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**List of country abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK- ENG</td>
<td>England (United Kingdom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK-SCT</td>
<td>Scotland (United Kingdom)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Introduction

1.1 Context and aim of report

This technical report sets out the findings of a survey carried out as part of a European project by the European Trade Union Committee for Education (ETUCE) and the European Federation of Education Employers (EFEE), entitled: Recruitment and retention in the education sector: a matter of social dialogue. This project was carried out within the framework of the European Sectoral Social Dialogue in Education (ESSDE) that began June 2010. It aims to support the work undertaken by the European social partners in education within the Working Group no. 2 of the ESSDE ‘Demographic challenges’.

The objective of the project is to examine the current situation in Europe regarding recruitment and retention of teachers in the education sector and existing national policies in the field. The project additionally aims to identify possible best practices in recruitment and retention policies and practices involving the social partners.

Broadly the survey addresses the following questions guiding the project:

(i) What is the current situation in Europe regarding the recruitment and retention of teachers?

(ii) What are the national policies concerning recruitment and retention of teachers, and is it possible to identify a set of best practices?

(iii) Are social partners involved in the policy development in the field, and how are they involved?

(iv) Which joint sectoral approach can be taken in relation to the challenges regarding recruitment and retention in the education sector?

This technical report has been prepared for the regional seminars held in the framework of the project that took place in Madrid, 20 March 2012 and Vilnius, 10 April 2012. The report is based on the responses of ETUCE and EFEE member organisations to a questionnaire carried out between 20 November 2011 and 20 January 2012. The questionnaire was developed by the project’s Advisory Committee composed of ETUCE members, EFEE representatives, ETUCE and EI secretariats.

The report addresses national policies in EU member countries1 on workforce planning and the process of recruiting teachers; outlines challenges to the recruitment and retention of teachers (such as teacher shortages); assesses which factors influence the attraction and retention of teachers in the education sector according to ETUCE and EFEE members; and, addresses if and which social partners are involved in developing recruitment and retention policies.

Specifically, the report comprises six sections which provide an overview of the following:

i) National education sectors’ workforce

ii) Workforce planning and recruitment policies

iii) Recruitment process for teachers

iv) Measures to attract teachers to the sector

v) Measures to retain teachers in the sector

1 In addition to surveying EU member states, two European Free Trade Association (EFTA) countries were also included in the survey: Iceland and Norway.
vi) European dimension

1.2 Method

This report is based on EFEE and ETUCE member organisation’s responses to a questionnaire in the period between 20 November 2011 and 20 January 2012. The coordination and communication with EFEE and ETUCE member organisations was administered by the ETUCE secretariat, with the support of the EFEE secretariat.

Factual questions were analysed and compared by country, whereas opinion questions were analysed by organisation to reflect differing positions between EFEE and ETUCE organisations, or between ETUCE organisations.

Limitations to the analysis of the data included a lack of data for factual questions concerning for example, the number of teachers leaving the sector due to retirement and/or the number of prospective teachers entering the profession. Many organisations reported that they did not have access to factual data, which may indicate that this information is not centrally collected or not accessible.

Per country, it was encouraged to have a response from both EFEE and ETUCE organisations. Employee and employer organisations in the same country were encouraged to respond to the survey together, particularly for factual questions. In six countries surveyed there are no EFEE member organisations as yet, so responses were not collected from employers in these counties.

In 9 countries, more than one organisation responded from the same country. In the case of factual questions, organisations from the same country gave different responses to the same question. As verification of the data was not possible in most cases, all responses were included and the differences stated where those arose. For opinion questions the responses represent the employer and employee organisations analysis of their countries national policies and practices on teachers’ recruitment and retention, and as such provide a useful insight into the positions and perspectives of different social partners.

1.3 Overview of survey responses

In total, 35 ETUCE\(^2\) and EFEE\(^3\) organisations from 21 European countries\(^4\) responded to the questionnaire. Of the 35 responses, 11 were provided by EFEE organisations and 24 by ETUCE member organisations. By country, this means that in 11 countries, both ETUCE and EFEE organisations were represented, in 9 countries only ETUCE organisations\(^5\) and in Ireland only an

---

\(^2\) ETUCE organisations are national trade unions of teacher and other staff in general education, including early childhood education, primary education, secondary education, vocational education and training as well as higher education and research.

\(^3\) EFEE organisations represent a diverse group of education employers that varies by country and includes: Ministries of Education; regional and/or local governments; employers’ organisations of school governing boards.

\(^4\) In total, 18 EU countries and two EFTA countries were surveyed.

\(^5\) In six of the nine countries in which only ETUCE member organisation responses were received, there are no EFEE member organisations, namely: Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Iceland, Lithuania, Slovenia.
employer organisation. In four countries, organisations provided combined responses, including Italy and Germany where respectively three and two ETUCE members completed the survey together, and in Norway and the Netherlands where both ETUCE and EFEE member organisations worked together on the survey.

![Figure 1.3: Representation of ETUCE and EFEE member organisations in survey by country](image)

The following table provides an overview of which organisations responded per country, and whether the response was combined between EFEE and ETUCE organisations, or if organisations responded separately for one country, as was the case in Cyprus, Denmark, Malta, Slovakia and Sweden. Separate responses had implications for the fact-based questions, as in some instances the responses varied. For those questions where this was the case, both responses were included, and it was clarified for which countries there were more than one response. The UK responses from England and Scotland were counted separately where they provided different data on factual questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>ETUCE/EFEE</th>
<th>Combined/separate/single response</th>
<th>Education levels represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Culture</td>
<td>EFEE</td>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DAU-SEN</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OELMEK</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLTEK</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CMOS-PS</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education &amp; Cultural Affairs of the Lander</td>
<td>EFEE</td>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEW</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VBE</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>DUT</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Government Denmark</td>
<td>EFEE</td>
<td></td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>EEPU</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>FECCOO</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Sgen-CFDT</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>OLME</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Irish Vocational Education Association</td>
<td>EFEE</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>KI</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>UIL SCUOLA</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CISL SCUOLA</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FLC-CGIL</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>EFEE</td>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>FLESTU</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>LIZDA</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT(^6)</td>
<td>Directorate for Educational Services</td>
<td>EFEE</td>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MUT</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>VO Raad</td>
<td>EFEE</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AOb</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Federation of Norwegian Enterprises Virke</td>
<td>EFEE</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utdanningsforbundet</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Lärarförbundet</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions (SALAR)</td>
<td>EFEE</td>
<td></td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>ZPŠav NKOS</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science, Research &amp; Sport</td>
<td>EFEE</td>
<td></td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>ESTUS</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK-ENG</td>
<td>Local Government Association</td>
<td>EFEE</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK-SCT</td>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>ETUCE</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>\textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x} \textbf{x}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) Additional information for Malta: the figures provided in table 1.3 do not include teachers employed by the non-state sector (e.g. Church and independent schools) which amount to circa 40% of the total amount of teachers and students on the Maltese Islands.
Table 1.3: Overview of responses detailing levels of education and number of teachers represented

