



Teacher Workload and Stressors

Perceived Changes in Teachers' Responsibilities, Time Allocation, and Levels of Stress in Maine Public Schools

A Survey Conducted for:
The Commissioner's Task Force on Teacher Workload

Prepared By:
The Maine Education Policy Research Institute
The University of Maine, Orono, Maine

November 2004

THE COMMISSIONER'S TASK FORCE ON TEACHER WORKLOAD

Karoldene Barnes, MSAD #64
Lois Kilby-Chesley, Freeport School Department
Suanne Giorgetti, Benton School Department
Grace Leavitt, MSAD #51
Larry Littlefield, Kittery School Department
Richard Lyons, MSAD #22
Serena Morris, MSAD #22
Amy O'Brien-Brown, Union #30
Krystal Ash O'Sullivan, Scarborough School Department
Greg Scott, Maine Department Of Education
Phyllis Shubert, Bangor School Board
Joe Stupak, Maine Education Association
Rob Walker, Maine Education Association

TEACHER WORKLOAD AND STRESSORS:
PERCEIVED CHANGES IN TEACHERS'
RESPONSIBILITIES, TIME ALLOCATION, AND LEVELS
OF STRESS IN MAINE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A Survey Conducted for:
The Commissioner's Task Force on Teacher Workload

Prepared By:
The Maine Education Policy Research Institute
The University of Maine, Orono, Maine

November 2004

Overview

In December 2003 the Commissioner's Task Force on Teacher Workload requested that the Maine Education Policy Research Institute (MEPRI) conduct a survey of Maine teachers that would assist in better understanding perceived changes in teachers' workload. The survey was to document if and how the job responsibilities and time allocation of teachers at various grade levels may have changed in recent years and identify factors that may have caused these changes. In addition, the survey was to assess teachers' perceived levels of job-related stress; identify factors attributed with causing stress; and identify strategies that school districts might have implemented to help teachers manage time and/or accommodate their workloads.

This report describes the sample and the most salient findings of the data. The survey is included in the Appendix.

Creation of the Survey

MEPRI personnel met with the Task Force members on three occasions in December 2003 and January 2004 to review survey items and format. A draft survey was created, reviewed with Task Force members and, in early January 2004, piloted with several groups of practicing teachers that represented all grade spans. Feedback from Task Force members and the pilot groups prompted revisions and creation of a final survey in mid-January. This survey was mailed to the school addresses of a sample of Maine teachers with the request that it be returned by February 6.

The Sample

A personnel list representing 16,447 full-time teachers in the 2002-2003 academic year was obtained from the Maine Department of Education. In order to ensure geographic representation of Maine's teachers, a sample was created by randomly selecting 60% (9,868) of

the elementary, secondary, and specialist teachers in each of the nine superintendent regions and the unorganized territories. Three thousand, two hundred and sixty-one surveys were returned yielding an overall return rate of 33%. Tables 1, 2, and 3 provide specific information about the number of teachers in the total population (Table 1), those selected for the sample (Table 2), and the return rate by region and teacher assignment (Table 3).

**Table 1
Total Population of Teachers by Teaching Assignment and Region (N = 16,447)**

	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary/ Secondary Combo	Special Education Elementary	Special Education Secondary	Special Education Elem/Sec Combo	Art	Music	Physical Education	Literacy	Vocational
Aroostook	504	209	33	74	28	12	21	36	50	8	44
Penquis	1058	477	17	185	64	10	62	74	88	32	46
Washington	253	100	5	42	11	2	16	13	15	6	14
Hancock	362	150	2	66	20	1	33	33	24	9	8
Mid-Coast	597	253	14	112	39	3	55	55	49	12	30
Western Maine	1199	542	14	249	86	9	85	77	92	19	69
Cumberland	1762	795	11	356	133	6	146	131	128	44	82
Kennebec Valley	1198	548	23	212	78	11	79	81	88	32	42
York	1244	572	6	223	79	8	97	88	96	19	31
Unorganized Townships	18			1					2		
Total	8,195	3,646	125	1,520	538	62	594	588	632	181	366

Table 2. Number of Teachers Sampled by Teaching Assignment and Region (N = 9,868)

	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary/ Secondary Combo	Special Education Elementary	Special Education Secondary	Special Education Elem/Sec Combo	Art	Music	Physical Education	Literacy	Vocational
Aroostook	302	125	20	44	17	7	13	22	30	5	26
Penquis	635	286	10	111	38	6	37	44	53	19	28
Washington	153	60	3	25	7	1	10	8	9	4	8
Hancock	217	90	1	40	12	1	20	20	14	5	5
Mid-Coast	358	152	8	67	23	2	33	33	29	7	18
Western Maine	719	325	8	149	52	5	51	46	55	11	41
Cumberland	1057	477	7	214	80	4	88	79	77	26	49
Kennebec Valley	719	329	14	127	47	7	47	49	53	19	25
York	746	343	4	134	47	5	58	53	58	11	19
Unorganized Townships	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Total	4,917	2,187	75	912	323	38	357	354	379	107	219

Table 3. Percent of Teachers Responding by Teaching Assignment and Region (N = 3,261)

	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary/ Secondary Combo	Special Education Elementary	Special Education Secondary	Special Education Elem/Sec Combo	Art	Music	Physical Education	Literacy	Vocational	Total %
Aroostook	36.1%	43.2%	25.0%	36.4%	64.7%	28.6%	15.4%	22.7%	23.3%	40.0%	50.0%	37.0%
Penquis	34.8%	34.6%	10.0%	35.1%	28.9%	0.0%	32.4%	27.3%	26.4%	31.6%	35.7%	33.5%
Washington	28.9%	40.0%	33.3%	44.0%	57.1%	**	10.0%	25.0%	33.3%	25.0%	12.5%	31.9%
Hancock	39.2%	33.3%	**	30.0%	33.3%	**	35.0%	10.0%	21.4%	**	**	33.6%
Mid-Coast	34.6%	42.1%	25.0%	29.9%	34.8%	**	12.1%	24.2%	34.5%	42.9%	16.7%	33.7%
Western Maine	34.2%	35.1%	12.5%	28.9%	28.8%	**	19.6%	19.6%	20.0%	54.5%	24.4%	32.0%
Cumberland	37.2%	31.9%	14.3%	24.3%	23.8%	**	27.3%	16.5%	29.9%	46.2%	34.7%	32.8%
Kennebec Valley	34.8%	34.3%	21.4%	26.0%	34.0%	14.3%	27.7%	20.4%	20.8%	47.4%	20.0%	32.3%
York	35.5%	32.7%	**	29.1%	23.4%	20.0%	27.6%	22.6%	22.4%	9.1%	42.1%	32.3%
Unorganized Townships	36.4%	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	30.8%
Total	35.4%	34.8%	18.7%	29.1%	30.7%	21.1%	24.9%	20.6%	25.1%	37.4%	30.6%	33.0%

** Random sample had fewer than six cases.

An overall return rate of 33% with a distribution among the regions ranging from 32% to 37% can be considered to be representative of the geographic distribution of Maine’s teaching force, and random selection further ensures a representative sample.

