Workload is improving, but there is more to do...

The Department for Education's latest Teacher Workload Survey results show that teacher workload is improving, but there is still a way to go. Jack Worth and Matt Walker investigate the latest research findings

Teacher workload remains one of the major issues facing the profession. The work/life balance of school staff affects the satisfaction and wellbeing of practitioners and their likelihood of staying in the profession long-term.

At a time when more teachers are needed to serve growing numbers of pupils and not enough new teachers are being trained, retention is of great importance to the quality of education.

As workload is a key factor affecting teacher retention, reducing teacher workload has become a key policy priority for the Department for Education (DfE).

The workload associated with marking, tracking and monitoring pupil progress coupled with accountability measures can seriously impact on stress and job satisfaction. Long working hours and constant changes to working practices, as outlined in our previous *Engaging teachers* report (Lynch et al, 2016), which presented an analysis of teacher retention, have led to challenges in recruiting and retaining teachers.

In October, the DfE published the findings from the latest Teacher Workload Survey (DfE, 2019), which was conducted by the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) in March this year. It is the most recent evidence on teacher workload and acts as a national barometer for the working conditions of teachers, middle leaders and senior leaders.

A key finding from the report is that teachers, middle leaders and senior leaders all report working fewer total hours per week, as compared to the 2016 survey.

Teachers' working hours

So, what does this latest study show about teachers' working hours? The survey found that, on average, primary teachers and middle leaders report working 50 hours per week in 2019, which was a decrease of 5.5 hours since 2016.

During weekends, evenings and other out-of-school hours, that figure was 12.5 hours, down by five hours since 2016. The proportion of time spent working out-of-school hours was down by seven percentage points in three years to 25 per cent.

However, the study found that teachers working in primary academies work almost two hours longer a week than their colleagues in maintained primary schools.

The survey, based on full-time and part-time workers combined, also found that senior leaders report working fewer hours per week than in the previous survey. Total recorded working hours in the reference week for primary senior leaders in the 2019 survey was 54.4 hours per week, down 5.4 hours from the 59.8 hours reported in 2016.

Image: Adobe Stock

Why have teachers' working hours dropped?

The Teacher Workload Survey adds to our understanding of teacher workload because it goes beyond estimating the total number of hours that teachers work. It also looks at how teachers spend their time on different activities, how they feel about the amount of time they spend on these various activities, and how they perceive their workload and their ability to manage it effectively.

The main factor driving the reduced total working hours in 2019 was that primary teachers and middle leaders report spending less time on non-teaching activities, such as planning and preparation, marking, administration and, to a lesser extent, data management, than in previous years.

Compared to 2016, primary teachers and middle leaders report spending 1.3 hours less a week on "individual planning/preparation of lessons", 2.2 hours less on "marking/correcting of pupils' work", and 1.8 fewer hours "undertaking pupil supervision". Smaller reductions were also reported in the "recording, inputting, monitoring and analysis of pupil data" – down 0.5 hours in the primary phase.

It is significant that these reductions are concentrated in the areas of focus for DfE's independent workload review groups on marking, planning and resources, and data management (DfE, 2016) as well as the Workload Advisory Group's recent report on data management (DfE, 2018). The findings therefore suggest that the work of the review groups may have contributed to progress in reducing teacher workload.

However, despite reporting spending less time on non-teaching activities, large proportions of teachers and middle leaders still reported that they feel they spend too much time on these activities. More than half of primary teachers and middle leaders report spending too much time on planning and preparing lessons, administration, marking and data management.

"More than half of primary teachers and middle leaders report spending too much time on planning and preparing lessons, administration, marking and data management"

However, the proportions that reported spending too much time on these activities were lower than in the 2016 survey, suggesting that time spent on these activities is moving in a positive direction.

Primary senior leaders' workload

Depending on how it is achieved, reduced teacher workload could impact negatively on senior leaders' workload. However, as mentioned earlier, the survey found that primary senior leaders have also seen their working hours fall in the 2019 survey, compared to 2016.

Primary senior leaders report spending the most time on "teaching and related tasks" (16 hours a week) and "leadership and management within the school" (11.5 hours). Compared to 2016, primary senior leaders report working fewer hours on "leadership and management within the school" (6.4 fewer hours) and "administration within the school" (2.1 fewer hours).