In terms of education level, lower and upper secondary education personnel are represented by 34 and 33 organisations in total respectively. Primary education is represented by 32 organisations. Pre-primary education is the least represented level in the survey; 26 of the 35 organisations responded that they had members at this level. In total, 26 organisations (74% of the respondents) represent education personnel at all four levels. In table 1.3 the number of teachers represented by each organisation is presented (where figures are missing, these were not provided). For some levels combined figures for different education levels were provided by some organisations: e.g. lower- and upper-primary together, or primary and lower-secondary levels together.
2 Overview of the sector

2.1 Legal status of teachers in countries

Respondents were asked to identify the legal status of teachers at different levels of education in their country. The following responses are analysed by country and education level. In the countries surveyed, the legal status of teachers is broadly divided into two main categories, which are: civil servant (and includes the sub-category career civil servant) and employee. The two categories are based on the Eurydice definition of the fully qualified public sector teachers’ legal status, which is set out in table 2.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil servant</td>
<td>Teacher employed by public authorities (at central, regional or local level), in accordance with a regulatory framework distinct from legislation governing contractual relations in the public or private sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career civil servant</td>
<td>Similar to civil servant, although appointed by appropriate top-level authority for education (central or regional). The appointment is for life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil servant or employee</td>
<td>Teachers can be hired as civil servants or as employees (private or public) subject to general employment legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public or private sector employee</td>
<td>Teachers employed generally by local or school authorities on a contractual basis in accordance with general employment legislation and with or without central agreements on pay and conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EACEA (2012) Key data on Education in Europe

Table 2.1: Categories of teachers’ status explained

Figure 2.1 below depicts teachers’ legal status in primary, lower- and upper-secondary education, based on the Eurydice categories.

7 When comparing the responses to the data collected by Eurydice on the legal status of teachers, inconsistencies are noted for Denmark, and Slovenia. According to Eurydice reports, teachers in Denmark are appointed as public sector employees, but in the survey the status of civil servant and public sector employee coexists at the primary and lower-secondary levels. In Slovenia, teachers are appointed as career civil servants in Slovenia, however respondents to the survey indicated that teachers are appointed as public sector employees at all levels.
In half the countries (10 total: CZ, EE, IT, LT, LV, NO, SE, SK, SL and UK), teachers are appointed as public sector employees at all education levels (pre-primary through upper-secondary education). In five countries (FR, CY, GR and MT, ES\(^8\)), teachers are appointed as career civil servants at all levels.

In five countries (DE, DK, IE, IS and NL), the two categories of employee exist alongside each other. In these countries teachers are appointed either as civil servants or public sector employees at the primary, lower- and upper-secondary levels. In Germany, around 70% of teachers at these levels are civil servants and 30% public sector employees. This division varies in the different Länder (States).

In the Netherlands, teachers in public schools (about 30% of the schools) are civil servants. Teachers in privately governed, but publicly funded, schools sign a contract with a legal entity that governs the school; they are employees and share the status of public sector personnel.

Germany and Iceland are the only two countries in the survey where the status of teachers differs at the pre-primary level from other levels of education. Teachers are appointed as public/private sector employees at the pre-primary level, but as either civil servants or public/private sector employees at the other levels.

2.2 Proportion of women teachers at pre-primary, primary and secondary levels

8 Teachers working at the primary and secondary levels are appointed following a competition for positions. Due to a teachers’ shortage in recent years, many teachers are appointed on a contract before having passed the competition.
Women account for the majority of teachers at the pre-primary, primary and lower-secondary levels. In the survey, EFEE and ETUCE organisations were asked to provide figures on the numbers of male and female teachers at each education level surveyed. When calculating the proportion of female teachers at each level, it is revealed that at the pre-primary level the overwhelming majority of teachers are women, and at the primary level women teachers account for over 70% of teachers. At the lower- and upper-secondary level, the proportion of female teachers is over 60% of teachers in most of the countries surveyed, with the exception of Malta, the Netherlands and Norway, where slightly less than 50% of teachers are female, and in Sweden where at the upper-secondary level, just over 50% are women. In general, it is revealed that as the education level increases, the proportion of female teachers decreases.

Figure 2.2: % of women teachers at pre-primary, primary and secondary levels

Conclusions:

- **In the majority of countries teachers are employed as public sector employees on a contractual basis.** In five countries teachers are employed career civil servants and appointed for life. In five countries, teachers are appointed as both career civil servants and public sector employees.
- **Women account for the majority of teachers at the pre-primary, primary and lower-secondary levels.** As education levels increase, the proportion of female teachers decreases.

---

9 The years for which the data was provided was not specified. This may vary by country, resulting in slight variations in the overall proportion of female teachers at each level.
3 Workforce planning and recruitment policy

3.1 Teacher shortages

Respondents were asked to report whether there are current or expected teacher shortages in their countries. These responses were analysed by country, with the exception of those countries where differing responses were provided by organisations. In those cases, individual responses were counted, and these differences are explained below.

![Figure 3.1: Current and expected teacher shortages by education level](image)

**Figure 3.1: Current and expected teacher shortages by education level**

Figure 3.1 reveals that teacher shortages are the most acute at the upper-secondary level, where 12 countries report that teacher shortages are current (MT/EFEE\textsuperscript{10}), expected (CZ, ES, IT, NL, UK-SCT) or both current and expected (DE, EE, GR, IS, NO, SE). These shortages are similar at the lower-secondary level, with the exception of Italy, where no shortages are reported by both ETUCE and EFEE organisations. In seven countries (DE, EE, IT, MT, NL, SE, UK-SCT), respondents identified teachers’ shortages at the lower and upper-secondary levels in specific subjects, including mathematics, sciences, technical subjects, languages and arts. Additionally, an ageing workforce was reported by respondents in Iceland and Spain as the reason for current and expected teacher shortages at the lower- and upper-secondary levels.