Tables 4 and 5 indicate the level of job stability of the respondents in terms of the number of years spent in the current teaching assignment (Table 4) and the number of years teaching in the same school district (Table 5).

Table 4. Number of Years in Current Teaching Assignment

	n	%
1 year	160	5.0
2 years	270	8.4
3 years	309	9.6
4 years	271	8.4
5 years	255	7.9
6 years	182	5.6
7 years	135	4.2
8 years	127	3.9
9 years	84	2.6
10 years	88	2.7
More than 10 years	1345	41.7
Total	3226	100.0
Missing	35	
Total	3261	

Table 5. Years in Current School District

	n	%
1 year	36	1.1
2 years	170	5.3
3 years	243	7.5
4 years	233	7.2
5 years	208	6.4
6 years	147	4.6
7 years	121	3.8
8 years	110	3.4
9 years	89	2.8
10 years	106	3.3
More than 10 years	1763	54.6
Total	3226	100.0
Missing	35	
Total	3261	

These data suggest that the respondents were predominantly teachers who were well experienced and had been working in their school districts and current assignments long enough to have experienced the various components of teaching that are explored with this survey.

In summary, the demographic data provided by the respondents suggest that the data resulting from the survey are representative of Maine teachers. However, caution is urged in interpreting these data because information about non respondents is not available.

Data Analysis

Unless otherwise noted, data are presented for all respondents. In several instances, the data have been divided into seven major groups according to respondent's teaching assignment: elementary teachers (preK – 8), secondary teachers (9 – 12), special education elementary teachers (preK – 8), special education secondary teachers (9 – 12), art and music teachers, physical education teachers, and vocational education teachers.

Teachers' Use of Time

Length of School Day and Week

The survey asked teachers to indicate the length of their required school day in hours and minutes excluding required before-school and after-school meetings. An examination of the data reported by all elementary and secondary teachers revealed virtually no difference. The average length of the school day reported by elementary teachers was 7 hours, 7 minutes ($SD = 21$ minutes), while secondary teachers reported an average of 7 hours, 2 minutes ($SD = 23$ minutes). All respondents indicated, on average, that they are required to be at school 7 hours per day, which would translate into an onsite work week of 35 hours. This average 35-hour per week requirement is often increased by before- and after-school meetings.

Total Time Spent on School Related Tasks

Teachers were asked to indicate the amount of school and personal time spent on specific school tasks during their last full week of teaching prior to receiving the survey. For each of the seven groups identified above, the total amount of time spent on job-related activities is illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6. Mean Number of Hours Per Week Teachers Spend on Various Job-Related Activities

	Elementary Teachers	Secondary Teachers	Special Education Elementary Teachers	Special Education Secondary Teachers	Art and Music Teachers	Physical Education Teachers	Vocational Education Teachers	All Teachers
Planning lessons, creating materials, or setting up room/lab	10.6	10.4	8.4	8.1	9.6	8.0	9.4	10.0
Classroom instruction	23.9	20.7	19.9	18.0	18.7	18.9	17.5	21.7
Evaluating student performance	7.4	8.3	5.4	4.7	5.5	6.2	7.0	7.1
Committee work	1.8	2.0	1.5	2.0	1.7	1.5	1.8	1.8
Communicating or meeting with parents	1.8	1.5	2.6	2.5	1.3	1.3	1.7	1.8
Preparing for or attending PET and/or 504 meetings	1.3	1.5	5.8	6.1	0.6	0.8	1.5	2.3
Directing, supervising, or coordinating after-school student activities	1.4	3.2	0.6	1.4	4.2	4.7	4.1	2.1
Other job-related tasks	3.9	5.1	4.8	5.7	4.8	4.6	4.6	4.4
Total Hours Spent on Tasks	52.0	52.8	49.1	48.5	46.4	46.2	47.7	51.4

One percent (n = 32) of the respondents indicated they spent more than 80 hours per week to complete the above tasks and were not included in this analysis.

Table 6 above indicates that the amount of time teachers spend on school-related tasks varies by job assignment and exceeds the number of hours in the required school week. As the last column in the table above illustrates, the average number of hours worked by the responding teachers, beyond the 35 hour baseline, is more than 16 hours per week. Elementary and secondary teachers reported spending the most amount of time per week on these tasks, while art and music teachers, and physical education teachers reported spending the least amount of time.

Teachers' Use of Personal Time

Further analysis of the data related to total amount of time spent on various school-related tasks allowed this time to be divided into school time and personal time. Table 7 presents the personal time as a percent of the total time reported by each group of teachers as spent on these specific tasks.

An examination of Tables 6 and 7 indicates that all teachers use significant amounts of personal time to accomplish school-related tasks. To complete the task of planning lessons, creating materials and/or setting up rooms or labs, elementary teachers use a higher percentage of personal time than all other groups. Conversely, elementary teachers do not appear to use as much of their personal time as the other groups to accomplish the task of directing, supervising or coordinating after-school activities. Both groups of special education teachers reported using a higher percentage of personal time than others to prepare for or attend PET and 504 meetings.

Table 7. Personal Time As a Percent of Total Time Spent on Specific Job Related Tasks

	Elementary Teachers	Secondary Teachers	Special Education Elementary Teachers	Special Education Secondary Teachers	Art and Music Teachers	Physical Education Teachers	Vocational Education Teachers
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Planning lessons, creating materials, or setting up room/lab	52.4	44.3	48.9	45.0	41.1	35.6	42.8
Evaluating student performance	48.9	50.5	38.8	39.1	42.7	33.8	39.3
Committee work	42.0	35.1	50.7	41.0	45.9	38.1	51.1
Communicating or meeting with parents	42.3	36.4	43.4	35.0	42.2	44.7	38.4
Preparing for or attending PET and/or 504 meetings	28.8	31.7	50.6	45.3	32.9	46.4	35.6
Directing, supervising, or coordinating after-school student activities	33.5	51.8	54.0	48.0	54.9	55.6	61.6
Other job-related tasks	42.2	34.1	40.2	40.2	34.2	34.2	55.6

Teachers' Perceptions of Change in the Use of Time Over a Three-Year Period

Teachers were asked to indicate on a 5-point scale (1 = significant decrease and 5 = significant increase) whether they perceived the amount of time spent on various job-related tasks to have increased or decreased over the past three years. Teachers were also asked to indicate if a specific activity did not apply to them. Since only a very small percentage of teachers indicated a decrease in the time they spend on any of the tasks, only the percentage of teachers who perceived an increase is presented. There were 36 tasks grouped into the following six categories: class preparation, assessment of student work, communications, administrative tasks, noninstructional/extracurricular student events, and other. Tables 8 through Table 13 presents these six categories. Only respondents who had taught for at least three years were included in this analysis.