However, senior leaders report working more hours on "performance management of staff" (1.5 more hours) and "recruitment" (0.6 more hours).

Perceptions of workload

Teachers' perceptions of workload involve more than just working hours. The findings show that teachers who report working longer hours are generally more likely to report that workload is a problem in their school. However, they also show that primary teachers and middle leaders – who generally report working longer hours than their secondary counterparts – are less likely to perceive teacher workload to be a "very serious problem" in their school.

How teachers view the severity of their workload is more complex than just their working hours: manageability of workload is a defining factor in their perceptions. Studies by the NFER (Worth et al, 2018) and Education Datalab (Sims, 2017) show that when it comes to determining teachers' job satisfaction and likelihood of remaining in the profession, the issue of unmanageable workload is more important than the hours worked.

Greater efforts are needed to reduce workload

Around seven out of 10 primary respondents – compared with nine out of 10 secondary practitioners – report that workload was a "fairly" or "very" serious problem in their school.

Teachers', middle leaders' and senior leaders' perceptions of their workload have improved relative to 2016, but nearly three-quarters still report not achieving a good work/life balance and 79 per cent report not having an acceptable workload.

The Teacher Workload Survey 2019 findings therefore give some grounds for cautious optimism about the direction that teacher workload is going. But they also highlight that there is more work to do to reduce working hours and to improve teachers' day-to-day experiences in the workplace.

The survey is just one of a range of data sources that measure working hours in England. The findings highlight the need to continue monitoring trends in teachers' working hours. The DfE is committed to collecting robust evidence on teacher workload every two years, and the next survey in 2021 will be an important part of this continued monitoring. the NFER also intends to provide further monitoring and insights through our analysis of Labour Force Survey data in our Teacher Labour Market annual report, the next instalment of which we will publish early next year.

• *Jack Worth is school workforce lead and Matt Walker is a research manager at the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER). Follow @TheNFER*

Further information & research

- *Engaging teachers: NFER analysis of teacher retention*, Lynch, Worth, Wespieser & Bamford, NFER, September 2016: www.nfer.ac.uk/engaging-teachers-nfer-analysis-of-teacher-retention
- *Teacher workload survey 2019*, DfE, October 2019: www.gov.uk/government/publications/teacher-workload-survey-2019
- *Making data work*, DfE Workload Advisory Group, November 2018: http://bit.ly/2QGbZCd
- The original DfE Workload Challenge working group reports (March 2016) can be found at:
  – Marking: http://bit.ly/20SOfJk
  – Planning and resources: http://bit.ly/1r2C1S7
  – Data management: http://bit.ly/1TXdDeU
- *Teacher workforce dynamics in England*, Worth, Lynch, Hillary, Rennie & Andrade, NFER, October 2018: www.nfer.ac.uk/teacher-workforce-dynamics-in-england
- *TALIS 2013: Working conditions, teacher job satisfaction and retention (statistical working paper)*, Sims/Education Datalab, DfE, November 2017: http://bit.ly/2pkywMq
- *Teacher labour market in England: Annual report 2019*, Worth & Van den Brande, NFER, February 2019: www.nfer.ac.uk/teacher-labour-market-in-england-annual-report-2019

Retaining our new and experienced teachers

With more teachers leaving the profession than joining, improving retention rates is crucial to tackling the on-going supply challenges. The government has recently announced new plans to boost teacher retention, particularly with additional support for new teachers. Dorothy Lepkowska reports

In January, the Department for Education (DfE) published its long-awaited *Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategy*.

A central focus of the new government strategy is teacher retention. Among the report's four key strategic priorities, it listed the need for high quality support for early career teachers – a move welcomed by school leaders and the wider education community as a step in the right direction.

It promises to transform support for early career teachers – teachers in the first two or three years in the job – with the "most significant reforms to teaching since it became a graduate-only profession". This is to be backed by "substantial investment" including the launch of an Early Career Framework (ECF), with an entitlement to two years of structured support for early career teachers linked to research evidence and funded time off timetable in the second year of teaching to access additional support.