At the primary level, shortages are reported in half of the countries. Expected shortages are foreseen in six countries (CZ, DE, DK/ETUCE\textsuperscript{11}, ES, IS, NL), in Norway and Sweden teacher shortages are both current and expected, and in Malta and Greece they are current. An ageing workforce is noted in Germany, Iceland, and the Netherlands as one of the main factors for expected shortages in the next five years. In Greece, Spain and the UK, respondents observed an increased number of redundancies and unfilled vacancies at the primary level, as a consequence of the impact of the crisis on public budgets and teacher recruitment. In Malta, increased enrolment in the B-Ed primary track

\textsuperscript{10} In Malta, the ETUCE respondent reported no shortages at the lower- and upper-secondary levels, whereas as the EFEE respondent reports a current shortage of teachers at these levels.

\textsuperscript{11} The EFEE respondent for DK reported no shortages.
programme during the past five years has meant that the sector will likely not continue to experience teacher shortages.

At the pre-primary level, teacher shortages are the lowest compared to other levels: in six out of 20 countries shortages are current, expected or both (CZ, DE/ETUCE, IS, MT/EFEE\textsuperscript{12}, NO, SE). In Iceland and Sweden a permanent shortage is reported for this sector as too few prospective teachers are choosing to work at this level. According to the ETUCE organisations in Germany, a shortage of pedagogic personnel for childcare is expected with the extension of day-care for under 3-year olds and without commensurate workforce planning.

In Ireland, the employers’ organisation commented that while there is no general shortage of teachers at any of the levels, it can be difficult to recruit suitable staff for specific subjects at the secondary level, such as Irish and higher-level mathematics. Secondary level teachers generally have two teaching subjects and an additional third subject that they are competent to teach. Given that most teachers teach two or more subjects on a curriculum, the employers’ organisation commented that it can at times be difficult to recruit staff with required combinations of subjects.

3.2 Teacher shortages and workforce planning

In countries where shortages were reported at different levels, respondents were asked whether current recruitment policies/workforce planning takes teacher shortages into account, and what measures they use to address current or expected shortages.

At the secondary education levels, respondents from five countries (DE, EE, MT, NL, UK-SCT) commented that workforce planning attempts to address teacher shortages by measures to make the profession more attractive. In the Netherlands, attempts are being made to increase the number of students in teachers’ training and to improve the attractiveness of the teaching profession, by broadening career perspectives and increasing professional development opportunities. In Germany, measures including longer working hours and later retirement have been introduced to address immediate teacher shortages at the primary and secondary levels to which unions are opposed. Salary supplements are granted to employee teachers coming from other sectors.

3.3 Adequate recruitment policies and workforce planning

Respondents were asked whether they considered teacher recruitment policies/workforce planning in their countries to be adequate.

\textsuperscript{12} The ETUCE respondent for MT reported no teacher shortages at the pre-primary level.
Of the 29 responses to the question, more than two-thirds (19 responses) considered that recruitment policies and workforce planning are not adequate in their countries (DE/ETUCE, EE, FR, GR, IS, IT/EFEE & ETUCE, LT, LV, MT/ETUCE, NL/EFEE & ETUCE, SE/EFEE & ETUCE, SL).

In both Iceland and Lithuania, respondents referred to a lack of common teacher recruitment policy at the state and local government levels. Similarly in Sweden, respondents commented on the absence of an agency at the national level to address teacher shortages and recruitment. In the Netherlands, EFEE and ETUCE respondents noted that recruitment policies have failed to address expected shortages at the secondary level and that teachers have left the profession for other sectors. In Malta, recruitment policies have resulted in an oversupply of teachers in some areas, while failing to address shortages in other areas in a proactive manner. EFEE and ETUCE respondents in Malta, the Netherlands and Sweden noted that improved workforce planning at the national level was needed to address current and expected shortages, particularly at the secondary levels in specific subject areas.

Respondents that did consider recruitment policies and workforce planning to be adequate in their countries (CY/ETUCE, DE/EFEE, IE/EFEE, MT/EFEE, NO/EFEE & ETUCE, SK, UK/EFEE & ETUCE), referred to the undertaking of needs assessments and recruitment strategies in the education sector (UK) and targeted campaigns for teacher recruitment (NO).

### 3.4 Institutions responsible for workforce planning and recruitment policy

In the different countries, teacher recruitment policies and workforce planning at the primary and secondary education levels is a responsibility of different institutions and bodies at various levels, including state (Ministry of Education, Education departments), regional or local governments and municipalities, and the individual school level.

Figure 3.4 sets out in which institutions are responsible for teacher recruitment policies and workforce planning in the different countries. In some countries this may be a combined responsibility between the state and local levels, for example in Denmark, Estonia, Norway and Spain where responsibilities are shared between the Ministry of Education and local governments. In
the Iceland, the Netherlands, Slovakia and Sweden, teacher recruitment policies and workforce planning are a responsibility shared by the Ministry of Education, local governments and school level bodies. In Germany and Spain, recruitment policies and workforce planning are a responsibility of the different Länder (States) and autonomous regions respectively. In Cyprus, France, Greece, Italy, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Slovenia and the UK, responsibility for recruitment policies and workforce planning lies with the Ministry of Education (Education departments of the Ministry). In England, it was noted that a specific government agency is responsible for the overall strategy of maintaining teacher numbers or the sector, whilst individual schools are responsible for making sure they have the right workforce to deliver services.

Figure 3.4: Institution(s) responsible for workforce planning/recruitment policies at the primary and secondary levels

It should be noted that ‘responsibility’ for recruitment policies and workforce planning may denote different responsibilities, and varying degrees of responsibility, in each country. In some countries a central body may hold overall responsibility for recruitment policies, but other institutions may be involved in workforce planning or development of recruitment policies. For example, in Scotland, the government is responsible for recruitment policies, but the local governments, unions and teacher education institutions are additionally involved in workforce planning.