Table 8. Percentage of Teachers Who Indicated an Increase in Time Spent on Classroom Preparation Activities

	Elem.	Sec.	Spec. Ed. Elem.	Spec. Ed. H.S.	Art & Music	Phys. Ed.	Voc.	All Teachers
Planning lessons (for class as a whole)	75.6%	57.1%	50.4%	68.5%	59.2%	60.7%	60.9%	66.9%
Planning lessons(s) for students with disabilities	69.6%	56.3%	71.3%	78.7%	54.4%	67.4%	60.3%	65.4%
Preparing instruction for students with Limited English Prof.	16.6%	20.8%	8.0%	9.5%	16.7%	21.0%	19.0%	16.8%
Modifying lessons to meet individual student needs	83.2%	71.9%	75.8%	77.0%	69.6%	64.4%	73.4%	78.0%
Preparing instructional materials	81.7%	68.6%	77.6%	77.0%	69.4%	65.9%	80.6%	76.8%
Directing or preparing lessons for support staff, ed. techs	51.0%	28.6%	67.7%	71.9%	23.7%	34.8%	35.9%	45.5%
Aligning lessons to the Maine Learning Results	90.9%	90.8%	87.1%	93.3%	89.2%	89.9%	89.1%	90.3%
Integrating technology into lessons	75.1%	70.7%	60.5%	68.5%	62.0%	54.5%	68.8%	71.0%

Consistent across all seven teacher groups, time spent *aligning lessons to the Maine Learning Results* was the task that garnered the highest percentage of respondents who indicated an increase in time spent (90.3%). More than three quarters of all respondents (78.0%) indicated that time spent *modifying instruction to meet individual student needs* had increased during the past three years, while 76.8% indicated that time spent *preparing instructional materials* had also increased.

Table 9. Percentage of Teachers Who Indicated an Increase in Time Spent on Assessment of Student Work Activities

	Elem.	Sec.	Spec. Ed. Elem.	Spec. Ed. H.S.	Art & Music	Phys. Ed.	Voc.	All Teachers
Creating assessment tools	95.2%	91.7%	80.6%	86.4%	93.0%	95.5%	89.1%	92.5%
Grading/scoring student work	86.0%	75.0%	69.0%	68.2%	78.5%	88.8%	79.4%	80.7%
Grading/scoring common (district) assessments	86.2%	71.3%	72.4%	51.7%	60.9%	79.5%	47.6%	78.1%
Analyzing student assessments to inform teaching	87.5%	72.9%	78.5%	67.1%	74.7%	84.1%	71.0%	81.5%
Participating in meetings on student assessment	93.5%	90.7%	89.8%	83.1%	84.1%	88.8%	72.6%	91.2%

Overall, *creating assessment tasks* and *participating in meetings on student assessment* were cited most often by respondents as the tasks that required an increase in their time. Although there is some variation in the perceptions of different types of teachers, more teachers report an increase in time spent on assessment tasks than any other category of tasks included in this survey.

Table 10. Percentage of Teachers Who Indicated an Increase in Time Spent on Communications Activities

	Elem.	Sec.	Spec. Ed. Elem.	Spec. Ed. H.S.	Art & Music	Phys. Ed.	Voc.	All Teachers
Meeting with parents/guardians face-to-face	49.3%	41.1%	53.2%	67.4%	28.7%	32.6%	37.5%	46.4%
Communicating with parents/guardians --email, phone	68.6%	72.8%	66.0%	80.9%	46.2%	55.7%	67.2%	68.0%
Meeting w/ school staff and/or administrators face-to-face	70.3%	60.4%	76.7%	75.3%	58.6%	64.0%	64.1%	67.8%
Communicating w/ school staff and/or administrators -- email, phone	72.6%	71.1%	78.8%	84.3%	65.6%	63.6%	68.8%	72.4%

In the area of communications, 72.4% indicated that time spent *communicating with school staff and/or administrators by e-mail* or *phone* had increased in the last three years.

Table 11. Percentage of Teachers Who Indicated an Increase in Time Spent on Administrative Tasks

	Elem.	Sec.	Spec. Ed. Elem.	Spec. Ed. H.S.	Art & Music	Phys. Ed.	Voc.	All Teachers
Preparing academic progress reports/report cards	70.0%	61.8%	71.2%	66.3%	64.6%	75.0%	64.1%	67.5%
Writing student recommendations and referrals	42.1%	59.1%	39.5%	39.3%	44.9%	44.9%	54.7%	46.3%
Writing weekly notes, progress notes, newsletters to parents	57.6%	46.5%	51.4%	58.4%	36.7%	44.3%	39.1%	52.4%
Integrating technology into management of student data	66.1%	76.3%	62.9%	78.4%	72.0%	67.4%	84.4%	69.4%
Responding to requests for information (NCLB, surveys, etc.)	74.3%	68.7%	66.4%	69.7%	63.5%	64.8%	70.3%	71.5%

In the area of administrative tasks, *responding to requests for information* (71.5%) and *integrating technology into management of student data* (69.4%) received the highest percentage of respondents indicating an increase in the amount of time spent on each task. Over two thirds (67.5%) of respondents reported that the time spent *preparing academic progress reports/report cards* had also increased.

Table 12. Percentage of Teachers Who Indicated an Increase in Time Spent on Non Instructional, Extracurricular Student Activities

	Elem.	Sec.	Spec. Ed. Elem.	Spec. Ed. H.S.	Art & Music	Phys. Ed.	Voc.	All Teachers
Mentoring students (advisor/advisee program)	21.9%	54.7%	21.7%	64.0%	39.5%	41.6%	46.9%	32.9%
Planning for non-instructional, extracurricular student events	25.7%	44.3%	15.9%	38.6%	42.6%	57.3%	45.3%	31.8%
Supervising student organizations	13.1%	30.6%	8.9%	27.3%	31.2%	29.2%	33.3%	19.1%
Coaching student athletic teams	5.7%	11.8%	3.3%	8.0%	4.5%	28.1%	14.1%	7.7%
Attending evening events (open house, concerts, science fair)	42.5%	42.1%	32.1%	46.6%	42.0%	51.1%	50.0%	42.0%

Relative to the other categories, fewer teachers indicated that the time spent on non instructional, extracurricular tasks had increased in the past three years. However, it is notable that more than half of the secondary teachers (54.7%) indicated that the time spent *mentoring students* had increased, which is not surprising since many high schools are implementing or expanding advisor/advisee programs. Additionally, 42.0% of all respondents indicated that time spent *attending evening events* had increased.

Table 13. Percentage of Teachers Who Indicated an Increase in Time Spent on Other Job-Related Tasks

	Elem.	Sec.	Spec. Ed. Elem.	Spec. Ed. H.S.	Art & Music	Phys. Ed.	Voc.	All Teachers
Tutoring students or providing extra help	62.0%	58.3%	53.8%	76.4%	49.4%	39.3%	45.3%	59.0%
Implementing behavior management plans	70.1%	37.9%	74.7%	68.5%	46.8%	55.1%	46.0%	60.4%
Attending to student discipline issues	72.3%	46.0%	70.9%	76.4%	51.9%	63.6%	60.9%	64.4%
Participating in meetings on curriculum development	90.3%	84.9%	82.4%	88.8%	85.4%	91.0%	67.2%	87.4%
Participating in meetings for the certification of prob. teachers	21.9%	24.0%	17.5%	22.7%	22.9%	12.5%	19.4%	22.1%
Participating in professional development activities	77.4%	66.9%	76.7%	77.9%	67.1%	74.2%	59.4%	74.4%
Participating in PETS	61.7%	54.8%	63.2%	70.8%	34.2%	55.1%	53.1%	58.5%
Participating in 504 meetings	37.4%	47.7%	31.6%	31.5%	25.3%	39.8%	35.6%	38.4%
Being evaluated	31.4%	21.1%	32.9%	31.8%	24.2%	27.0%	32.8%	28.6%

Consistent across all seven teacher groups, *participating in meetings on curriculum development* garnered the highest percentage of respondents who indicated an increase in the amount of time spent on that task. The time spent *participating in professional development activities* had also increased for three quarters of all teachers. This may be in response to the development and implementation of local assessment systems to meet the requirements of *Maine’s Learning Results* and the *No Child Left Behind Act*. The third and fourth most frequently cited tasks requiring an increase in respondent’s time are related to student behavior -- i.e., *attending to student discipline issues* (64.4%) and *implementing behavior management plans* (60.4%).

