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Abstract
The remodelling agenda is a part of a wider modernisation process within education and the public sector as a whole. Schools are being taken through a process of examining the types of work taking place together with role re-definition, particularly for support staff. Issues are being raised about the resources supporting this process together with how teaching and administrative assistants are trained, paid, and have status in the school community. This paper draws on evaluation data from the Transforming the School Workforce Pathfinder Project (2002-2004), which piloted what is now known as remodelling, to examine how the goal of freeing teachers to teach and the cutting of bureaucratic burdens has impacted on the role and identities of teachers and support staff. A critical evaluation of the remodelling process will be provided, together with an analysis of how this relates to wider trends in modernisation.

Introduction
The current predicament in teaching is not new and it continues to be serious for both pupils and the profession. Not enough people are being trained and recruited to teaching, too many are leaving early in their career. For example, at the turn of the century 58% of teachers were over the age of 40 and 40% of new teachers leave within three years, and so a generation of teachers will retire in the next decade and their replacements are not staying the pace. It is estimated that 300,000 teachers are not working as teachers, and so their skills are being used in other parts of the economy, or members of the school workforce might be qualified but do not wish to practice as teachers. Teacher workload has been identified as a factor in teachers leaving (Smithers and Robinson 2003), and studies by PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC 2001) and the School Teachers’ Review Body (DfES 2000) provided evidence of long hours and intensified work. The solution to this is known as Remodelling the School Workforce and in January 2003 the DfES secured a National Agreement (DfES 2003) with the employers and unions (except the NUT, one of the largest teaching unions) to enable teachers to focus on teaching and learning by cutting the amount of clerical work and cover, and the provision of time to do leadership activities and for classroom teachers to have time to plan (NRT 2003: 3). A key strategy is to increase the role and types of support staff such as classroom assistants, clerical assistants, technicians, and bursars, to undertake work that has usually been done by qualified teachers. From September 2003 schools had to transfer 24 administrative tasks from teachers to support staff, and those with
leadership responsibilities had to have time to do this work\(^1\). Phase two began in September 2004 with a reduction in teacher cover, and from 2005 there will be guaranteed time for planning, preparation and assessment (PPA). Teachers will not have to do invigilation, and heads will have dedicated leadership time (NRT 2003). Underlying this are clear attempts to change the cultural norms that sustain traditional ways of working by using a change process that embraces the whole workforce through participation in change management teams within schools. Delivery of this strategy is in the hands of the Workforce Agreement Monitoring Group (WAMG) made up of unions, employers and Government, together with the National Remodelling Team (NRT) who are located in the National College for School Leadership and are providing advice and support to schools.

The key question is whether Remodelling can solve the difficulties in teacher workload, and the implications this has for the image and experience of teaching. In this paper I intend to explore this by drawing on evaluation data from a Project that the DfES launched in spring 2002 in order to pilot new ways of working that has subsequently become known as remodelling: first, to secure significant reductions in the current weekly hours worked by teachers; and, second, to increase the proportion of teachers’ working week spent teaching or on tasks directly related to teaching. The Project was called Transforming the School Workforce (TSW) Pathfinder Project and took place in 32 schools in England. The Project lasted a year with funding provided for additional staff (not teachers), ICT, bursarial training, and capital build. Each school had to devise an action plan and work within a change framework led by the London Leadership Centre, and was supported by a school workforce advisor and change management training.