There will also be new incentives for early career teachers in the form of phased bursaries in shortage subjects, with staged retention payments to encourage more teachers to remain in the profession.

Two of the other three key points also relate to early career teachers. Ministers are proposing "clear pathways" for career development for those who seek promotion to leadership and teachers who want to remain in the classroom, and reforms to the accountability system to try and tackle excessive workload.

In recent years, the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) has helped inform the discussion around teacher retention and the development of the government's strategy by exploring the factors and challenges that result in thousands of teachers quitting every year.

The NFER's report, *Teacher Workforce Dynamics in England*, published last year, found that rates of teachers leaving the state sector have increased since 2010, particularly among early career teachers. Its research showed that it is getting harder to retain early career teachers in the profession, especially in key subjects such as maths, science and modern foreign languages.

Image: Adobe Stock

Why are our teachers leaving the profession?

When teachers leave the profession, it affects our schools and students so it is important to understand the factors influencing teacher retention. The report highlighted that a lack of job satisfaction was a key reason for teachers leaving the profession, and that this was influenced by how supported and valued they felt by colleagues and senior leaders, whether workload expectations were manageable, and how supportive the culture was of tackling and alleviating those challenges in their school.

Long working hours and a lack of work/life balance, frequent policy changes and the impact of accountability, such as Ofsted inspections, also had negative effects on teacher health and wellbeing. It found that many teachers left the profession and took on lower-paid jobs because the demands were less, and they offered a better work/life balance and increased job satisfaction.

The report suggested that more and better flexible and part-time working opportunities may help to support some teachers to stay in teaching for longer.

At the same time, salary increases needed to be structured and targeted at those groups within the profession likely to be most responsive – such as early career teachers and those teaching shortage subjects.

What support new teachers need to stay

The research emphasises that engagement underpins retention, especially for new teachers. The NFER's *Early Career Continuing Professional Development Exploratory Research*, published in November, and commissioned by the DfE, examined how CPD can support, develop and retain teachers in the early stages of their careers.

Researchers found that in the first year of teaching, NQTs needed support in developing knowledge and skills in behaviour management, pupil assessment, pedagogy and supporting children with learning needs.

The reality of work in schools can lead to "practice shock" for early career teachers, so support from colleagues to help them settle into their new roles and to adjust to the school environment is critical.

Teachers who felt supported and had a positive experience of induction included those who had had a balanced package of support (which personalised opportunity), who had worked in supportive whole-school cultures and who could access guidance from a range of colleagues, including senior leaders and mentors.

In the second and third year, however, teachers needed training and development to support progression in their subject or key stage, or into middle leadership or other specialist roles.

Researchers found that as teachers progressed in their careers, they needed to broaden their skill-set, to reflect the fact they were encountering new challenges, such as teaching pupils in examination years and with different support needs.

However, dedicated CPD for them was found to be limited, even though many continued to receive support from a senior colleague and to access CPD available to all staff. There is currently no statutory requirement for schools to provide training and support for recently qualified teachers (RQTs), and in most schools involved in this study, there was no formal mentoring support (though informally this was still available from senior colleagues).

The study also found that many RQTs were keen to take on progression opportunities, and that these were essential to ensuring they maintained levels of job satisfaction. However, such opportunities often did not exist, or there was a lack of recognition of the RQT as being able to fulfil the role.

The proposed Early Career Framework

It is evident that improving the retention of new teachers is an important issue for current and future teacher supply. The government has set out the first steps to improve the offer of support new teachers receive through the ECF.

Published in January alongside the *Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategy*, the ECF has been designed to support early career teachers in the key areas of behaviour management, pedagogy, curriculum, assessment and professional behaviours – as highlighted in NFER's findings for the DfE.

However, it is also crucial that we retain our experienced teachers so new teachers can gain experience and support from more experienced teachers, which is important to their professional development.

Carole Willis, NFER's chief executive, agreed that while more teachers did need to be recruited, retaining those already in post was just as important.

"Our current teachers have already been recruited, trained, and have gained valuable experience in the classroom. If more of them stay that will reduce the number of new recruits that need to be found and trained; it will ensure that experienced teachers can continue to contribute their expertise, and it will secure the pipeline of future leaders."