There is little doubt that nearly all teachers surveyed view the amount of time spent on most major job-related tasks to have increased during the past three years. Most notable changes were in the areas of class preparation and assessment of student work. These changes, more specifically, are related to curriculum alignment with the *Maine Learning Results* and various aspects of student assessment.

Factors Perceived by Teachers to Have Increased Their Workloads

Teachers were provided with a list of 15 factors that the Task Force identified as having the potential to increase teachers' workloads. From this list, teachers were asked to identify only three factors that had caused an increase in their workload during the last three years. If a respondent indicated more than three factors, his/her response was not included in the following analysis. Table 14 below indicates the number and percent of teachers in the total sample selecting each factor.

Table 14. Percent of Teachers Indicating Each Factor as Causing an Increased Workload

	n	%
Curriculum alignment with the Learning Results	1668	55.3%
Student assessment requirements	1638	54.3%
Compliance with No Child Left Behind	1025	34.0%
Getting students to expected levels of performance	948	31.4%
Data management (attendance, report cards, assessment, etc.)	785	25.9%
Diverse student learning needs in the classroom	625	20.7%
Student behavior	538	17.8%
Required committee work	469	15.5%
Class size increases	339	11.2%
Required professional development	328	10.9%
Budgetary constraints	188	6.2%
Other factor	156	5.2%
Administration turnover	109	3.6%
Student mentor/advisory program	83	2.7%
Mentor programs (teachers with colleagues)	60	2.0%
Teacher turnover	51	1.7%

An analysis of the data in Table 14 indicates that factors related to the curriculum and assessment tasks inherent in the *Maine Learning Results* and *No Child Left Behind* are most often cited by teachers as having caused an increase in their workload. Not surprisingly, these data are consistent with data pertaining to activities that have required additional teacher time as reported in Table 8 through Table 13.

Support for Managing Teachers' Workload

Teachers were asked to rate the degree of support provided by 13 different programs and resources that exist in many schools to support teaching and learning. Ratings were requested on 5-point scale (1 = not at all supportive to 5 = very supportive) with an additional category of "does not apply." This scale was collapsed to a 3-point scale as presented in Tables 15a through 15h below. Table 15a presents the results for all respondents, while the following seven tables present the results by job assignment.

Table 15a. All Teachers' Perceptions of the Degree of Support for Teaching and Learning

	Not supportive		Neutral		Supportive		Does not apply	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Special education programs	361	11.3%	760	23.7%	1998	62.4%	85	2.7%
Limited English Proficiency programs	355	11.2%	452	14.3%	495	15.6%	1869	58.9%
Migrant programs	411	13.1%	339	10.8%	265	8.5%	2118	67.6%
Remedial and developmental reading programs	467	14.7%	634	20.0%	1486	46.8%	585	18.4%
Curriculum support	914	28.7%	1088	34.2%	1043	32.8%	139	4.4%
Technology support services	759	23.7%	895	27.9%	1527	47.6%	24	.7%
Technology resources available to you	638	19.9%	863	26.9%	1692	52.7%	17	.5%
Library/media resources	312	9.7%	693	21.6%	2168	67.5%	39	1.2%
Educational technician resources	621	19.4%	818	25.6%	1470	46.0%	289	9.0%
School health services	480	15.0%	937	29.2%	1660	51.8%	129	4.0%
Clerical support	919	28.7%	748	23.4%	1322	41.3%	210	6.6%
Professional development program	750	23.5%	1123	35.1%	1253	39.2%	72	2.3%
Social services resources	785	24.8%	1088	34.4%	950	30.0%	343	10.8%
Other	21	36.2%	6	10.3%	30	51.7%	1	1.7%

Table 15b. Elementary Teachers' Perceptions of the Degree of Support for Teaching and Learning

	Not supportive		Neutral		Supportive		Does not apply	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Special education programs	196	11.4%	440	25.6%	1069	62.2%	13	.8%
Limited English Proficiency programs	173	10.2%	238	14.0%	230	13.5%	1058	62.3%
Migrant programs	226	13.4%	176	10.5%	139	8.3%	1143	67.9%
Remedial and developmental reading programs	231	13.5%	330	19.3%	962	56.2%	188	11.0%
Curriculum support	509	29.9%	613	36.0%	515	30.2%	68	4.0%
Technology support services	436	25.4%	495	28.8%	773	45.0%	13	.8%
Technology resources available to you	327	19.1%	457	26.6%	921	53.7%	10	.6%
Library/media resources	182	10.6%	380	22.1%	1146	66.7%	10	.6%
Educational technician resources	332	19.4%	436	25.5%	821	48.0%	120	7.0%
School health services	277	16.1%	530	30.8%	869	50.6%	42	2.4%
Clerical support	483	28.2%	427	25.0%	698	40.8%	103	6.0%
Professional development program	363	21.2%	636	37.1%	687	40.1%	28	1.6%
Social services resources	444	26.1%	594	34.9%	510	30.0%	152	8.9%
Other	10	35.7%	3	10.7%	15	53.6%	0	.0%

Table 15c. Secondary Teachers' Perceptions of the Degree of Support for Teaching and Learning

	Not supportive		Neutral		Supportive		Does not apply	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Special education programs	116	15.5%	199	26.7%	399	53.5%	32	4.3%
Limited English Proficiency programs	113	15.2%	114	15.4%	138	18.6%	377	50.8%
Migrant programs	98	13.5%	86	11.8%	46	6.3%	497	68.4%
Remedial and developmental reading programs	150	20.6%	170	23.4%	171	23.5%	237	32.6%
Curriculum support	237	31.8%	224	30.1%	242	32.5%	42	5.6%
Technology support services	181	24.3%	213	28.6%	346	46.4%	6	.8%
Technology resources available to you	172	22.8%	204	27.1%	374	49.7%	3	.4%
Library/media resources	62	8.2%	145	19.3%	534	70.9%	12	1.6%
Educational technician resources	181	24.1%	217	28.9%	236	31.5%	116	15.5%
School health services	107	14.3%	207	27.7%	385	51.5%	48	6.4%
Clerical support	231	30.9%	153	20.5%	294	39.3%	70	9.4%
Professional development program	217	29.2%	262	35.2%	241	32.4%	24	3.2%
Social services resources	169	22.7%	271	36.4%	207	27.8%	97	13.0%
Other	4	28.6%	1	7.1%	8	57.1%	1	7.1%