\(^1\) These are tasks that classroom teachers should not routinely do. They were first listed in a DfES Circular in 1998 and then ratified by the School Teacher Review Body. They include: collecting money, chasing absences, bulk photocopying, copy typing, producing standard letters, class lists, record keeping and filing, classroom display, analysing attendance figures, processing exam results, collating student reports, administering work experience; administering examinations, invigilating examinations, administering teacher cover, ICT trouble shooting, commissioning new ICT equipment, ordering supplies and equipment, stocktaking, cataloguing, preparing, issuing and maintaining equipment and materials, minuting meetings, co-ordinating and submitting bids, seeking and giving personnel advice, managing and inputting pupil data. See DFES (2002).
The DfES commissioned a team from the School of Education, University of Birmingham, to evaluate the Project. The detail of the evaluation can be found in the final report (Thomas et al. 2004) where the outcomes regarding the link between interventions into practice and changes in workload are analysed. All teachers and support staff in the 32 schools (4 special, 16 primary, 12 secondary) were asked to complete a substantial questionnaire at the beginning and end of the Project. In 2003, a total of 2077 questionnaires were distributed and 1578 were completed, a response rate of 76 per cent. In the special schools, 173 were completed from a total of 202, a response rate of 86 per cent. In the primary schools, 440 were completed from 498 distributed, a response rate of 88 per cent. In the secondary schools, 969 were completed from a total of 1377, a response rate of 70 per cent. When responses from 2002 and 2003 are compared, only data from individuals who reported at both points has been used to make statements about change. In addition to this interviews were held with a representative sample of the workforce and governors on both occasions with a total of 359 interviews in 2003 (40 in the special schools, 122 in the primary schools and 197 in the secondary schools). The departure of staff was monitored and information collected from exit questionnaires. Eight of the schools where selected as case studies (2 secondary, 1 special, 1 primary, 4 small primaries in a cluster), and two additional visits took place during the year to undertake interviews with staff, governors and students, observe meetings, and to debrief the staff who had completed a workload diary. In order to review the potential of Remodelling to achieve its goals I intend reporting on aspects of the questionnaire data regarding how teachers use time and issues around job satisfaction and quality of life.

**Teachers’ work**

When we compare the data from teachers who reported their working week in 2002 with what they said in 2003 then there is evidence that during the time of the Project there has been a reduction in the hours worked. In the case of primary school classroom teachers there were 124 who replied in both years and their responses show an average fall of 4.1 hours in their reported hours of work. In the special schools, based on 47 teachers who replied in both years the fall in hours was comparable at 3.7. In secondary schools teachers report a smaller fall of 1.2 hours based on 311 teachers who replied in both years.
The data shows that 95% of teachers work in the evenings and weekends. The mean for a 'typical' evening in 2003 was 1.7 hours in special and primary schools and 1.9 hours in secondary schools. These must be aggregated to obtain a total for the week and such an aggregation would depend on how many weekday evenings teachers work. For example, if teachers normally worked on four evenings, excluding weekends, these data indicate 6.8 hours of work in special and primary schools and 7.6 hours in secondary schools. In terms of change from 2002, the evidence points to a small decline in each sector with the total for all weekdays again depending on the number of evenings worked. Thus, if work occurs on four weekday evenings, the reduction amounts to about 80 minutes in special schools, 53 minutes in primary schools and 29 minutes in secondary schools. With respect to Saturday, the mean hours in 2003 was 1.3 (special), 0.9 (primary) and 1.2 (secondary); and for Sunday, the mean was 2.1 (special), 2.1 (primary) and 2.3 (secondary). In terms of change between 2002 and 2003, there was a modest fall in hours across all school types ranging from 0.11 per cent (less than seven minutes) to 0.67 per cent (about 40 minutes).

The questionnaire has enabled the types of work teachers do to be mapped. Figure 1 shows the patterns of work across primary, special and secondary schools. In the pilot special schools in 2003, teachers reported that they spent 44 per cent of their time teaching and a further ten per cent in other forms of pupil contact, including registration, supervision, pastoral work and out-of-hours clubs. About 15 per cent of their time was committed to supporting learning, activities that include planning and preparing lessons, tests and assessments, marking class work, homework, exams and tests, keeping records of pupil performance and preparing pupils’ work for display. Twelve per cent of time was spent on school and staff management and six per cent on general administration, including organising resources and different forms of clerical work. Less frequent 'other activities’, such as staff training, writing term reports, liaison with governors and parents added up to a further 13 per cent of time. In assessing change between 2002 and 2003 in the distribution of time to different activities, data were provided by 41 full time teachers who replied.
in both years and, with respect to time spent on the items in the ‘teaching’ category, there was a negligible decline of 0.7 per cent.

