



Effective Interventions:
Promoting Learning, Tackling Workload

Contents

Effective interventions: promoting learning, tackling workload	4
Key messages	4
What is an intervention?	5
Evaluation	5
Teacher workload and wellbeing	5
Evidence base	6
Interventions that can be effective and avoid workload burdens	7
Interventions that are ineffective or may create excessive workload.....	10
Further information	14

Effective interventions: promoting learning, tackling workload

This document summarises the findings of research into interventions used in schools across the UK, the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man. It provides evidence about interventions that are effective in supporting pupils to achieve, without creating workload burdens for teachers and school leaders. It also outlines evidence about interventions that appear to have limited educational value and/or generate excessive and unnecessary workload burdens for teachers and school leaders.

Key messages

- Some interventions can be highly effective in supporting pupils to progress and achieve, and secure widespread professional support.¹
- Some interventions have limited educational value and/or create excessive and unnecessary workload burdens for teachers and school leaders.²
- Schools should use evidence about the impact of an intervention on educational outcomes and the workloads of teachers and school leaders before deciding whether to use the intervention.^{3 4}
- An intervention that is badly implemented may increase workload. Therefore, it is essential that careful consideration is given to how an intervention will be implemented, including the resources that will be needed to support the intervention.⁵
- In England, Ofsted inspects the workload and wellbeing of staff. A school cannot be judged outstanding unless, *'leaders ensure that highly effective and meaningful engagement takes place with staff at all levels and that issues are identified. When issues are identified, in particular about workload, they are consistently dealt with appropriately and quickly'*.⁶

There is a substantial evidence base that can be used to assess the effectiveness of potential interventions. However, teachers and school leaders continue to have interventions imposed on them that are of limited educational value and increase their workload. The NASUWT will continue to promote evidence about effective practice, and support teachers and school leaders to challenge poor and ineffective practice.

1 Burroughs-Lange, S. and Douetil, J. (2006). *Evaluation of Reading Recovery in London Schools: Every Child a Reader 2005-2006*. University of London.

2 Department for Education (2015). *Government response to the Workload Challenge*; and Teacher Workload Advisory Group (November 2018) *Making data work*.

3 Education Endowment Foundation Report of the Teachers Workload Advisory Group (December 2019). *Putting evidence to work: A school's guide to implementation – Guidance Report*.

4 NASUWT advice on workload. Available at: www.nasuwt.org.uk/advice/conditions-of-service/workload.html. (Accessed: 6 January 2020)

5 Education Endowment Foundation (2018). *Sutton Trust-Education Endowment Foundation Teaching and Learning Toolkit*, London: <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/resources/teaching-learning-toolkit>

6 Ofsted (November 2019). *School Inspection Handbook: inspection of schools under section 5 of the Education Act 2005*, paragraph 277.

What is an intervention?

An intervention is normally understood to mean an activity or strategy that is different from, or additional to, those employed routinely with pupils.⁷

Evaluation

Schools should use evidence about the effectiveness of interventions to assess whether it will be appropriate to introduce an intervention. Such research may also be used to support evaluations of the effectiveness of interventions that are used within the school.

Evaluation is important because it:

- enables schools to establish whether an intervention is having a positive or negative impact on learning;
- reduces workload by ensuring that teachers put their time and effort into things that work; and
- helps schools to establish where improvements can be made.⁸

Schools should refer to the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) *DIY Evaluation Guide* for practical advice on how to assess and evaluate interventions.⁹ Schools should also refer to the NASUWT's advice on workload reduction.¹⁰

Teacher workload and wellbeing

Numerous studies report the negative impact of workload on teacher recruitment and retention, teacher wellbeing and learning outcomes.

International studies show that teachers in England work significantly longer hours than teachers in other countries.¹¹ Full-time lower secondary teachers in England report working an average of 49.3 hours per week compared to an average of 40.8 hours across Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries.¹²

Workload is repeatedly cited as a significant reason why teachers consider leaving the profession.^{13 14 15 16} Excessive workload, a culture of high-stakes

⁷ Education Endowment Foundation (EEF). *DIY Evaluation Guide*. Available at: <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/tools/diy-guide/getting-started/> (accessed 17 December 2019).