Table 15d. Special Education Elementary Teachers' Perceptions of the Degree of Support for Teaching and Learning

	Not supportive		Neutral		Supportive		Does not apply	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Special education programs	6	2.3%	24	9.3%	209	81.0%	19	7.4%
Limited English Proficiency programs	24	9.4%	18	7.0%	42	16.4%	172	67.2%
Migrant programs	38	14.8%	25	9.8%	26	10.2%	167	65.2%
Remedial and developmental reading programs	27	10.5%	50	19.5%	156	60.9%	23	9.0%
Curriculum support	51	19.9%	95	37.1%	104	40.6%	6	2.3%
Technology support services	43	16.5%	69	26.4%	147	56.3%	2	.8%
Technology resources available to you	51	19.7%	69	26.6%	138	53.3%	1	.4%
Library/media resources	28	10.9%	67	26.0%	161	62.4%	2	.8%
Educational technician resources	25	9.7%	39	15.1%	184	71.0%	11	4.2%
School health services	33	12.7%	72	27.7%	147	56.5%	8	3.1%
Clerical support	75	29.1%	52	20.2%	120	46.5%	11	4.3%
Professional development program	54	20.8%	84	32.4%	114	44.0%	7	2.7%
Social services resources	61	24.2%	68	27.0%	96	38.1%	27	10.7%
Other	2	28.6%	2	28.6%	3	42.9%	0	.0%

Table 15e. Special Education Secondary Teachers' Perceptions of the Degree of Support for Teaching and Learning

	Not supportive		Neutral		Supportive		Does not apply	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Special education programs	5	5.2%	13	13.5%	72	75.0%	6	6.3%
Limited English Proficiency programs	6	6.3%	11	11.6%	22	23.2%	56	58.9%
Migrant programs	5	5.3%	11	11.6%	10	10.5%	69	72.6%
Remedial and developmental reading programs	19	19.6%	15	15.5%	32	33.0%	31	32.0%
Curriculum support	26	27.7%	30	31.9%	34	36.2%	4	4.3%
Technology support services	29	30.2%	27	28.1%	40	41.7%	0	.0%
Technology resources available to you	18	18.8%	37	38.5%	41	42.7%	0	.0%
Library/media resources	6	6.3%	25	26.0%	63	65.6%	2	2.1%
Educational technician resources	11	11.5%	20	20.8%	62	64.6%	3	3.1%
School health services	13	13.5%	24	25.0%	56	58.3%	3	3.1%
Clerical support	32	33.0%	22	22.7%	39	40.2%	4	4.1%
Professional development program	26	26.8%	29	29.9%	38	39.2%	4	4.1%
Social services resources	27	29.0%	28	30.1%	30	32.3%	8	8.6%
Other	1	100%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%

Table 15f. Art and Music Teachers' Perceptions of the Degree of Support for Teaching and Learning

	Not supportive		Neutral		Supportive		Does not apply	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Special education programs	18	11.4%	39	24.7%	92	58.2%	9	5.7%
Limited English Proficiency programs	15	9.7%	22	14.2%	29	18.7%	89	57.4%
Migrant programs	14	9.4%	15	10.1%	14	9.4%	106	71.1%
Remedial and developmental reading programs	17	11.0%	29	18.8%	61	39.6%	47	30.5%
Curriculum support	45	28.5%	57	36.1%	47	29.7%	9	5.7%
Technology support services	32	20.1%	36	22.6%	89	56.0%	2	1.3%
Technology resources available to you	34	21.4%	41	25.8%	82	51.6%	2	1.3%
Library/media resources	12	7.6%	27	17.2%	117	74.5%	1	.6%
Educational technician resources	29	18.6%	39	25.0%	68	43.6%	20	12.8%
School health services	20	12.7%	36	22.8%	88	55.7%	14	8.9%
Clerical support	41	25.9%	35	22.2%	73	46.2%	9	5.7%
Professional development program	41	26.6%	45	29.2%	61	39.6%	7	4.5%
Social services resources	37	24.0%	42	27.3%	48	31.2%	27	17.5%
Other	3	50.0%	0	.0%	3	50.0%	0	.0%

Table 15g. Physical Education Teachers’ Perceptions of the Degree of Support for Teaching and Learning

	Not supportive		Neutral		Supportive		Does not apply	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Special education programs	9	9.5%	12	12.6%	73	76.8%	1	1.1%
Limited English Proficiency programs	10	10.9%	24	26.1%	16	17.4%	42	45.7%
Migrant programs	13	14.4%	15	16.7%	9	10.0%	53	58.9%
Remedial and developmental reading programs	9	9.8%	13	14.1%	42	45.7%	28	30.4%
Curriculum support	17	18.3%	27	29.0%	46	49.5%	3	3.2%
Technology support services	17	18.3%	19	20.4%	57	61.3%	0	.0%
Technology resources available to you	15	16.0%	22	23.4%	57	60.6%	0	.0%
Library/media resources	7	7.4%	15	15.8%	70	73.7%	3	3.2%
Educational technician resources	16	17.2%	28	30.1%	44	47.3%	5	5.4%
School health services	12	12.9%	24	25.8%	55	59.1%	2	2.2%
Clerical support	21	22.3%	26	27.7%	44	46.8%	3	3.2%
Professional development program	24	25.3%	26	27.4%	45	47.4%	0	.0%
Social services resources	20	22.0%	35	38.5%	26	28.6%	10	11.0%
Other	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	100.0%	0	.0%

Table 15h. Vocational Education Teachers’ Perceptions of the Degree of Support for Teaching and Learning

	Not supportive		Neutral		Supportive		Does not apply	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Special education programs	8	12.1%	19	28.8%	37	56.1%	2	3.0%
Limited English Proficiency programs	9	13.6%	17	25.8%	8	12.1%	32	48.5%
Migrant programs	7	10.6%	6	9.1%	10	15.2%	43	65.2%
Remedial and developmental reading programs	10	15.4%	17	26.2%	16	24.6%	22	33.8%
Curriculum support	16	24.2%	20	30.3%	24	36.4%	6	9.1%
Technology support services	11	16.9%	14	21.5%	40	61.5%	0	.0%
Technology resources available to you	10	15.2%	13	19.7%	42	63.6%	1	1.5%
Library/media resources	11	16.7%	16	24.2%	30	45.5%	9	13.6%
Educational technician resources	17	25.8%	19	28.8%	20	30.3%	10	15.2%
School health services	9	13.6%	19	28.8%	28	42.4%	10	15.2%
Clerical support	19	29.2%	14	21.5%	29	44.6%	3	4.6%
Professional development program	15	22.7%	21	31.8%	29	43.9%	1	1.5%
Social services resources	17	26.2%	19	29.2%	15	23.1%	14	21.5%
Other	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%

Special education programs and library/media resources were viewed as highly supportive by all seven groups of teachers. Elementary teachers also rated remedial and developmental reading programs as highly supportive. As might be expected, education technician resources were rated more highly by both groups of special education teachers than by the other groups. More than one quarter of elementary teachers (29.9%), secondary teachers (31.8%), special education secondary (27.7%), and art and music teachers (28.5%) indicated that curriculum support resources in their school were not supportive.