In the Czech Republic, the survey respondent commented that there exists no workforce planning or recruitment policy at the central or local level, but schools may have their own policies.
3.5 Social partners at the national level involved in workforce planning/recruitment policy development

Respondents in 11 countries (CY/ETUCE, CZ, DK, IT, NL, NO, SE, UK-SCT/ETUCE) reported that social partners at the national level are involved in workforce planning and recruitment policy development, often in tripartite dialogue involving (local) government, trade unions and employers’ organisations and/or teacher education institutions (CZ, DK, NL, SE, NO, UK-SCT/ETUCE). In the Netherlands and Sweden, teacher unions’ comments that they actively lobby at the national level, for example for adequate measures to prevent teacher shortages (NL). They also inform governments about projected teacher needs (e.g. subject specific needs) according to the needs of municipalities (SE). Similarly, in Italy the unions note that it is the government who establishes recruitment policies, but that they are able to influence the development of these policies.

Respondents in 11 countries reported that social partners are not involved (CY, DE, FR, GR, IE, LT, LV, MT, SK, SL, UK-ENG/EFEE). In Cyprus the Ministry of Education and Culture reported that social partners are not involved, while the ETUCE members indicated that they are, through union demands for better working conditions for teachers. In Germany, it was noted that unions are not formally involved in social dialogue on workforce planning or recruitment policy development in the various Länder.

In Ireland, the employers’ organisation commented, that while social partners are not formally involved at the national level in workforce planning and recruitment policy development, teacher

---

13 No response was received for Estonia, Iceland and Spain.
unions do influence policy developments and planning around teachers recruitment and retention. The Department of Education and Skills, following consultations with both the school management bodies and the teachers' unions sets out the terms and conditions of employment under which all teachers are employed.

In the majority of the countries where respondents report that social partners are not involved in recruitment policy development and workforce planning, these respondents also consider recruitment policies to be inadequate. Similarly, these are also the countries where teacher shortages are noted.

Conclusions:

- Teacher shortages are most common at the lower- and upper-secondary levels, particularly in subjects such as mathematics, sciences, and languages.
- An ageing workforce is a common reason for expected shortages at the primary and secondary levels.
- In countries affected by the current economic crisis, increased redundancies and unfilled vacancies as a result of budgetary cuts has led to, or exacerbated, teacher shortages.
- The majority of respondents consider that recruitment policies and workforce planning are inadequate, mainly because they do not adequately address teacher shortages and workforce needs.
- Social partners are not involved in recruitment policy development and workforce planning in over half the countries surveyed. These are also the countries where teacher shortages are noted, and in which recruitment policies and workforce planning are considered inadequate.

4 Recruitment process of Teachers

4.1 Institutions responsible for the recruitment of teachers

Recruitment of teachers in the different member states is a responsibility of different institutions and bodies at various levels, including state (Ministries of Education/Departments of Education), regional or local governments and municipalities, and at the individual school level (by school leaders, principals, headmasters etc.). In 13 of the countries surveyed teachers are recruited at the individual school level (CZ, EE, IE, IS, LT, LV, NL, NO, SE, SK, SL, UK-ENG, UK-SCT), which corresponds to teachers having a public servant status (see section 2.1).

In Cyprus, France, Greece and Malta, teachers at all levels are centrally recruited teachers by the Ministry of Education as career civil servants. Similarly in Italy, recruitment of teachers takes place at the state level, with the exception of pre-primary teachers who are appointed both by the Ministry of Education and local authorities. Malta reports of a difference between state school and non-state schools: In state schools the recruitment of teachers is carried out at the state-level, but at non-state school the individual schools are responsible for the recruitment of teachers.
In Germany, responsibility for the recruitment of teachers varies between the different Länder (states). At the pre-primary level, different bodies and institutions (including municipalities, churches, and private charity organisations) are responsible for the recruitment of teachers, whereas it is either the local authority or the individual school leader at the institutional level who is responsible for the recruitment at the primary and secondary levels. In Denmark, local authorities (municipalities) and school leaders are responsible for the recruitment of teachers.

4.2 Administrative process used to recruit teachers

In over half of the countries surveyed (CZ, DK, IE, IS, MT, NL, NO, SE, SK, UK-ENG, UK-SCT) teachers are recruited through public job advertisements, usually on teacher recruitment websites. In seven countries (CY, DE, ES, GR, FR, IT, SL), teachers are recruited through public selection, normally through competitive examinations (CY, ES, GR, FR). In Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, teacher recruitment takes place both through job advertisements and public selection at all levels.

Respondents in Germany reported of differences in the recruitment process between pre-primary level and other levels of teaching. Pre-primary teachers in Germany are recruited through job advertisements, whereas teachers at primary and secondary level are recruited through public selection. Furthermore, Germany also operates with a formal procedure for the transfer of teachers between the different states through which teachers can also be recruited.

4.3 Changes in recruitment policies

In the majority of countries, respondents stated that the recruitment process of teachers had not changed over the last 5 years, with the exception of respondents in Germany, Malta and Scotland.

In Germany, the decentralisation of the recruitment process at the primary and secondary levels has resulted in a more active role of the schools in selecting and appointing teachers according to their needs. Explanations for the reasoning behind the decentralisation of recruitment to the school level varied between the employer organisation who reported it gives schools the possibility to recruit teachers with a profile that matches the needs and characteristics of the school, whereas the employee organisations reported that the decentralisation of recruitment has been implemented to reduce administrative costs, while many schools do not preside over the administrative capacity to adequately recruit teachers.

In Scotland, job advertisements are advertised on a web portal by local authorities to allow for online applications for arising vacancies. In Malta, the Department of Education reports that the recruitment process has been reorganised in recent years to allow for a more streamlined process.

4.4 Adequate recruitment process of teachers

Respondents were asked whether they consider the recruitment process of teachers to be adequate in their countries: in half of the countries surveyed this was answered positively (CZ, DK, UK, FR, MT, NL, NO, SE, SK, SL). In France, respondents noted that recruitment through competitive examination
is adequate, however concerns were raised that the examination content is not sufficiently linked to the competences needed in the profession. In the Netherlands, the employer and employee organisations reported that the process of recruiting at the school level is adequate, however many teachers are recruited on a contractual basis, causing many younger teachers to leave the sector prematurely.