In the pilot primary schools in the Project, teachers reported in the 2003 survey that they spent 42 per cent of their time teaching. Eleven per cent of their time was reported as being committed to other pupil contact and 20 per cent to supporting learning. School and staff management absorbed about nine per cent of their time, six per cent on general administration and 12 per cent on other less frequent activities. When the results of the 106 teachers who provided data in 2002 and 2003 were compared, there was a small increase of three per cent in the time allocated to the ‘teaching’ category. Secondary school teachers in the pilot schools reported that in 2003, 44 per cent of their time was committed to teaching and 11 per cent to other forms of pupil contact. Supporting learning, activities such as planning and preparing lessons, tests and assessments, marking class work, homework, exams and tests, keeping records of pupil performance absorbed 20 per cent of their time with six per cent committed to school and staff management and six per cent to general administration. About 13 per cent of the time of class teachers was spent on less frequent ‘other activities’. In reviewing the responses from those who replied in 2002 and 2003, there was almost no change. For the 282 teachers who provided data in both years, there was a negligible increase of 0.2 per cent in time allocated to the ‘teaching’ category.

It is not surprising that teachers’ work is dominated by teaching and pupils support activity, and indeed the Project was designed to free teachers up from bureaucratic burdens in order to focus on teaching and learning. Underlying each of these six main categories in Figure 1 were 85 sub-items and, of these, eight were selected for further analysis because they could clearly be done by members of the school workforce who were not teachers. These were: (1) preparing pupil work for display; (2) mounting pupil work for display; (3) clerical work – photocopying; (4) clerical work – filing; (5) clerical work – database entry; (6) clerical work – routine form filling; (7) collecting money from children – school trips; and (8) collecting money from children – clubs. When these eight items were examined in the special schools, the most notable finding was that
for all except one of the items, teachers reported a fall in time spent on all but one of these activities. The first two of these items – preparing and mounting pupil work for display – showed a total fall of about 40 minutes per week among the 33 teachers reporting in both years. The remaining six items were clerical functions and these showed a total fall 45 minutes among the 25 teachers reporting in both years; the one item showing a rise was an increase of only one minute. Primary schools showed a fall in time devoted to the eight tasks, and for the two items on preparing and mounting pupils' work for display, the mean fall in time reported by 83 teachers was 52 minutes per week and, for the 81 teachers reporting on the six 'clerical' items, a fall of 58 minutes was reported. The profile among secondary school teachers was markedly different from their special and primary school counterparts. Their response to the two items on pupil display showed a fall of only three minutes by the 206 teachers who replied in both years. For the other six 'clerical' items, the 177 teachers who responded to these in both years reported a decline of 22 minutes, 15 of these on the item 'clerical work – photocopying', and an overall fall that was lower than in the special and primary schools.

It is important to be cautious in using these numbers. Estimates of time devoted to specific tasks are just that – estimates – and subject to error. However, the direction of change is illuminating. On average, those teachers reporting on the distribution of their time in 2003 compared with 2002 showed a marked decline in hours spent on tasks that can clearly be done by other members of the school workforce, though the decline is lower in secondary schools. Reviewing the data across the three types of schools, the biggest difference was on the time devoted by teachers to preparing pupil displays. On this task, teachers in special and primary schools reported a large fall in time while secondary school teachers reported no change. The effect of this was to make the 2003 returns more comparable across all three types of school. Thus, in 2003, the 390 secondary school teachers reported spending 66 minutes per week on pupil display compared with 72 minutes in primary schools and 64 minutes in special schools. Whilst these estimates must not be interpreted too literally, the overall profile of no change in secondary schools and marked change in the special and primary schools suggests that these were items available for
‘quick wins’ in the use of time in those schools with teachers transferring functions to support staff.

With respect to the ‘clerical items’, while secondary school teachers reported a decline of 22 minutes, this was lower than the decline of 58 minutes among primary school teachers and 45 minutes in the special schools. Moreover, comparisons of the responses by all teachers in 2003 showed these items as taking more time among secondary school teachers with the biggest difference in two items: ‘clerical work – database entry’ and ‘clerical work – routine form filling’. On these items alone, secondary school teachers reported spending 66 minutes per week compared with 33 minutes by teachers in special and primary schools. While these data must not be interpreted too literally, they do point to activities in secondary schools that might more appropriately be done by members of the clerical staff.

Taken as a whole, therefore, a review of the eight items that could be transferred to non-teaching members of the school workforce, suggest two initial conclusions. First, it would seem that there were some ‘quick wins’ that were implemented in special and primary schools with respect to pupil display and where the fall in time between 2002 and 2003 may have contributed to the larger fall in total hours in those schools. Second, there would seem to be some evidence that there was routine activity related to database work and form filling in all schools - but particularly in secondary schools - that could be transferred to non-teacher members of the school workforce.