Positive Strategies

Teachers were asked to describe any strategies that their school district had implemented to help manage time and/or accommodate workload. Over 2,300 teachers responded to this item on the survey. There were 1,374 direct responses to the request for strategies which represent 42% of the total sample. The remaining 970 responses, which represent 30% of the total sample, were comments about increased workload and a lack of helpful strategies or accommodations. Nine hundred fourteen teachers did not respond to this item.

The strategies described by teachers as helpful to managing their time and accommodating their workloads could be grouped in four general categories; Finding Time, Using Auxiliary Personnel, Support from Technology, and Compensation. Each of these categories and representative examples are listed below.

Finding Time:

Release time:

- Release time for creating assessments and integrating *Learning Results*
- Release time on Wednesdays (1:40 –2:30 p.m.) to work on targets
- Release Wednesday afternoons 3 times monthly for curriculum development
- Release half day for committee work
- Early release days
- Early release days for assessment development and scoring
- Early release once a month for curriculum work
- Scheduled or planned release time –“We have early release days in the calendar”

Other common time:

- Grade-level meetings every other week instead of staff meeting every week
- Grade-level meetings during school hours
- Grade-level meetings during common planning time
- More opportunity to meet at grade level
- Some – most of meetings pertaining to students occur during school day
- Wednesday schedule includes an hour and a half common planning time
- Late start one time per week
- Daily planning time
- Extended school day
- Professional days to work on curriculum and assessment
- 1st period free for collaborative work
- Workshop days to map curriculum
- Two and a half workshop days to focus on the new report card and allow us time on them

Lunch time:

- Duty free lunches
- Classroom teachers do not do noontime duties. This frees up one hour for prep time
- Lunch duty on a rotating basis every third week

Using Auxiliary Personnel:

Ed Techs

- Ed Techs cover our duties more often to provide time to plan or work with students at recess
- Hired Ed Techs to supervise study halls
- One Ed Tech for each of two classes
- Ed Tech support has been very good
- Ed Tech help in the classroom
- Have started training Ed Techs to help with calibrating and scoring assessments
- Hired more aids to take over some of many duties: lunch, recess, etc.

Substitutes

- I can request a substitute if I have back-to-back triennials or new referral evaluations to complete.
- Principal provided 4 half days of substitute time to handle influx of new referrals
- Rolling sub days—days we are able to be out of the classroom to work on curriculum
- This year's principal and special ed. director cover class time to assist teachers with collaboration time. Very beneficial.
- Substitutes hired for teachers to attend professional development activities and for curriculum training
- Substitutes hired for grade-level meetings during school hours
- Substitutes hired for curriculum work during the school day
- Substitutes hired to provide time for individualized meetings with children

Support from Technology:

- Technology is supposed to decrease grading and report card time and it does – when it works.
- E-mail saves communication time
- The MLTI laptops have made life much better
- Our paperwork (IEPs) is computerized and we have responsibility for part of the IEP, not all of it.
- Install phone in my room to facilitate communication
- The office puts grades on computer
- New software for grading/attendance
- Provided each teacher with a laptop for assessment/communication

Compensation:

- For summer work (for creating assessments and integrating *Learning Results*)
- For combined scoring of common assessments
- For summer work for curriculum development (less time/money for conferences)
- For after-school committee/curriculum work

Not all responses to this item fulfilled the request for descriptions of helpful strategies and/or accommodations, but instead documented the absence of such strategies. These comments were remarkably similar in that all indicated that no helpful strategies had been implemented and most described the addition of new job responsibilities without a reduction in existing responsibilities. Many also indicated that budget cuts had forced their districts to reduce the use of specialists and education technicians resulting in increases in workload. The following list presents the central themes that emerged.

- None. We continue to add programs and requirements without resources
- No strategies, our workload is a constant uphill scale
- None. They allow me to use my lunch period to get things done
- None. I am given more to do each year with less time to do it
- No strategies have been implemented. We have lost our math specialist, literacy specialist and technology specialist. This has increased our workload.
- None. We just keep adding tasks, paperwork, new assessments without any plan for deleting anything
- I have very little time to work in my classroom on workshop days to prepare and plan. I do work before and after school and come in on weekends

Teachers' Job Satisfaction

Teachers were asked several questions related to job satisfaction and factors that may contribute to their level of satisfaction and job-related stress. Table 16a describes the responses for all teachers to the question, "In the past two years have you seriously considered leaving the teaching profession for another occupation?" Table 16b presents the same information for each of the seven groups of teachers.

Table 16a. Teachers Considering Leaving the Profession

	n	%
Yes	1952	60.6
No	1268	39.4
Total	3220	100.0
Missing	41	
Total	3261	

Table 16a reveals that 60.6% of the teachers in this sample have seriously considered leaving the profession for another occupation in the past two years.

Table 16b. Teachers Considering Leaving the Profession by Job Position

	Yes		No	
	n	%	n	%
Elementary	1024	59.8%	689	40.2%
Secondary	469	62.0%	288	38.0%
Special Education Elementary	170	65.4%	90	34.6%
Special Education Secondary	61	62.9%	36	37.1%
Art and Music	88	54.3%	74	45.7%
Physical Education	55	57.9%	40	42.1%
Vocational Education	43	64.2%	24	35.8%

In this analysis, it appears that art and music teachers are the least likely to leave the teaching profession, while vocational education and special education elementary teachers are the most likely to leave.

Teachers were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with various aspects of their jobs on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = very dissatisfied to 5 = very satisfied). For analysis purposes, the scale was collapsed to a 3-point scale with “1” and “2” denoting dissatisfaction, “3” denoting a neutral opinion, and “4” and “5” denoting satisfaction. Table 17 summarizes the responses.

Table 17. Percent of Teachers Indicating Levels of Satisfaction with Job Factors

	Dissatisfied		Neutral		Satisfied	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Retirement benefits	2427	75.7%	600	18.7%	181	5.6%
Salary	1676	52.0%	1059	32.9%	487	15.1%
Job expectations	1426	44.5%	1040	32.5%	736	23.0%
Working conditions	1101	34.2%	1106	34.3%	1013	31.5%
Health benefits	878	27.4%	1065	33.2%	1267	39.5%
Community relations	759	23.7%	1373	42.9%	1070	33.4%
Personal gratification	654	20.3%	808	25.1%	1759	54.6%
Vacation time	212	6.7%	694	21.8%	2280	71.6%

Table 17 indicates that teachers are least satisfied with the retirement benefits, salary, and job expectations. Conversely, teachers appear most satisfied with vacation time, personal gratification, and the health benefits provided by their jobs. It should be noted that some teachers commented that they were only paid for the days they worked and did not feel that teachers received “vacation time.” Since respondents appeared to answer this item at the same rate as other items in the table, many may have interpreted “vacation time” as synonymous with the schedule of the typical academic year.

Job Stress

Teachers were provided with a list of 14 factors that the Task Force suggested might contribute to teachers’ stress. Teachers were asked to select only three factors that they considered most important in causing stress. If a respondent indicated more than three factors, his/her response was not included in the following analysis. The results of this item are described in Table 18 below.