• *Dorothy Lepkowska is a freelance education journalist.*

"The reality of work in schools can lead to 'practice shock' for early career teachers, so support from colleagues to help them settle into their new roles and to adjust to the school environment is critical"

Further information

- *Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategy*, Department for Education, January 2019: http://bit.ly/2Tphgiw
- *Supporting Early Career Teachers*, Department for Education, January 2019: http://bit.ly/2UpPaUL
- *Teacher Workforce Dynamics in England*, NFER, October 2018: www.nfer.ac.uk/teacher-workforce-dynamics-in-england/
- *Early Career Continuing Professional Development – Exploratory Research*, NFER, November 2018: www.nfer.ac.uk/early-career-continuing-professional-development-cpd-exploratory-research

Research Insights

- This article was published as part of *Headteacher Update*'s NFER Research Insights series. A free pdf of the latest Research Insights best practice and advisory articles can be downloaded from www.headteacher-update.com/knowledge-bank/nfer-research-insights-2019/200714/

Image: Adobe Stock

School accountability in England: A critique

No school accountability system is perfect, but will mooted changes to inspection in England tackle some of the unintended consequences that school leaders face? Hilary Grayson draws some lessons from international practice

The school accountability regime in England has met with a lot of scrutiny in the past year. The National Association of Head Teachers (NAHT) led an expert commission in considering the case for a reformed school accountability system, and coinciding with publication of the commission's report in September 2018, there was a lot of media coverage on the issue.

The Department for Education (DfE) has recently published a brief paper entitled *Principles for a clear and simple school accountability system* (May 2018), which is to be followed by more detailed proposals and a future full consultation.

And Ofsted's chief inspector, Amanda Spielman, in her Annual Report for 2017/18, noted that: "Where (an) accountability measure becomes the sole driver of a school, college or nursery's work, their real purpose – to help young people learn and grow – is lost."

NFER's chief executive, Carole Willis, was invited to participate on the NAHT commission, whose subsequent report *Improving school accountability* launched with the key message: "We want to create an education system that rivals the best in the world. However, too many of the incentives and sanctions are working against this ambition."

Alongside the commission's deliberations, a team of researchers at NFER produced a rapid literature review – *What impact does accountability have on curriculum, standards and engagement in education?* – on the impact of accountability on curriculum, standards and engagement in several international jurisdictions (September 2018).

We selected a mixture of countries that we thought would provide learning for England – some were top achievers in the highly visible international comparative studies, others had similar achievement to England but perhaps a different way of "doing" accountability.

We defined accountability broadly as a government's mechanism for holding educational institutions to account for the delivery of high-quality education. We reviewed a small body of the best available evidence on the accountability systems in Australia (New South Wales), England, Japan, New Zealand, Singapore and Wales, focusing for reasons of manageability on evidence relating to primary education.

It was clear even from the limited evidence studied that no country has all the answers. There is no perfect accountability system and all methods have their pros and cons. However, two themes emerged strongly from the literature in terms of reported accountability impacts: the phenomenon of curriculum narrowing, and the professional capacity of teachers to engage with accountability data.

Curriculum narrowing and 'teaching to the test'

Curriculum narrowing as a consequence of "teaching to the test" was addressed in literature from a number of the jurisdictions we studied. Where pupil performance is used as a high-stakes accountability measure, there is concern that schools feel constrained to prioritise those parts of the curriculum that are tested at the expense of others that are not.

"We could see the more 'horizontal' structures, such as school-to-school networks, complementing the 'vertical' accountability system of assessment and Ofsted inspection"

Ofsted's latest Annual Report, referred to earlier, acknowledges such perceptions and promises to put the curriculum – "the substance of education" – back at the heart of the inspection system in the new inspection framework from September 2019.

We also found suggestions that some pupils may receive an impoverished experience of the school curriculum as a result of targeted teaching where accountability systems focus on "borderline" or "cliff edge" measures. This may occur, for example, if there is (actual or perceived) pressure to ensure that a certain percentage of pupils attains a threshold standard, leading teaching efforts to be concentrated on raising the performance of "borderline" pupils.