**Job satisfaction**

In addition to seeking a reduction in the hours worked by teachers, the Project was also concerned to enrich teachers’ own work and increase their job satisfaction and commitment. In that context, the questionnaire included a set of statements that represented attributes of a job where satisfaction would contribute to an overall sense of satisfaction about work. The statements on job satisfaction have been divided into two sets:

- Individual perceptions of their own job satisfaction:
  - The actual job itself
The degree to which you feel ‘motivated’ by your job

The kind of work you are required to perform

The degree to which you feel you can personally develop or grow in your job

The degree to which your job taps the range of skills which you feel you possess

The degree to which you feel extended by your job

Individual perception of how the organization impacts on their job satisfaction:

Communication and the way information flows around the organisation

The style of supervision that your superiors use

The way changes are implemented

The way in which conflicts are resolved in your organisation

The psychological ‘feel’ or climate that dominates your organization

The design or shape of your organisation's structure.

In regard to the personal statements levels of satisfaction in the pilot schools are high with the highest level of satisfaction was from teachers in special schools. In 2003, these range from a mean of 4.53 to 4.94 and changes during the year are negligible. The responses of primary school teachers were next highest in level of satisfaction, ranging from 4.49 to 4.73 with the change from 2002 to 2003 also showing negligible change. Whilst the responses from the secondary school teachers in the Project were the lowest of all three sectors, ranging from 3.93 to 4.45, they were all positive with the change from 2002 also negligible.

Relationships between working hours, job satisfaction and motivation are complex and some highly motivated people gain much satisfaction from their work and choose to work long hours. However, given the publicly expressed concern about the hours worked by teachers and the Project's goal of reducing hours, it was reasonable to propose an hypothesis that for most teachers, job satisfaction and motivation would be negatively correlated with hours worked. In other words, longer working hours would be associated with less job satisfaction and lower motivation. Further analysis was undertaken, therefore, to examine the relationship between job
satisfaction and hours worked. Among the six statements attitudes to the first two – the ‘job itself’ and ‘motivation’ – were judged to be more likely to be related to or influenced by working hours. The hypothesis was applied in three ways. The first two comparisons examined the relationship between hours worked and levels of job satisfaction and motivation in 2002 and 2003. In 2002 and 2003, no significant relationships were established between reported hours and levels of job satisfaction and levels of motivation; this was the case in special, primary and secondary schools. However, when change in hours between 2002 and 2003 was examined, the results for teachers in secondary schools showed a significant correlation between job satisfaction and change in hours worked and it was in the expected direction with job satisfaction increasing as hours fall. There was no comparable change in the results for the statement on ‘motivation’ or for either statement among teachers, in special and primary schools.

These results indicate the complexity of these issues. The response of secondary school teachers to a fall in their hours indicates that the relationship cannot be ignored. Yet, it is clear that there is no simple predictive general relationship between hours worked – or even change in hours worked – and a sense of job satisfaction or motivation. The data shows that there were higher levels of job satisfaction in special and primary schools compared with secondary schools, but these cannot be explained by differences in hours worked. More likely is that teachers’ sense of satisfaction and motivation is embedded in a larger set of beliefs and attitudes, such as commitment to teaching, working relations with children and colleagues or the ethos of the school, and that securing higher levels of satisfaction involves a wider set of changes than focusing on hours alone.

The pattern of response to the statements on satisfaction with the organization were similar to the pattern for the statements more directly linked to a person’s job; special schools reported the highest level of satisfaction and secondary schools the lowest. In all three types of schools, however, the satisfaction scores were in a lower range. In special schools, the mean scores for each statement ranged from 3.81 to 4.46, all showed a level of satisfaction but lower than for the
‘personal’ statements, and the change from 2002 were negligible. For the primary schools in the Project, the mean responses all showed some level of satisfaction with the range from 3.88 to 4.23. The change from 2002 showed a very small fall in every mean score with the exception of one item (the way changes are implemented) that showed a small rise. In the case of the secondary schools, the mean scores for the six statements ranged from 3.32 to 3.74. For two of these scores, one on communication and the other on how change is implemented, levels of dissatisfaction were higher than levels of satisfaction; for the other four statements, the average scores reported a level of satisfaction but only slightly above the mean. The change from 2002 was negligible.