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Available at: <https://www.nasuwat.org.uk/advice/conditions-of-service/workload.html> (accessed 17 December 2019).

¹¹ Teacher Workload Advisory Group (November 2018). *Making data work: Report of the Teacher Workload Advisory Group*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/teacher-workload-advisory-group-report-and-government-response>. (Accessed 18 December 2019)

¹² Jerrim, John and Sims, Sam. (June 2019). *Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) 2018: Research report*. Department for Education.

¹³ Education Support (2019). *Teacher Wellbeing Index 2019*. Available at: https://www.educationsupport.org.uk/sites/default/files/teacher_wellbeing_index_2019.pdf. (Accessed 6 January 2020)

¹⁴ NASUWT Big Question survey reports available at: <https://www.nasuwat.org.uk/news/campaigns/big-question-survey.html> (accessed 6 January 2020).

¹⁵ Department for Education (2015). *Government response to the workload challenge*.

¹⁶ Teacher Workload Advisory Group (November 2018). *Making data work*.

accountability and lack of support from senior managers are cited as reasons for poor mental health, including stress and burnout.^{17 18 19}

Therefore, it is vital that schools address issues relating to the workload and wellbeing of teachers when considering whether and/or how an intervention should be implemented.

Evidence base

The EEF's *Teaching and Learning Toolkit* summarises research about the effectiveness of a range of strategies used commonly in schools.²⁰ The *Toolkit* draws on evidence from the UK and internationally about the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of these strategies.²¹ It also judges the relative strength of the research base for each intervention.²² Currently, the *Toolkit* evaluates the effectiveness and value for money of over 30 distinct interventions.

The *Toolkit* can be used to inform professional discussions with employers and others about the effectiveness of interventions.

The *Toolkit* is endorsed by the Department for Education (DfE), the Welsh Government and the Scottish Government.²³

This document summarises other evidence about effective practice, including the *School Workload Reduction Toolkit*,²⁴ the reports of the Independent Teacher Workload Review Group on marking, planning and data management,²⁵ and the report of the Teacher Workload Advisory Group, *Making data work*.²⁶

17 Ofsted (July 2019). *Teacher well-being at work in schools and education providers*. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/819314/Teacher_well-being_report_110719F.pdf (accessed 6 January 2020).

18 Education Support (2019). *Teacher Wellbeing Index 2019*.

19 NASUWT Big Question surveys, op. cit.

20 Education Endowment Foundation (2018) op. cit.

21 Ibid.

22 Ibid.

23 Department for Education (DfE). '(2019). 'Pupil premium funding: effective use and accountability'. Available at: (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pupil-premium-information-for-schools-and-alternative-provision-settings>), (accessed: 18 December 2019); Learning Wales. (2013). 'Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) Toolkit'. Available at: <https://gov.wales/teaching-and-learning-toolkit-education-endowment-foundation> (accessed 18 December 2019); Scottish Government (2017). 'New attainment tools for teachers'. Available at: (<https://news.gov.scot/news/new-attainment-tools-for-teachers>), (accessed: 18 December 2019).

24 Department for Education (July 2018). *School Workload Reduction Toolkit*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/school-workload-reduction-toolkit>. (Accessed 18 December 2019)

25 Independent Teacher Workload Review Group. (2016): *Eliminating unnecessary workload around marking; Eliminating unnecessary workload around data management; and Eliminating Unnecessary workload around planning and teaching resources*. Available at: (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/reducing-teachers-workload/reducing-teachers-workload>), (accessed 18 December 2019).

26 Teacher Workload Advisory Group (November 2018). *Making data work*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/teacher-workload-advisory-group-report-and-government-response>. (Accessed 18 December 2019)

Interventions that can be effective and avoid workload burdens

i. Behaviour interventions²⁷

Behaviour interventions seek to improve attainment by tackling challenging behaviour. They may focus on addressing a range of behaviours including low-level disruption, antisocial activities, aggression, violence, bullying and substance abuse.