Pupils may furthermore become less engaged learners when the performance of some groups is emphasised at the expense of others. In this case, the application of accountability measures could be said to increase the achievement gap; although conversely they could be used to reduce the gap, such as when they inform funding programmes for disadvantaged pupils.

Our discussion explored whether there is a way of breaking the reported link between schools feeling compelled to focus on curriculum areas that are most salient for accountability purposes at the expense of other areas that do not have accountability consequences. We noted that clarity over what is expected through the inspection regime is a key driver of school behaviour, and whether schools focus on those subjects which are assessed or take a wider view of the curriculum.

Training teachers to engage with data

Another recurring theme in the literature was the complexity of accountability and the suggestion that the training teachers receive may not align with the requirements that their jurisdictions' accountability systems place on them.

Several studies suggested that teachers' initial training might not adequately prepare them to be fully assessment literate and data literate – to have a comprehensive understanding of how to implement assessment or of how to interpret assessment or other outcome data. This echoes the findings of two recent explorations of aspects of the education system in England – the Carter Review of Initial Teacher Training (DfE, January 2015) and the Commission on Assessment without Levels (DfE, September 2015).

This could be seen as a positive impact of accountability, in that it has exposed an area of weakness in professional development that should be addressed anyway, irrespective of the accountability system in place. In other words, support for teachers to understand how to use assessment data to support their teaching and learning should be part and parcel of any professional set of teaching skills.

Future directions

Recent reforms in England have aimed to address some of the unintended consequences this review has discussed, with the removal of assessment levels and refocusing of the accountability system onto progress measures rather than absolute standards.

Ofsted is about to launch a consultation on its draft new inspection framework (expected this month). It will be interesting to see how far these approaches reduce unintended consequences in the system in the future, and likewise what sort of "clear and simple" system results from the forthcoming DfE consultation.

Andreas Schleicher, the lead PISA expert at the OECD, suggests that effective approaches to accountability may involve a move in emphasis towards "professional accountability" systems and collaborative, less hierarchical approaches where "teachers are accountable not so much to administrative authorities but primarily to their fellow teachers and school principals".

Translating this to England, we could see the more "horizontal" structures, such as school-to-school networks, complementing the "vertical" accountability system of assessment and Ofsted inspection. Interestingly, our research found examples of such peer-to-peer support in all the systems we explored.

• *Hilary Grayson is an information and reviews manager at the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER).*

Further information

- Keep up-to-date with the latest NFER research and resources relevant to school leaders and practitioners by signing up to its monthly e-newsletter, NFER Direct for Schools: www.nfer.ac.uk
- *Improving school accountability*, Accountability Commission, NAHT, September 2018: http://bit.ly/2yapeng
- *What impact does accountability have on curriculum, standards and engagement in education?* NFER, September 2018: http://bit.ly/2LcdupK
- For fuller details on Ofsted's proposals and Amanda Spielman's recent comments on the new inspection framework, see *Schools prepare for January consultation over Ofsted plans* (*Headteacher Update*, October 2018): http://bit.ly/2R6vJ1F
- *Principles for a clear and simple school accountability system*, DfE, May 2018: http://bit.ly/2FQUWXN
- *Ofsted Annual Report 2017/18*, Ofsted, December 2018: www.gov.uk/government/collections/ofsted-annual-report-201718

Choosing to read – what the evidence tells us...

Literacy and numeracy are critical skills for pupils to develop if they are to reach their potential and achieve rewarding outcomes during and after education. Liz Twist highlights the evidence showing why reading – including reading out loud – must be at the heart of the curriculum in the primary years

Children who enjoy reading tend to read more frequently than those who don't – and they are better at it.

There's nothing unexpected in that statement and nothing to disagree with. We can always find exceptions but, yes, it's a virtuous circle. Reading is generally accepted to be "a good thing", and each time a child chooses to curl up with a book, they are practising and improving their reading skills.