Respondents in Greece, Ireland, Italy and Lithuania reported that the recruitment process in their country is not adequate. In Greece the employee organisation considered that the process could be improved if teacher unions were involved. In Italy, both employee and employer organisations reported that the recruitment process has resulted in teachers increasingly hired on a contractual basis, leading to job insecurity, which was also noted in the Netherlands and Spain. The three Italian employee organisations agree that a solution could be to allocate permanent staff to each school for a fixed period, e.g. 3 years. The employer organisation indicates that no measures have been taken to improve the recruitment process of teachers, and no suggestions for improvement are announced. In Lithuania, the employee organisation considers that the introduction of selection criteria for the appointment of teachers, in addition to a transparent recruitment process, would help to improve the recruitment of qualified teachers. Similarly, the employer organisation in Cyprus noted the need for improved selection criteria for the recruitment of teachers.

In Ireland, the employers’ organisation commented that there needs to be a greater focus on teachers’ professional competence at the point of recruitment, whereas the current practice of recruiting teachers relies heavily on performance during interviews and referees’ reports. It was noted that interview/selection boards may comprise members with little appreciation for the competences that teachers should have.

In Germany, the employee organisations do not consider the recruitment process to be adequate whereas the employer organisation does. As reported in section 4.3, the employee organisations consider that schools would benefit from administrative support and training in, for example, labour laws, to better organise recruitment at the school level. Unions also highlight the importance of the participation of work councils in the recruitment process.

Conclusions:

- In those countries in which teachers are appointed as public sector employees, teachers are recruited at the individual school level, and in those countries in which teachers are recruited as career civil servants, they are appointed at the state level (Ministry of Education).
- In the majority of countries the recruitment process has not changed in the last five years.
- Inadequate recruitment processes were attributed by respondents to insufficient selection criteria for the recruitment of teachers, and little focus on teachers’ professional competence during selection.
- In some countries, the increased employment of teachers on a contractual basis, has resulted in job insecurity for young teachers.
5 Attraction of Teachers

5.1 Attraction of male and/or female teachers to the profession

Respondents were asked whether the education sectors in their countries experienced difficulty in attracting male and/or female teachers to the profession. Additionally, respondents were asked whether there exist policies to address the attraction of teachers to different levels.

Respondents from five countries (CY/EFEE, IE, IT, MT/ETUCE, SE/EFEE, UK-ENG,) reported that female teachers are overrepresented at the pre-primary level and that the pre-primary sector generally faces difficulties attracting male teachers. Respondents noted that the absence of male teachers at this level is due to the predominant societal perception that pre-primary education is a traditionally ‘female’ profession (CY/EFEE, DE, MT, SE and UK-SCT). The Irish respondent commented that issues related to the position of women in society and societal perceptions of the value of early childhood education and care contribute to the reasons for a lack of male teachers at this level.

In addition, low salaries, limited career opportunities, insufficient training and a perceived low status of the profession at this level, were cited as reasons for difficulties in attracting both male and female teachers to the pre-primary level in Germany, France, Italy and Malta.

In Germany, respondents reported that campaigns have been organised by the federal government in collaboration with the social partners to boost the image of the profession at this level.

In Ireland, the then Office of the Minister of Children and Youth Affairs published ‘Diversity and Equality for Childcare Providers” guidelines for childcare managers and practitioners in 2006, which stated that every setting should have an equal opportunities recruitment policy to create inclusive and support childcare settings for all children. In this context, the guidelines recognised the importance of children interacting with men in the childcare environment.
Respondents in more than half of the countries consider that there are difficulties in attracting male teachers at the primary level (DE, DK, EE, IS, IT, MT, NL, SE, SK, and UK-ENG), and in an additional three countries both male and female teachers (CZ, FR, NO). As at the pre-primary level, low status, salaries and a lack of career perspective at the primary level were cited by both EFEE and ETUCE members as the most common reasons for difficulties in attracting teachers to this level (CZ, DE, EE, IS, IT, MT, NL, NO, SE, SK). It was noted that male teachers tend to seek employment at the secondary levels where salaries are generally higher and there exists more room for career development (DE, SE). Both in the Netherlands and Sweden an overall lack of students in teacher education for the primary level was highlighted. In Norway, it was noted that small district school faces bigger difficulties recruiting qualified teachers at this level.

In Ireland, the employers’ organisation noted that the economic downturn has resulted in increased number of males from other disciplines seeking to undertake post-graduate courses in primary teaching on account of losing employment in other sectors. In 2006, preceding the economic crisis, the Department of Education and Skills launched a resource pack ‘Equal Measures’ to assist schools in formulating a gender equality policy, and to promote gender equality within the whole school context, including faculty. The Irish EFEE member, however, do not consider these measures to be adequate, commenting that increased number of male teachers entering the profession at the primary level is due to economic developments rather than government policies.

In Norway, a specialised campaign ‘GNIST’ (SPARK) was developed in partnership with the employers, school leaders, teachers’ unions, the national council for teacher education and the ministry of education, to attract well-qualified teachers to the primary level. The campaigns main objectives were to increase the quality and status of the teaching profession, teacher education, and school leadership. A closer partnership between higher education institutions and schools was additionally developed under the campaign. The employer and employee organisations considered that this campaign was partially effective in addressing teacher shortages.

In the Netherlands, the Ministry of Education developed special policies to attract male teachers to the teaching profession.

At the lower secondary level, respondents in eight countries reported difficulties in attracting both male and female teachers (CZ, DE/ETUCE, EE, FR, MT/EFEE, NL, NO, SE), and in six countries (DK, UK-ENG, IE, IS, SE, SK/ETUCE) respondents stated that it is difficult to recruit male teachers at this level.

Figure 5.1.3: Difficulty attracting teachers at lower-secondary level
Low salaries were the most common reason cited for difficulties in recruiting teachers at this level (CZ, EE, IS, IT, SK/ETUCE), followed by high workloads and low status (DE/ETUCE, EE, FR, IS). Respondents in Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, and Sweden highlighted a difficulty in attracting teachers for specific subjects, including mathematics, sciences, and languages. Additionally, a difficulty in attracting teachers to certain areas was also noted, e.g. smaller districts and rural areas in Norway and Sweden, and larger cities in the Netherlands.

Respondents from 11 countries reported no difficulties in attracting teachers (CY, DE/EFEE, UK-SCT, ES, GR, IT, LT, LV, MT/ETUCE, SK/EFEE, SL). Across all levels, respondents in Spain noted that there are currently more candidates than positions available for prospective teachers.

In Germany, teachers coming from other sectors may receive partial supplemental pay, particularly in subject areas where there is a high shortage of teachers.