**Quality of life**

A set of statements on quality of life included items that were related to work but also included items that locate the consequences of work in the broader context of a teacher’s personal life and aspirations. These statements are:

- I effectively manage my working time
- I feel that my work in this school is valued
- I enjoy my work most of the time
- I feel that the work I do is a good use of my time
- I enjoy work now more than I did 12 months ago
- I know that if my workload is too much I can discuss it with a senior manager in school
- I find it difficult to unwind at the end of a work day
- I am expected to do things that are not part of my job
- I want to reduce the hours I work
- I feel unable to do things which I think should be a part of my job
- I feel I should have the time to do the job as it should be done
- After leaving work I still worry about job problems
- I would like to leave teaching within the next year
- My job makes me feel exhausted by the end of the work day
The first six statements are positively worded and are about work and the working environment. The overall response to these statements was positive with most of the mean scores for 2003 greater than four and represented a position between agreement (a score of four) and strong agreement (a score of five). The least positive response was to the statement ‘I enjoy work now more than 12 months ago’. Here, the mean response was less than four, in the range between ‘disagree’ (three) and ‘agree’ (four). Moreover, the change from 2002 showed a marked shift towards a more negative position with the special schools showing a negative shift of 0.91, primary schools a fall of –1.05 and secondary schools a fall of 1.04. In terms of other changes since 2002, negative movements occurred in relation to three other statements: whether work is valued, whether it is a good use of time and whether workload problems can be discussed with senior managers. By contrast, there was a positive shift in relation to the statement on ‘enjoying work’ and, in special and primary schools, to the statement on time management.

The next six statements are couched in a negative form, and across all three types of schools, responses to the eight statements are all in the same direction. With respect to the first statement, ‘I find it difficult to unwind at the end of work day’, teachers were somewhat more likely to agree than disagree with those in secondary schools most likely to agree that they found it difficult to unwind. Change since 2002 was small. In terms of doing ‘things that are not part of my job’, attitudes were evenly divided in special and primary schools with secondary school teachers more likely to agree; change since 2002 reflected this profile with the teachers in special and primary schools more likely to disagree with the statement than a year earlier. The third statement on reduction in hours elicits a very high level of agreement across all three types of school and also shows a higher level of agreement in 2003 compared with a year earlier. The next statement was ‘I feel unable to do things which I think should be part of my job’. Attitudes were fairly evenly divided in response to this statement but there was a marked change from 2002, where teachers were much more likely to disagree with the statement. The next statement was ‘I feel I should have the time to do the job as it should be done’. Responses here were
overwhelmingly in agreement with the change (quite large for the secondary schools) indicating a stronger view on the issue compared with a year earlier. The sixth and eighth statements refer to worrying about job problems after leaving work and feeling exhausted at the end of the workday. On both statements, there were high levels of agreement, indicating unsatisfactory positions. Change since 2002 show different profiles, however, the small negative shift on the first statement indicating less likelihood to worry about job problems but the opposite shift on the final statement, a more troubling outcome.

Implications of the findings for remodelling the school workforce

The key findings from the study are that classroom teachers across all types of schools report a reduction in hours worked, ranging from 3.7 hours per week in the primary schools, 3.5 hours in the special schools and 1.2 hours in the secondary schools. There is evidence of substantive change in time devoted to routine tasks. Teachers became more positive about the contribution that teaching assistants can make, although there was only a weak relationship between a fall in hours worked and a more positive view on the potential of teaching assistants reducing workload. Teachers were positive about the impact of bursars on their own workload. There is no systematic relationship between job satisfaction and hours worked, and this remains a complex issue.