The *Teaching and Learning Toolkit* identifies a range of behaviour-related interventions that seek to have a beneficial impact on learning outcomes. The *Toolkit* finds that the provision of specialist, targeted support for pupils with problematic behaviour is associated with the largest educational gains. Evidence indicates that programmes of between two and six months tend to have the most sustained results in terms of pupil progress and achievement.

The *Toolkit* finds that there is wide variation in effectiveness of programmes and suggests that schools look for programmes with a proven track record of impact. It also highlights the need for schools to consider the training and professional development needs of staff.

The *Toolkit* notes that there is limited research about the impact of universal interventions on educational outcomes and that further research is needed to examine the links between general classroom behaviour and learning outcomes.

ii. Collaborative learning²⁸

Collaborative learning involves pupils working together on activities or learning tasks. Some approaches are co-operative, while others are competitive. The *Toolkit* finds that collaborative learning approaches have a positive impact on learning but that the size of the impact varies. Effective collaborative learning requires more than just sitting pupils together, and the *Toolkit* stresses the importance of getting the detail of the intervention right.

The *Toolkit* finds that pupils need support and practice to work together and that structured classroom-based approaches that encourage this are most effective. Competition between groups can support pupils to work together, but this needs to be carefully managed as it could encourage pupils to focus on winning rather than the learning that it aims to support.

²⁷ EEF. (2018). *Behaviour interventions*. Available at: (<https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/teaching-learning-toolkit/behaviour-interventions/>), (accessed 18 December 2019).

²⁸ EEF. (2018). *Collaborative learning*. Available at: (<https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/teaching-learning-toolkit/collaborative-learning/>), (accessed: 18 December 2019).

Collaborative learning is found to increase the effectiveness of other interventions, including mastery learning and digital technology.

iii. Feedback

Feedback involves giving pupils information about their performance in order to redirect or refocus their actions to achieve a goal by aligning effort and activity with an outcome. Feedback can be verbal or written, or it can be given through tests or via digital technology.²⁹

Studies tend to show that feedback has very high effects on learning. However, some studies find that feedback can have negative effects. The *EEF Toolkit* states that this highlights the importance of understanding the potential benefits and possible limitations of feedback as a teaching and learning approach.³⁰

The *Toolkit* stresses that providing effective feedback is challenging and that effective feedback tends to be specific, accurate and clear.³¹ It tends to compare what a learner is doing now with what they have done wrong before, encourage and support further effort, be given sparingly, and provide specific guidance on how to improve.³² The *Toolkit* also states that feedback can come from peers as well as from adults.³³

Schools will need to take specific account of the concerns raised about marking when considering feedback as an intervention (see below).

iv. Peer tutoring³⁴

Peer tutoring interventions involve pupils working in pairs or small groups to provide each other with explicit teaching support. The interventions include older pupils working with younger tutees, and pupils of similar ages swapping between the tutor and tutee roles.

Evidence suggests that peer tutoring systems can be very effective at supporting the progress and achievement of pupils, particularly lower attaining pupils and those with special educational needs (SEN).

Peer tutoring appears to be more effective when the approach supplements and consolidates normal teaching, rather than replacing it.

²⁹ EEF (2018). *Feedback*. Available at: <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/teaching-learning-toolkit/feedback/> (accessed 3 January 2020).

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ EEF (2018). *Peer tutoring*. Available at: <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/teaching-learning-toolkit/peer-tutoring/>. (Accessed: 18 December 2019)

The *Toolkit* reports that some peer tutoring programmes have not been particularly effective. This indicates that it is important to monitor the implementation and impact of the intervention.

v. Social and emotional learning³⁵

Interventions which target social and emotional learning (SEL) seek to improve pupils' self-management of emotions and their interaction with others.