At the upper-secondary level, the highest number of respondents (9 total) reported difficulties in attracting both male and female teachers to the profession. Similarly as at the lower-secondary level, respondents in Germany, the Netherlands, and Sweden emphasised a difficulty in attracting teachers to particular subjects, including mathematics, sciences, and languages. Low status and salaries, as well as high demands and workloads, were reasons cited for a lack of male and female teachers entering the profession. Respondents in 11 countries reported that there are no difficulties in recruiting teachers to the upper-secondary level.

In Ireland, it was noted that similar to the primary level, the economic downturn has resulted in increased numbers of male business and engineering graduates seeking to enter both lower and upper-secondary level teaching in recent years, which has helped level out the gender imbalance in teaching positions across all levels. The availability of teacher training programmes at the post-graduate level has facilitated the transfer of prospective teachers from other sectors.

Recommendations made by EFEE and ETUCE member organisations to improve the recruitment of male and female teachers at all levels included: increased, and improved quality of, teacher training.

---

14 In both German and Slovakia the unions reported difficulties in attracting teachers to the lower secondary level, whereas the EFEE members reported no difficulties. In Malta the Ministry of Education reported difficulties, whereas the ETUCE member did not. This accounts for the total number of responses included in the figures exceeding the total number of countries.
(DE/ETUCE, FR, NL); provision of additional training for teachers in specific subjects (DE/ETUCE), increased salaries (DE, EE, IT, NL, SK) and opportunities for career development (DE, IT, NL).

5.2 Measures to increase mobility to the education sector

In over half of the countries\(^\text{15}\) (13 total), measures do not exist to increase mobility from other sectors to the education sector, whereas in seven countries there are such measures (CZ, DE, DK, UK-ENG, NL, NO and SK). Requirements in all these countries for individuals recruited from other sectors are a higher education degree and the completion of professional teacher training, which may be undertaken part-time and/or on-the-job.

5.3 Required level of certified education for teachers

At the primary, lower- and upper-secondary levels, teachers are required to have either a bachelor or master level degree in order to teach. In the table below the requirement per country is set out. In more than half of the countries, a master degree is the minimum education level requirement for teachers working at the primary and secondary levels. In the Netherlands, a bachelor degree is required at the primary and lower-secondary levels, and a master at the upper-secondary level. Similarly, in Sweden a bachelor is required for teachers at the primary level, and teachers in the lower- and upper-secondary levels a master degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country / Level</th>
<th>CY</th>
<th>CZ</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>LT</th>
<th>LV</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>SL</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(P=\text{Primary level}; \ L-S=\text{Lower-secondary}; \ U-S=\text{Upper secondary}\)

Table 5.3.1: Required level of education to teach at primary and lower- and upper-secondary education levels

At the pre-primary level, education level requirements are more varied between countries. In France and Slovakia, respondents report that the minimum education level requirement to work at the pre-primary level is a secondary education degree. In the Czech Republic and Germany, teachers at the pre-primary level should have a post-secondary non-tertiary education. In the majority of countries, the minimum requirement at the pre-primary level is tertiary education (bachelor or master level degree). In Norway, even though teachers are required to hold a bachelor level degree at the pre-primary level, both EFEE and ETUCE organisations note that only one in three teachers has an adequate professional qualification.

\(^{15}\) No response received for Estonia.
At the lower- and upper-secondary levels, respondents in seven countries (DK/EFEE, EE, ES, IT, NL, NO, SE/ETUCE) commented that their education systems face difficulty in attracting teachers in specific subject areas (including mathematics, sciences, languages and IT) that meet the basic requirements for teacher education.

In 10 countries, respondents reported that there exists a gap between the skills and competences teachers have and those needed to teach in the education sector (CZ, DE, DK, ES, GR, IE, IT, LT, NO, SL). Respondents noted a lack of ICT skills in the Czech Republic, Denmark, Ireland and Italy, whereas respondents in Denmark, Germany and Slovenia commented on a lack of training for teachers to adequately incorporate diversity in the classroom, work with children with special needs, or to address conflict or violence in the classroom or school.

Similarly in Ireland, the employers’ organisation noted that many teachers at the secondary education level lack skills that are essential to group work, assessment for learning, using ICT effectively in the classroom, differentiating their teaching, teaching mixed ability class groups, addressing the intercultural dimension and coping with students with emotional, behavioural and learning difficulties. Reasons cited for the lack of skills were a strong didactic orientation of the Irish education system, with an emphasis on teaching rather than on learning, and on student performance in state-wide examinations. To address this, the Department of Education developed a range of services to support teachers in acquiring additional skills and competences, but these have been curtailed by the economic downturn in the country. The Irish employers’ organisation proposed that all teachers should be required to undertake continuous professional development in order to further develop their skills and competences.

In the Czech Republic, Germany, Italy, and Slovenia, specialised seminars and training courses have been organised by schools, ministries and/or teacher unions for teachers to enhance teacher skills and competences. Respondents in Latvia and Malta commented that additional and/or required skills are provided for in regular in-service programmes. In Spain, the provision of in-service teacher

---

No response was received for FR, IS, NL, SE and UK-SCT.
training is a responsibility of each autonomous region, with varying degrees of implementation according to the national union.

5.4 Factors attracting teachers to the profession

EFEE and ETUCE organisations were asked on a scale from ‘not important at all’ to ‘very important’, which factors they consider important in attracting teachers to the profession. For each factor, figure 5.4.1 below shows the number of organisations that consider them ‘very important’, ‘important’, ‘neither important/unimportant’, ‘somewhat important’ or ‘not important at all’.

![Graph showing the importance of factors attracting teachers to the profession.](image)

Figure 5.4.1: Importance of factors attracting teachers to the profession

The majority of EFEE and ETUCE organisations consider salary (17), employment security (15), and status of the profession (12) ‘very important’ for the attraction of teachers to the profession. Factors considered ‘important’ by the majority of respondents: commitment to education/contribution to society (17 total), influence on job content (14), access to continuing professional development (14), employment security (14) and work/life balance (13). When combining those factors considered ‘very important’ and ‘important’ together, the majority of organisations consider employment security (29 in total), commitment to education/contribution to society (26), and salary (24) the most important factors attracting teachers to the profession. ETUCE organisations in Lithuania and Slovakia additionally mentioned safe working environments as essential for teaching.