A positive reading of the potential of Remodelling based on the findings of the TSW Project shows that at local level interventions can be made in practice which make a difference to the work-life balance. Furthermore, trends in the school workforce show that the number of support staff are up by 17,700 to 243,000 in January 2004, with the biggest increase being in the number of teaching assistants with an additional 11,000 raising the total to 133,400 (DfES 2004). While there is no formal research evidence of the impact of Remodelling, there are anecdotal reports that show positive trends that resonate with the experiences of the TSW schools (see the Remodelling web site: www.remodelling.org). Professionals have written into the TES to provide accounts of the gains being made (TES 2004), and Crace (2004) reports on Grey Court
School in Ham, south west London, where the Head argues that “It’s not just about getting the staff to feel better about themselves… it’s also about getting a better deal for the students. If staff are doing the jobs they are trained for, then pupils will be getting their educational needs met”.

She goes on to describe the changes:

“For instance, we’ve got in a full-time attendance officer to save heads of year wasting time on following up kids not in school. I’ve also hired an IT specialist to run our systems: previously it was all ad hoc and the school didn’t even have any standard letter templates… It also makes sense to hire a part time social worker to help with problem kids, instead of putting a highly paid head of department with no counselling skills on the case. We also plan to get assistants in to supervise the brighter students on accelerated learning programmes en route to outside colleges; and at the needier end of the scale, it’s better to have an assistant trained in helping with special needs than to deploy a whole-class specialist” (Crace 2004: 2).

Such evidence is important because it could be argued that the achievements in the TSW Pilot Schools were due to particular factors: first, additional resources where given; and, second, the schools were invited to participate and some had already begun to work on what has become known as Remodelling prior to the Project, had a stake in making it work and could use it as an opportunity to further strategic goals.

There is also evidence of concerns regarding Remodelling and the educational press has covered a range of stories regarding: first, the resourcing of the reforms; second, whether workload has eased and teachers have a better work life balance; and third, the role of support staff, and in particular teaching assistants, in regard to status, job descriptions and pay. Certainly there is evidence from the TSW Project regarding these matters:

- Slater and Stewart (2004) report on OfSTED findings that the workload agreement has increased the demands on headteachers, and while teachers in the TSW schools secured a reduction in hours of work, it is still the case that they report working around 50 or more hours per week, and senior staff in the interviews did talk about the pressures of securing Project outcomes. We must also acknowledge particular local factors that led to variations in outcomes: the highest rate of workload reduction was 13 hours per week in
a primary school, and the lowest rate was a two and a half hour increase per week in a primary school.

- Lee (2004) reports that in a Remodelling training session Heads were told to bring in the Women’s Institute to cover lessons while teachers could do planning. Stewart (2004c) reports that Headteachers had costed the shortfall between what PPA needed to be implemented and what they would probably receive. The TSW schools did secure some changes for free through examining work and changing attitudes, but the additional funds for ICT, buildings, staffing, and training did make a difference to the extent that the schools were concerned about sustainability once the Project had ended.

- There have been numerous reports regarding the pay and role of support staff, with Crace (2004) outlining the Birmingham agreement where Higher Level Teaching Assistants (HTLA) can earn a maximum of £22,689 in comparison with a Newly Qualified Teacher (NQT) who starts on £18,558. This anomaly could affect the relationships between the workforce in regard to status and experience, but is made more complex by reports from other localities that HLTAs may only be paid at the higher level for the time they work at that level rather than all the time (Stewart 2004d). Certainly the TSW Project shows that the schools had worked on job descriptions and pay scales, but while they had developed new structures it was still the case that local and national agreements on salaries and training would be needed. There are even deeper issues than this, and what is so far unreported in the press but has been raised through the TSW Project is the composition of the support staff. The questionnaire data shows that of the 292 support staff in learning roles (e.g. teaching assistants, learning assistants for SEN or EAL) at the time of the 2003 fieldwork, 217 are women and 15 are men. Of these 50 have first degrees (9 men and 41 women), and 10 have qualified teacher status (4 men, 6 women). This generates questions about the gender composition of the support staff, and why very qualified people are either not moving on to train to teach or may be using their professional skills without the status or remuneration.
The TSW Project raised issues regarding teachers and their work that Remodelling is not directly addressing. This could be because Remodelling is part of a wider modernisation process that has within it the contradictions and tensions that TSW unearthed. For example, for the Project to be successful within the pilot schools then it had to be supported and prioritised by staff, most notably senior staff. The investment of time, thinking, and emotion into the process and the delivery of outcomes that the evaluation team could then measure is part of the culture of work that the Project, and subsequently Remodelling, is meant to moderate and hopefully eradicate. Compliance with this is based on a tension between the demands of modernisation and the sediments of professionalism. Modernisation means that teachers, like other public sector workers, must submit themselves to radical restructuring in the following ways:

- **Standards and accountability**: there is a national framework to regulate performance which both challenges and secures scrutiny of public sector workers;
- **Devolution and delegation**: where innovation at local level is allowed and encouraged in resolving issues on the “front-line”;
- **Flexibility and incentives**: the relationship between work and the employ/deployment of the workforce in an efficient and effective way challenges traditional contractual and cultural boundaries;
- **Expanding choice**: there is expanding diversity through types of provision and tackling poor quality service (DfES 2002: 3-4).

What this has done is to shift the focus of relationships towards “the contractual, competitive and calculative” (Clarke et al. 2001: 9), and so in order to achieve the funds necessary to deliver education the workforce have to operate within the bidding culture of endless short term projects and varied income streams. They have been told that they are the problem in education, most notably illuminated in the DfEE document in 1998 when teachers were told they, and it seems they alone, must meet the challenge of change (DfEE 1998). At the same time, the workforce have had to make the reforms work through their professionalism, and as such draw on the culture and experience that has both sustained them, and minimised damage to learning, since site based management was introduced from the late 1980s. Local Management of Schools showed
great promise regarding the opportunities to identify curriculum and learning needs and use this to make choices about staffing and plant, but this was eclipsed by the centralisation and instrumentalisation of the curriculum and assessment in the 1990s. Similarly, while schools are now seeking to create a better work-life balance, they are having to handle a pay restructuring for those who have crossed the threshold with pay reductions forecast (Stewart 2004a, b), and the prospect of teachers being expected to support out of hours homework through email discussions with students (Shaw 2004).

At the heart of modernisation is incentivisation where commitment to work is shifted away from the school as a public institution, and as Ozga (2000) argues “teachers are disconnected from their fundamentally important role in building citizenship” (356). By “stripping out (the) meaning” (355) from teaching then the workforce becomes flexible and deployable: they can be used to deliver central political agendas through organisational compliance. Helsby (1999) notes the damaging effect of this:

“Workloads for most people have also increased as a result of coping with constant changes, attending more frequent team meetings, satisfying more extensive accountability, reporting and quality assurance requirements and meeting target for continuing increases in productivity. Job insecurity tends to enhance compliance, as people work longer hours in order to meet work demands, which increasingly impinge upon their private life. The seductive rhetoric of ‘empowerment’ rings somewhat hollow for many as excessive responsibilities, imposed by others, force them towards corner-cutting and survival strategies and reduce scope for meaningful reflection and creative thinking. Whilst rapid technological advances have frequently obliged people in employment to acquire new capabilities, continuing changes to work practices have the effect of repeatedly deskilling many, whilst persistent calls for ‘upskilling’ are often based upon a demoralizing view of the presumed deficiencies of the workforce” (7).

This intensification of work can, based on the only data we have from the TSW Evaluation, only partly be dealt with by Remodelling. This is because it begins on the assumption that teachers are the problem and proposes to restructure work and reculture attitudes through organisational change. It does not begin with the nature of teaching and learning, and hence how human and other resources can be used to enable this process to develop and improve. Furthermore, it does not return to teachers the opportunity to determine the ends of teaching and learning, and without direct involvement in the purposes of work then teachers are once again sedated into making
externally determined changes work. A danger for Remodelling is that it is just that, a do-it-yourself make over, where the surface fabric looks different but underneath the structural issues of having to do work that does not make sense to students or to teachers continues. While a teacher may have a lap-top and may be able to access lesson plans from the internet, and may have an assistant to do photocopying, this does not necessarily mean that student learning and achievement is improved. This is largely because there is no conceptual link between the speeding up of ready made resources and actual pedagogic practice with learning. Indeed, the danger could be, as Sennett (1999) as so graphically described, that the teacher’s character continues to be corroded. The TSW case study data (Thomas et al. 2004) shows that when schools did begin with the nature and process of learning, and how teaching enables this, then they have been able to make some fundamental changes to the nature of work. In particular, they have learned that they can take back control for teaching and learning, and through exercising professional judgement in regard to externally determined change.
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Figure 1: Teachers’ work in three types of schools
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