Table 18. Factors Related to Stress

	n	%
Compliance with No Child Left Behind	1323	40.9%
Student assessment requirements	1291	39.9%
Getting students to expected levels of performance	1287	39.7%
Curriculum alignment with the Maine Learning Results	1023	31.6%
Student behavior	984	30.4%
Data management	740	22.8%
Diverse student learning needs in the classroom	698	21.5%
Class size increases	387	11.9%
Required committee work	370	11.4%
Other	355	11.0%
Budgetary constraints	336	10.4%
Communicating with parents (or lack of)	264	8.2%
Lesson planning	259	8.0%
Required professional development	200	6.2%
Administration turnover	164	5.1%

Factors causing the most stress for teachers are very similar to those that they perceive to have increased their workload in the last three years: compliance with the *No Child Left Behind*, student assessment requirements, getting students to expected levels of performance, and aligning curriculum with the *Maine Learning Results*. At 30.4%, student behavior is also a stressor for nearly one third of the respondents.

Finally, teachers were asked if they could go back to their college days and start over, would they become a teacher again. The overall results of these data are contained in Table 19a, while Table 19b provides the breakdown by teaching assignment, and Table 19c provides a breakdown by number of years of teaching experience.

Table 19a. Starting Over by All Respondents

If you could go back to your college days and start over, would you become a teacher again?

	n	%
Yes	1600	51.3
No	1384	44.4
Maybe/Don't know	135	4.3

Table 19b. Starting Over by Teaching Assignment

If you could go back to your college days and start over, would you become a teacher again?	Yes		No		Maybe/Don't know	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Elementary	849	50.7%	755	45.1%	69
Secondary	362	49.8%	332	45.7%	33	4.5%
Special Education Elementary	122	49.4%	114	46.2%	11	4.5%
Special Education Secondary	49	52.1%	39	41.5%	6	6.4%
Art and Music	95	59.7%	56	35.2%	8	5.0%
Physical Education	54	60.0%	34	37.8%	2	2.2%
Vocational Education	34	53.1%	25	39.1%	5	7.8%

Table 19c. Starting Over by Years of Teaching Experience

If you could go back to your college days and start over, would you become a teacher again?	Yes		No		Maybe/Don't know	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Has taught 1 year	5	71.4%	2	28.6%	0
Has taught 2-3 years	89	60.5%	48	32.7%	10	6.8%
Has taught 4-5 years	144	60.0%	84	35.0%	12	5.0%
Has taught 6-10 years	293	56.8%	203	39.3%	20	3.9%
Has taught more than 10 years	1043	48.4%	1024	47.5%	88	4.1%

The data in Table 19a reflect the dissatisfaction of many teachers (44.4%) with their chosen profession. In Table 19b the data illustrate that art and music teachers and physical education teachers were the most likely to indicate they would become a teacher again, while the special education elementary teachers, secondary teachers, and elementary teachers were least likely to

indicate the same. Table 19c indicates that the more years of experience a teacher has, the less likely it is that he/she would become a teacher again.

Summary and Conclusions

- Average length of school day for all teachers is approximately 7 hours, which is often increased by required before- and after-school meetings.
- The average number of hours worked by the responding teachers, beyond the 35 hour baseline, is more than 16 hours per week.
- Nearly all teachers have seen an increase in the amount of time spent on most job related tasks. Most notable changes were in the areas of class preparation and assessment of student work. These changes, more specifically, were related to curriculum alignment with the *Maine Learning Results* and various aspects of student assessments.
- Given a list of 15 factors that could potentially increase teachers' workload, the most frequently selected factors were: curriculum alignment with the *Maine Learning Results*, student assessment requirements, compliance with *No Child Left Behind*, and getting students to expected levels of performance.
- Factors causing the most stress for teachers are the same as those that they perceive to have increased their workload in the last three years: compliance with *No Child Left Behind*, student assessment requirements, curriculum alignment with the *Maine Learning Results*, and getting students to expected levels of performance. Additionally, nearly one third of the respondents cited student behavior as one of the factors causing the most stress.
- Special education programs and library/media resources were viewed as highly supportive by all teachers. Special education teachers were more likely to view education technician resources as highly supportive than were the other teachers.
- When asked what strategies school districts have implemented to help manage time and accommodate workload, 42% described district strategies that included common planning time, release time, use of time derived from the use of specialists, sharing students, late start days and early release days. Thirty percent of the respondents commented that no strategies had been implemented and most described added responsibilities with no reduction in existing responsibilities.
- There is a high level of dissatisfaction with teaching as a profession among respondents to the survey. Forty-four percent indicated if they could start over, they would not choose teaching. More than half (60.6%) of the respondents indicated they have seriously considered leaving the profession in the last two years.

- Teachers rated vacation time, personal gratification, and health benefits as the most satisfactory aspects of their jobs. Some respondents indicated that teachers did not receive “vacation time” and therefore may have responded to this item in terms of “yearly academic schedule.”
- Teachers were least satisfied with job expectations, salary, and retirement benefits.

Appendix
Teacher Workload Survey

TEACHER WORKLOAD SURVEY

PLEASE RETURN BY: FEBRUARY 6, 2004

Section A: Teacher Information

Gender: <input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	Currently enrolled in degree program: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Highest level of educational attainment: <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input type="checkbox"/> MAT	<input type="checkbox"/> MA/MS <input type="checkbox"/> CAS	<input type="checkbox"/> M.Ed. <input type="checkbox"/> Ed.D./Ph.D.
Number of years teaching including this year: 1—2—3—4—5—6—7—8—9—10—10+		Number of years in current school district: 1—2—3—4—5—6—7—8—9—10—10+		
Number of years in current teaching assignment: 1—2—3—4—5—6—7—8—9—10—10+		Grade(s) currently teaching (circle all that apply): PreK—K—1—2—3—4—5—6—7—8—9—10—11—12		

Section B: Teaching Assignment

1. How many students do you assess in each of the following subject areas or programs? Indicate the total number of students in the box preceding the appropriate subject area. Specialists should indicate the number of students in their caseload.

No. of Students	Subject Area	No. of Students	Subject Area
	Applied Arts		Mathematics
	Arts (art, music, theatre)		Physical Education
	Computer Technology		Reading
	English/Language Arts		Science
	Foreign Languages		Social Studies
	Health		Writing

No. of Students	SPECIALISTS ONLY Program Area
	Gifted and Talented
	Literacy Specialist
	Reading Recovery
	Special Education
	Vocational Education
	Other _____

2. In a typical **week**, how many hours do you spend preparing lessons or related materials? _____
- 2a. How many of these hours occur during your personal time? _____

—————**SKIP SECTION C AND D IF YOU ARE A FIRST- OR SECOND-YEAR TEACHER.**—————

Section C: Change in Time Spent on Tasks

3. Indicate to what extent the time you spend on the following tasks has **changed over the past three years** using the scale of 1-5 (1 = *significant decrease* in time, 3 = *no change*, and 5 = *significant increase* in time).