---

17 Organisations in Denmark (EFEE and ETUCE), Norway (EFEE) and Sweden (EFEE) refrained from answering this question.
EFEE and ETUCE member organisations find similar factors important in the attraction of teachers (Figure 5.4.2 below). A comparison of their responses reveals that: commitment to education/contribution to society, salary, employment security, career opportunities and influence on job content are factors considered to be most important by EFEE organisations in the attraction of teachers, and similarly employment security, salary, commitment to education are considered the most important factors by ETUCE organisations. Career opportunities are additionally seen as imperative for the attraction of teachers by over 80% of the employers, compared to 55% of the unions, despite the fact that many of the unions consider that a lack of career opportunities plays an important role in teachers’ shortages (see section 5.1). Work/life balance is on the other hand, considered important by over 80% of unions, but only 57% of the employers’ organisations.

![Figure 5.4.2: Comparison of factors considered ‘important’ and ‘very important’ by EFEE and ETUCE organisations](image)

Non-salary benefits and mobility within the sector were considered less important factors in the attraction of teachers by both employer and employee organisations.

### 5.5 Social partners involved in tackling challenges concerning attraction of teachers

EFEE and ETUCE organisations were asked whether the national social partners are involved in tackling challenges regarding the attraction of teachers. In just over half of the countries¹⁸ (CY/EFEE, CZ, DK, EE, ES, IT, LV, MT, NL, NO, SE), organisations reported that social partners are involved in either bilateral or tripartite dialogue and collective bargaining structures. Examples specific to the attraction of teachers, include the participation of unions in ongoing education reforms dialogue (CY), developing national recruitment campaigns (DK), developing measures to increase the

---

¹⁸ No response was received for France and Scotland.
attractiveness of the profession through, for example, the provision of professional development programmes for teachers (ES).

Respondents in eight countries reported that social partners are not involved in tackling challenges pertaining to the attraction of teachers (CY/ETUCE, DE, IE, GR, LT, SK, SL, UK-ENG). In Ireland, the employers’ organisation commented referred to the unions advocating for better working conditions of teachers, which contributes to the attractiveness of the profession.

Conclusions:
- The attraction of male teachers is a particular problem at the pre-primary and primary levels.
- Low salaries, limited career opportunities, insufficient training and perceived low status of the profession are reasons cited for the difficulty in attracting teachers to the profession.
- At the secondary levels, countries face difficulties in attracting teachers to specific subject areas, including mathematics, languages and sciences, which are also the subject areas in which shortages were noted. High workloads were cited as reasons for the difficulty in attracting teachers to this level.
- Commitment to education/contribution to society, salary, employment security, career opportunities and influence on job content are factors considered to be most important by both EFEE and ETUCE organisations in the attraction of teachers.
- Generally teachers at all levels are required to have at minimum a bachelor or master degree to teach. These requirements are lower at the pre-primary level in some countries.
- Respondents consider that teachers require continual training and professional development in using ICT skills, addressing diversity in the classroom, and dealing with conflict in the classroom.
- EFEE and ETUCE member organisations recommend improving the recruitment of teachers at all levels through: increased, and improved quality of, teacher training, provision of additional training for teachers in specific subjects areas, increased salaries, and opportunities for career development.
- In over half the countries, social partners are involved in addressing challenges related to the attraction of teachers to the profession.

6 Retention of Teachers

6.1 Institutions responsible for teacher retention policies

Similar to recruitment policies, in the majority of the countries surveyed the state (Ministry of Education) is responsible for teacher retention policies, where these exist. In nine countries teacher retention policies are the responsibility of the Ministry of Education (CY, CZ, FR, GR, IE, IT, LT, NO, SL), whereas in Denmark and Iceland the local governments share responsibility with the state
government, and in UK-ENG, MT, and the Netherlands it is a combined responsibility of the Ministry of Education and the individual schools. In Sweden, teacher retention policies are a shared responsibility between local governments and schools. Respondents in Estonia, and Slovakia reported that the Ministry of Education together with local governments and individual schools are responsible for retention policies of teachers. In Spain and Germany, teacher recruitment policies are a responsibility of the Educational administrations in the Autonomous regions and German Länder (states) respectively.

6.2 Implementation of teacher retention policy at the institutional level

With regard to the implementation of teacher retention policies at the institutional level, in eight countries the individual school leaders/governing boards/managerial bodies are directly responsible (CZ, IS, LV, NL, NO, SK, SL, UK-ENG). In Denmark, Estonia and Sweden local governments and schools share responsibility. In Spain, schools and regional education administrators share responsibility.

In five countries the Ministry of Education holds responsibility for the implementation of teacher retention policies (CY, FR, GR, LT and MT), and in Germany it is a responsibility of the different Länder (states).

In Ireland, the employers’ organisation commented that teacher retention has not been a problem in the Irish education system, and has not been addressed in Irish schools.

6.3 Challenges to the retention of teachers

EFEE and ETUCE organisations were asked whether the education sectors in their countries experience difficulties in retaining teachers. The majority of respondents commented that their countries do not experience difficulties in retaining teachers.

At the pre-primary level, only the ETUCE organisations in Germany and Sweden noted that they have difficulties in retaining teachers. In Germany, low pay combined with limited career perspectives were cited as reasons for both male and female teachers to leave the profession.

At the primary level, ETUCE organisations in the Czech Republic, Sweden, and Slovakia reported of male teachers leaving the profession in particular, due to low salaries (CZ, SK). In Malta and the Netherlands, unions and employers reported of difficulties in retaining both male and female teachers.

At the lower- and upper-secondary levels, unions in the Czech Republic and Slovakia report difficulties in retaining male teachers in the sector, particularly in subjects such as mathematics, computer sciences and languages, due to low salaries in the education sector. In Estonia, Italy, and the Netherlands, both EFEE and ETUCE organisations indicated difficulties in retaining both male and female teachers at these levels. The EFEE and ETUCE organisations in the Netherlands commented that young teachers are often hired on fixed-term contracts, resulting in a lack of job security. This combined with demanding workloads, a lack of support, and limited career perspectives, results in young teachers leaving the sector early in their teaching careers. Similarly, low salaries and limited
career opportunities were cited as reasons for teachers leaving the sector in Estonia and Italy. The union in Spain additionally noted that while overall there are few problems with regard to teachers’ retention, newly graduated teachers leave the profession due to ‘praxis shock’.