The EEF *Toolkit* suggests that SEL has an 'identifiable and valuable' impact on attitudes to learning and social relationships in school. Programmes appear to be particularly beneficial for disadvantaged and low attaining pupils. On average, SEL programmes have an impact of four months' progress on attainment. However, the *Toolkit* finds that interventions vary in their effectiveness in raising attainment. The most effective approaches are embedded into routine educational practices, where teachers are committed to the approach, and where staff have access to professional training and development.³⁶

EEF and Early Intervention Foundation (EIF) guidance on improving social and emotional learning in primary schools³⁷ is based on international evidence about SEL and feedback from teachers and experts. The guidance makes six recommendations to help primary schools implement SEL effectively:

- 1) teach SEL skills explicitly;
- 2) integrate and model skills through everyday teaching;
- 3) plan carefully for adopting a SEL programme;
- 4) use a SAFE (sequential, active, focused and explicit) curriculum;
- 5) reinforce SEL skills through a whole-school ethos and activities; and
- 6) plan, support and monitor SEL implementation.

These recommendations may also be helpful to secondary schools, and the *Teaching and Learning Toolkit* highlights the importance of evaluating the intervention to ensure that its impact is effective.³⁸

vi. Metacognition and self-regulation

Self-regulation approaches can be broken down into three essential components: cognition (the mental processes involved in knowing, understanding and learning); metacognition (learning to learn); and motivation.³⁹

³⁵ EEF. (2018). *Social and emotional learning*. Available at: <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/teaching-learning-toolkit/social-and-emotional-learning/>. (Accessed 18 December 2019).

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ EEF and EIF (2019). *Improving Social and Emotional Learning in Primary Schools: Guidance Report*. Available at: <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/tools/guidance-reports/social-and-emotional-learning> (accessed: 28 December 2019)

³⁸ EEF. (2018). *Social and emotional learning*, op. cit.

³⁹ EEF. (2018). *Metacognition and self-regulation*. Available at: (<https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/teaching-learning-toolkit/meta-cognition-and-self-regulation/>), (accessed: 18 December 2019).

Metacognition and self-regulation approaches are intended to help pupils to think more explicitly about their own learning.⁴⁰ Interventions often involve teaching pupils strategies for planning, monitoring and evaluating their own learning.

The *Toolkit* finds that metacognition and self-regulation approaches have consistently high levels of impact. The evidence indicates that the strategies are most effective for low achieving and older pupils.⁴¹ The approaches are more likely to be effective when taught in collaborative groups so that pupils support each other and make their thinking explicit through discussion. While the *Toolkit* finds that pupils make an average of seven additional months of progress under these approaches, impact varies. For instance, some small programmes that have been evaluated by the EEF demonstrated just two months' additional progress.

Interventions that are ineffective or may create excessive workload

Evaluation of research evidence indicates that some interventions have little or limited impact in improving education outcomes.⁴² The effectiveness of an intervention will also depend on how the intervention is implemented.⁴³

Evidence indicates that the following interventions have limited impact on education outcomes or that they are burdensome and create excessive workload. Schools should take steps to avoid placing workload burdens on teachers and school leaders. These should include undertaking workload impact assessments of proposed interventions and actively engaging staff in decisions about proposed interventions. Schools should consider whether other interventions will be more effective in achieving the desired educational outcomes.

i. Extending teaching time

Extending teaching time can take a variety of forms. It includes lengthening the school day (e.g. by adding a 'period six' to the end of the standard school timetable), reducing holidays and reducing lunch periods. Interventions can either be targeted at all pupils within a class, cohort or school, or focused on particular groups of pupils, such as those felt to require additional support to meet expected standards.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² EEF (2018). *Teaching and Learning Toolkit*.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ EEF. (2018). *Extending school time*. Available at: (<https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/pdf/generate/?u=https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/pdf/toolkit/?id=153&t=Teaching and Learning Toolkit&e=153&s=>), (accessed: 3 January 2020).

