**
Primary schools						
Major difficulty	14.0	*9.1*	3.3	*1.1*	3.5	6.1
Moderate difficulty	15.2	*11.0*	17.4	*2.6*	17.3	21.1
Minor difficulty	45.3	*17.2*	36.5	*3.9*	36.8	31.7
No difficulty	25.5	*11.7*	42.8	*4.0*	42.4	41.1
	100		**100**		**100**	**100**
Secondary schools						
Major difficulty	19.5	*11.7*	7.3	*2.4*	8.1	9.1
Moderate difficulty	13.2	*6.6*	32.1	*4.4*	31.0	31.6
Minor difficulty	32.0	*10.7*	34.0	*4.3*	33.9	38.3
No difficulty	35.4	*10.7*	26.5	*4.7*	27.1	21.1
	100		**100**		**100**	**100**

Table A2.7: Principals' perceptions of difficulties in retaining staff, by special schools

What degree of difficulty have you had in the past 12 months in retaining suitable staff vacancies across all areas of	Special schools (%)		Other schools (%)		All schools (%)	
	2013	***SE***	**2013**	***SE***	**2013**	**2010**
Primary schools						
Major difficulty	21.6	*14.6*	2.2	*1.0*	2.8	5.1
Moderate difficulty	8.9	*5.9*	6.3	*1.8*	6.4	10.3
Minor difficulty	--	--	32.6	*3.9*	31.6	27.4
No difficulty	69.4	*14.9*	58.9	*4.0*	59.2	57.2
	100		**100**		**100**	**100**
Secondary schools						
Major difficulty	10.5	*7.1*	1.3	*0.8*	1.9	5.9
Moderate difficulty	24.0	*11.1*	10.1	*2.8*	11.0	18.2
Minor difficulty	15.6	*8.3*	50.5	*4.9*	48.2	39.6
No difficulty	49.9	*11.4*	38.1	*4.5*	38.9	36.4
	100		**100**		**100**	**100**