Class Preparation	Significant decrease		No change		Significant increase	Does not apply
Planning lessons (for class as a whole)	1	2	3	4	5	6
Planning lesson(s) for students w/disabilities	1	2	3	4	5	6
Preparing instruction for students with Limited English Proficiency	1	2	3	4	5	6
Modifying lessons to meet individual student needs	1	2	3	4	5	6
Preparing instructional materials	1	2	3	4	5	6
Directing or preparing lessons for support staff, ed. techs, or classroom volunteers	1	2	3	4	5	6
Aligning lessons to the <i>Maine Learning Results</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
Integrating technology into lessons	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Significant decrease		No change		Significant increase	Does not apply
Assessment of Student Work						
Creating assessment tools	1	2	3	4	5	6
Grading/scoring student work	1	2	3	4	5	6
Grading/scoring common (district) assessments	1	2	3	4	5	6
Analyzing student assessments to inform teaching practice	1	2	3	4	5	6
Participating in meetings on student assessment	1	2	3	4	5	6
Communications						
Meeting with parents/guardians face-to-face	1	2	3	4	5	6
Communicating with parents/guardians—email, phone, memos	1	2	3	4	5	6
Meeting with school staff and/or administrators face-to-face	1	2	3	4	5	6
Communicating with school staff and/or administrators—email, phone, memos	1	2	3	4	5	6
Administrative Tasks						
Preparing academic progress reports/report cards	1	2	3	4	5	6
Writing student recommendations and referrals	1	2	3	4	5	6
Writing weekly notes, progress notes, newsletters to parents	1	2	3	4	5	6
Integrating technology into management of student data (attendance, report cards, assessment)	1	2	3	4	5	6
Responding to requests for information (No Child Left Behind compliance, surveys, interviews)	1	2	3	4	5	6
Non-instructional, Extracurricular Student Events						
Mentoring students (advisor/advisee program)	1	2	3	4	5	6
Planning for non-instructional, extracurricular student events	1	2	3	4	5	6
Supervising student organizations	1	2	3	4	5	6
Coaching student athletic teams	1	2	3	4	5	6
Attending evening events (open house, concerts, science fair)	1	2	3	4	5	6
Other						
Tutoring students or providing extra help	1	2	3	4	5	6
Implementing behavior management plans	1	2	3	4	5	6
Attending to student discipline issues	1	2	3	4	5	6
Participating in meetings on curriculum development	1	2	3	4	5	6
Participating in meetings for the certification of probationary teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6
Participating in professional development activities	1	2	3	4	5	6
Participating in PETs	1	2	3	4	5	6
Participating in 504 meetings	1	2	3	4	5	6
Being evaluated	1	2	3	4	5	6

Section D: Impact on Workload

4. Check (✓) the **three (3) most important** factors from the list below that have **caused an increase in** your workload in the last three years. Selecting more than three will invalidate your response to this item.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Data management (attendance, report cards, assessment, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Budgetary constraints
<input type="checkbox"/>	Student assessment requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	Class size increases
<input type="checkbox"/>	Curriculum alignment with the <i>Maine Learning Results</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Required professional development
<input type="checkbox"/>	Diverse student learning needs in the classroom	<input type="checkbox"/>	Required committee work
<input type="checkbox"/>	Student behavior	<input type="checkbox"/>	Compliance with No Child Left Behind
<input type="checkbox"/>	Administration turnover	<input type="checkbox"/>	Getting students to expected levels of performance
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teacher turnover	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mentor programs (teachers with colleagues)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Student mentor/advisory program	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other

Section E: Time Spent on Tasks

5. What is the exact length of your **required** school day (including lunch)? _____ hours _____ minutes
 (e.g., If you are required to be on duty by 7:45 a.m. and permitted to leave school by 3:00 p.m., your school day is 7 hours and 15 minutes). Do not include required before- or after-school meetings.
6. How many before- or after-school meetings do you attend in a typical month?
 Less than one a month Two a month Four a month Six to ten a month
 One a month Three a month Five a month More than ten a month
7. In your **last full week** of teaching, indicate in hours/minutes how much time you spent on the following tasks between the time you are required to be at school and the earliest time you can leave (Column A). Also indicate how much of your personal time was spent on each task during the past week (Column B). If you received additional compensation for any of these tasks, check the box provided (Column C).

NOTE: Although we are not asking you to total the time indicated in Column A, keep in mind it should not exceed the time entered in question 5 multiplied by 5.

Teacher responsibilities	Column A School Time (weekly)	Column B Personal Time (weekly)	Column C Additional Compensation
Planning lessons, creating materials, or setting up room/lab			<input type="checkbox"/>
Classroom instruction			<input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluating student performance			<input type="checkbox"/>
Committee work			<input type="checkbox"/>
Communicating or meeting with parents			<input type="checkbox"/>
Preparing for or attending PET and/or 504 meetings			<input type="checkbox"/>
Directing, supervising, or coordinating after-school student activities			<input type="checkbox"/>
Other _____			<input type="checkbox"/>

Section F: Teacher Support Resources

8. Rate the following resources in terms of the support they provide for teaching and learning in your school (1 = *not at all supportive* and 5 = *very supportive*).

Class Preparation	Not at all supportive			Very supportive		Does not apply
Special education programs	1	2	3	4	5	6
Limited English Proficiency programs	1	2	3	4	5	6
Migrant programs	1	2	3	4	5	6
Remedial and developmental reading programs	1	2	3	4	5	6
Curriculum support	1	2	3	4	5	6
Technology support services	1	2	3	4	5	6
Technology resources available to you	1	2	3	4	5	6
Library/media resources	1	2	3	4	5	6
Educational technician resources	1	2	3	4	5	6
School health services	1	2	3	4	5	6
Clerical support	1	2	3	4	5	6
Professional development program	1	2	3	4	5	6
Social services resources	1	2	3	4	5	6
Other _____						

9. Please describe any strategies your school district has implemented to help you manage time and/or accommodate your workload?

Section G: Job Satisfaction

10. In the past two years have you seriously considered leaving the teaching profession Yes No for another occupation?

11. Use the scale provided (1 = *very dissatisfied*, 5 = *very satisfied*) to rate your level of satisfaction with each of the items listed below as they pertain to your current employment.

	Very dissatisfied					Very satisfied					
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Community relations	1	2	3	4	5	Retirement benefits	1	2	3	4	5
Health benefits	1	2	3	4	5	Salary	1	2	3	4	5
Job expectations	1	2	3	4	5	Working conditions	1	2	3	4	5
Personal gratification	1	2	3	4	5	Vacation time	1	2	3	4	5

12. Of the factors listed below, check (✓) the **three** that contribute the most stress to your work as a teacher? While more than three may affect your stress level, for analysis purposes please select **only three**. Selecting more than three will invalidate your response to this item.

Data management (attendance, report cards, assessment, etc.)	Lesson planning
Student assessment requirements	Class size increases
Curriculum alignment with the <i>Maine Learning Results</i>	Required professional development
Diverse student learning needs in the classroom	Required committee work
Student behavior	Compliance with No Child Left Behind
Administration turnover	Getting students to expected levels of performance
Budgetary constraints	Other _____
Communicating with parents (or lack of)	

13. If you could go back to your college days and start over, would you become a teacher again? Yes No

Thank you for your participation