While the evidence indicates that, on average, pupils make two months' additional progress from extending school time and that disadvantaged pupils benefit more from such programmes, such interventions usually form part of a range of activities.⁴⁵ This makes it difficult to attribute impact to the specific intervention. Further, there is very limited evidence from the UK about the impact of extending school time.⁴⁶

Extending teaching time can have profound consequences for the workload of teachers. There is a significant risk that the intervention will create workload burdens that are excessive and unsustainable. Feedback from teachers also indicates that attempts to extend school time often fail to take account of the legitimate expectations and views of teachers and school leaders.

It is vital that schools undertake a workload impact assessment of the proposed intervention. It is also essential that the decision about the use of the intervention is made with the full engagement and agreement of staff. Finally, it is essential that staff are compensated appropriately for the intervention-related tasks that they undertake. This may include reducing their existing tasks and financial recompense for additional responsibilities.

The majority of interventions included in the *Toolkit* are rated as more effective than extending the school day.⁴⁷ Therefore, schools should consider using existing school time more effectively before considering whether to extend the school day.

ii. Holiday schools

Holiday schools involve the provision of lessons outside of normal term times. They are often designed as 'catch up' sessions for pupils,⁴⁸ and so may be considered 'extending teaching time' intervention. However, holiday schools may also be used for other purposes such as preparing high attaining pupils for university or supporting pupils at the transition from primary to secondary school. Transition programmes may be open to all pupils or targeted at particular pupils, e.g. those with special or additional support needs.

There is a significant risk that the intervention will create excessive and unsustainable workload burdens for teachers and other school staff. It is vital that schools take account of the legitimate expectations and views of

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ EEF (2018). *Summer schools*. Available at: <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/teaching-learning-toolkit/summer-schools/>, (accessed: 3 January 2020).

teachers and school leaders. Staff should be actively engaged in decisions about whether and how the intervention should be implemented. Staff must also be compensated appropriately for the intervention-related tasks that they undertake.

The EEF *Toolkit* finds that summer schools that are intensive, well-resourced and involve small group tuition by trained and experienced teachers have the greatest impact on academic outcomes.⁴⁹ However, the *Toolkit* finds that it makes little difference whether the teacher is one of the student's usual teachers.⁵⁰

The NASUWT is aware of cases where teachers have been instructed or put under pressure to participate in holiday schools. This is entirely unacceptable and is in direct contravention of the provisions of the NASUWT's action short of strike action instructions.

iii. 'Deep' or 'triple' marking

The report of the Independent Teacher Review Group on marking defined the frequent use of 'deep', 'triple', 'dialogic' or 'quality' marking as:

'a process whereby teachers provide written feedback to pupils offering guidance with a view to improving or enhancing the future performance of pupils. Pupils are then expected to respond in writing to the guidance which in turn is verified by the teacher.'

The Group found this form of marking to be 'excessive' and 'burdensome',⁵¹ and stated that the growth in deep marking was:

'[based on] an assumption that marking provides a more thorough means of giving feedback and demonstrates a stronger professional ethic, as well as improving pupil outcomes. Deep marking often acts as a proxy for "good" teaching as it is something concrete and tangible which lends itself as "evidence". In some cases, the perception exists that the amount of marking a teacher does equals their level of professionalism and effectiveness. These are false assumptions.'

The Group found that there is little robust evidence to support the extensive use of deep marking and stressed the need for teachers to be given the scope to make effective use of their professional judgement in determining the most appropriate means of ensuring that pupils benefit from effective feedback. The Group noted that teachers forced to mark

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Independent Teacher Workload Review Group. (2016). op.cit.

work late at night and at weekends were unlikely to operate efficiently in the classroom.⁵²

The EEF has reviewed evidence on written marking and finds that the quality of evidence is low.⁵³ The EEF reports that this is ‘surprising and concerning bearing in mind the importance of feedback to pupils’ progress and the time in a teacher’s day taken up by marking’.⁵⁴

There is no meaningful evidence about the effectiveness of deep marking as a strategy to raise standards of attainment.

iv. Detailed short and medium-term planning

The Westminster Government’s Workload Challenge identified excessive planning as a significant driver of excessive workload. The Independent Teacher Review Group undertook a detailed evaluation of planning practices, including those that lead to unacceptably burdensome practices in schools.⁵⁵