In Iceland, the union commented that since the financial crisis that severely hit the country in 2008, the education sector has not experienced difficulties in retaining teachers. The ETUCE member organisation in France also noted that since the impact of the economic crisis and rising unemployment, job security of civil servants has been major factor in job retention. The unions in Germany also noted that civil servant status and high social security levels has meant that the sector faces little retention problems.

6.4 Factors influencing teachers to leave the profession

EFEE and ETUCE organisations were asked on a scale from ‘not important at all’ to ‘very important’, which factors they consider important in influencing teachers to leave the profession. For each factor, Figure 6.4 below shows the total number of organisations that consider them ‘very important’, ‘important’, ‘neither important/unimportant’, ‘somewhat important’ or ‘not important at all’.

![Bar chart showing the importance of factors in influencing teachers to leave the profession](chart.png)

**Figure 6.4: Importance of factors in influencing teachers to leave the profession**

Both EFEF and ETUCE organisations considered the factors ‘stress’, ‘salary’ and ‘job satisfaction’ the three most important factors in influencing teachers to leave the profession. Difficulties in balancing
work and personal life, as well as a lack of career perspectives were factors also considered important and very important by half of the respondents.

Surprisingly, and in contradiction to factors attracting teachers to the profession, a lack of job security was considered not important in influencing teachers to leave the profession by 15 respondents. This may be explained by the fact that in a number of countries surveyed, teachers are appointed for life as career civil servants, but this is not the situation in the majority of countries.

6.5 Social partners involved in policy development to retain teachers

EFEE and ETUCE organisations were asked whether social partners at the national level are involved in policy developments to retain teachers. In less than half (9 total) of the countries surveyed, social partners are involved in policy development to retain teachers (CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, ES, NL, NO and UK-SCT), as part of the social dialogue in education. In 10 countries, social partners are not involved in policy developments, including: FR, GR, IE, LT, LV, MT, SE, SK, SL and UK-ENG. The Irish employers’ organisation highlighted that teachers’ retention has not been an issue in the education sector thus not requiring the development of policies. This may be similarly the case in other countries, but was not reported.

Conclusions:

- The majority of countries do not face problems with the retention of teachers. In countries where teachers hold career civil servant positions, this may be explained by their permanent appointment.
- Low salaries, limited career perspectives, and a lack of job security were cited as reasons for teachers to leave the profession in those countries that do face teacher retention challenges.
- Young teachers in particular are prone to leave the profession early in their careers due to fixed-term contractual employment, limited support, and ‘praxis shock’.
- ‘Stress’, ‘salary’ and ‘job satisfaction’ are factors considered important in influencing teachers to leave the profession.
- In half of the countries, social partners not involved in policy developments around teacher retention.

7 European dimension

7.1 Measures proposed at European level to improve recruitment and retention of teachers

The sharing of teacher recruitment and retention policies and practices in different countries at the European level was the most common response to the question what could be done at the European level to improve teacher recruitment and retention in respondents’ national contexts (EE, ES, LT, MT/EFEE, SL).
Additional suggestions included: advocating at the European level for permanent contracts in the education sector (NL), promoting career perspectives for teachers (CZ/ETUCE, NL), and ensuring adequate remuneration for teachers (CZ/ETUCE) as measures to increase the attractiveness of the teaching profession. Similarly, the Norwegian EFEE and ETUCE member organisations proposed that social partners at the European level focus on measures to increase the status of teachers across Europe. Further respondents in Denmark (EFEE) and Norway proposed European level support to increase mobility from other sectors into the education sector to address shortages.

Employee organisations in Denmark and Germany proposed European level support for ensuring higher education levels for teachers. Specifically it was proposed that all teachers work at the pre-primary level should have at least a Bachelor’s degree (DE), or a Master degrees requirements at all levels (DK).

The EFEE member in Cyprus suggested that the European level should encourage and support policies regarding the selection, appointment, evaluation and continuous professional development of teachers. The employers’ organisation in England, commented on the need ensure that teachers’ competences are fairly evaluated based on common teachers’ qualifications and competences. Similarly, the EFEE member in Ireland, noted that an agreement between social partners at the European level about the competences that teachers should possess, as well as agreements about the nature of the teachers’ role and function, would be helpful.

Respondents in Italy, the Netherlands and Slovakia urged for European level advocacy for increased public spending on education.

7.2 European level measures by social partners in education to improve the recruitment and retention of teachers

Respondents were asked what can be done by the social partners in education at the European level to improve the recruitment and retention of teachers in their national contexts.

Respondents in Greece, Italy (EFEE & ETUCE) and Slovakia urge the social partners at the European level to ensure that education sectors are spared from austerity measures in the context of the economic crisis.

EFEE and ETUCE members in Denmark, Italy, Norway suggested that the social partners should discuss measures to give the profession increased status and recognition, and to recognise the crucial contribution of the education sector to economic growth and employment and social outcomes.

Two trade unions (CZ, EE) call for European support to augment teachers’ salaries at the national level to match salaries paid to similar profession. The Danish employer organisation suggested that initiatives should be undertaken at the European level by the social partners to attract more male teachers to the profession in general.
Trade unions in Germany and Lithuania would like the European social partners to help improve the relationship between social partners at national level. Trade unions in Cyprus and Malta would like the social partners to help ensure the implementation of EU directives pertaining to education at the national level. The trade union in Iceland indicated that it would like support in policy development at the national level.

The German employer organisation commented that as the education authorities of the different German states regulate recruitment and retention processes, it considers that the situation cannot be influenced at the European level.

Both the unions in Lithuania and Slovenia comments that social partners at the European level should put more pressure on national governments to include social partners in policy developments at the national level.

Conclusions:
EFEE and ETUCE members recommend the following at the European level to improve the recruitment and retention of teachers in the education sector:

- Sharing of national practices and policies around teachers’ recruitment and retention between countries.
- European level advocacy for permanent contracts in the education sector, promoting career perspectives, ensuring adequate remuneration for teachers, and implementing measures to increase the attractiveness of the teacher profession across Europe.
- Increased mobility from other sectors into the education sector.
- Ensuring higher education qualifications, particularly at the pre-primary level.
- Initiatives to attract more male teachers to the profession.
- Improve relations between social partners at the European level.
- In the context of the economic crisis, respondents urged for European level advocacy for increased public spending on education.