The Group acknowledged that planning is an essential element of teachers’ professional practice and is central to ensuring that pupils can access high-quality learning experiences. However, the Group recognised that the use of detailed, individual lesson plans had become more widespread as an intervention designed to support pupil progress and achievement.⁵⁶

The Group expressed concern at the use of lesson plans as a proxy for effective teaching, where the teachers’ written plans themselves become the required end product, to be scrutinised and assessed by others:

‘too often, “planning” refers to the production of daily written lesson plans which function as proxy evidence for an accountability “paper trail” rather than the process of effective planning for pupil progress and attainment.’

The Group noted that:

‘the fundamental purpose of planning is to support effective teaching in the classroom, not to satisfy external audiences. Plans cannot show what actually happened in the classroom, nor the outcomes or progress made.’⁵⁷

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Elliott, V.; Baird, J.; Hopfenbeck, T.N.; Ingram, J.; Thompson, I.; Usher, N.; Zantout, M.; Richardson, J. & Coleman, R. (2016). *A marked improvement? A review of the evidence on written marking*. Available at: https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/public/files/Publications/EEF_Marking_Review_April_2016.pdf, (accessed 3 January 2020).

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Independent Teacher Workload Review Group. (2016). *op.cit.*

⁵⁶ Independent Teacher Workload Review Group. (2016). *Eliminating Unnecessary workload around planning and teaching resources*. Paragraph 3. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/reducing-teachers-workload/reducing-teachers-workload>, (accessed 3 January 2020).

⁵⁷ Independent Teacher Workload Review Group. (2016). *Eliminating Unnecessary workload around planning and teaching resources*. Paragraph 14. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/reducing-teachers-workload/reducing-teachers-workload>, (accessed 3 January 2020).

The Group stated that:

*'detailed daily or weekly plans should not be a routine expectation.'*⁵⁸

Therefore, interventions to support learning that are based on the monitoring and scrutiny of extensive and detailed daily or weekly lesson plans cannot be supported.

v. Homework

The EEF *Toolkit* reports that homework, when used appropriately, can have a positive impact on pupil progress and achievement, particularly for secondary pupils.⁵⁹ However, the *Toolkit* recognises that the setting of homework has implications for staff time for preparation and marking.⁶⁰

Evidence indicates that the routine setting of homework is likely to have limited positive educational impacts, as well as being burdensome.⁶¹ In secondary schools, the evidence suggests that homework can make a significant contribution to pupils' progress and attainment if it is used as a short and focused intervention.⁶² In the case of secondary schools, the evidence also indicates that homework is most effective if it is an integral part of learning rather than an 'add on'.⁶³

Further information

- Education Endowment Foundation (2018). *Teaching and Learning Toolkit: an accessible summary of the international evidence on teaching 5-16 year olds*. Available at: <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/teaching-learning-toolkit/>
- Education Endowment Foundation (December 2019). *Putting Evidence to Work: A school's guide to implementation*. Available at: <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/tools/guidance-reports/a-schools-guide-to-implementation/>
- Department for Education. *Reducing school workload* resources. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/reducing-school-workload>.
- NASUWT. *Advice on workload* available at: <https://www.nasuwf.org.uk/advice/conditions-of-service/workload.html>.
- NASUWT. *Advice on health, safety and wellbeing* available at: <https://www.nasuwf.org.uk/advice/health-safety.html>.

⁵⁸ Independent Teacher Workload Review Group. (2016). *Eliminating Unnecessary workload around planning and teaching resources*. Paragraph 12. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/reducing-teachers-workload/reducing-teachers-workload>, (accessed 3 January 2020).

⁵⁹ EEF. (2018). *Homework (Primary); Homework (Secondary)*. Available at: <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/teaching-learning-toolkit/homework-primary/> and <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence-summaries/teaching-learning-toolkit/homework-secondary/>, (Accessed: 3 January 2020).

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ *Ibid.*

NASUWT

The Teachers' Union

Tel: 03330 145550

Website: www.nasuwt.org.uk