The national curriculum in England is explicit: "All pupils must be encouraged to read widely across both fiction and non-fiction to develop their knowledge of themselves and the world in which they live, to establish an appreciation and love of reading, and to gain knowledge across the curriculum." (DfE, 2014)

Reading – what the evidence says

The American psychologist Keith Stanovich (1986) coined the term the Matthew Effect to describe the reciprocal relationship between the development of reading comprehension and the development of vocabulary knowledge.

The term is referring back to the Bible passage in which the rich-get-richer and the poor-get-poorer. Cunningham and Stanovich (2001) explored the differential amount of practice in reading children get and how this contributes to the reciprocal relationship between reading and not just vocabulary but also background knowledge, familiarity with syntax, and so on.

In a British context, data from the 1970 British Cohort Study shows how reading leads not only to improvements in vocabulary and hence better reading but has an even wider effect. Using the data from this longitudinal study, Sullivan and Brown (2013) found an impact of voluntary reading beyond that of developing better reading skills.

They found that frequency of reading for pleasure was linked to increases in the rate of cognitive progress over time. So while reading makes children better at reading, it has an even greater significance. It is linked to improvements in other skills that are important to success – in school and in life. And these skills aren't just those which we might intuitively associate with reading, such as vocabulary, but also others, such as mathematics. This has implications across the school, for all year groups and all abilities.

Reading for enjoyment

A well-known study by McKenna, Kear and Ellsworth (1995) looked at attitudes to reading among US elementary-aged pupils and found that there was a steady fall in interest from Grade 1 to Grade 6 among pupils of all abilities.

There were positive attitudes from most pupils in the youngest grade, with similar measures across high, medium and low ability groups. By Grade 6 not only were attitudes in each group much less positive, but the differences in attitudes had become more marked, with lower attaining pupils having much less positive attitudes than higher attaining pupils.

Image: Adobe Stock

"While reading makes children better at reading, it has an even greater significance. It is linked to improvements in other skills that are important to success. And these skills aren't just those which we might intuitively associate with reading, such as vocabulary, but also others, such as mathematics"

In addition, there was a wide gender difference, with boys much less engaged than girls – boys had a lower engagement level at the start and the gap had widened substantially by Grade 6.

Given that McKenna et al noted that enjoyment in reading was at its peak at the start of schooling and fell with increasing age (and presumably growing reading competence), it seems reasonable to recognise it as a whole-school issue.

More recent data from the OECD's 2016 Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) endorses the links between reading competence, reading engagement and frequency of reading (Mullis et al, 2017). Across almost all participating countries, higher reading performance within a country is associated with greater enjoyment of reading and reading more frequently. This isn't just an issue in England or even the UK.

What reading offers

In a rare moment of lively prose, the national curriculum points out that: "Reading ... feeds pupils' imagination and opens up a treasure-house of wonder and joy for curious young minds."

Sullivan et al (2013) emphasised the impact reading for pleasure had on children and young people's vocabulary scores – and the contrast between the complexity of vocabulary used in written texts compared to the spoken word is well-established.

Cunningham and Stanovich (2001) compared the relative complexity of spoken and written speech, describing the former as "lexically impoverished". They emphasised the vast range in the amount of words children who read out of school are exposed to, depending on the volume of their reading.

So what can school leaders do?

There are enormous pressures on schools to ensure pupils make progress and are happy, engaged and challenged learners. What can schools do that does not add to the pressures they are already under?

Ofsted's *Bold Beginnings* report (2017) put language and literacy at the heart of the curriculum for the Reception year. But it is not just needed at the heart of the curriculum for the youngest children in school. There are ways of putting reading at the heart of every classroom.

Reading aloud – not just while children are in the early stages of learning to read – fulfils the vital task of exposing children to books that they are, as yet, unable to read independently. Books they hear should be those that they would not otherwise come across or that they could not read themselves, that give them a flavour of the world of books that lies ahead of them.

This is clearly stated in the national curriculum and its statutory requirements for years 3 and 4, and years 5 and 6: "Pupils should be taught to ... participate in discussion about both books that are read to them and those they can read for themselves." (DfE, 2013)

Sometimes it can be tempting to choose the "easy win" books – few children dislike Roald Dahl's creations. But the most effective approach will be to read books that will expand children's horizons – stories that they aspire to read but can't yet or non-fiction books providing information that builds on what they already know rather than just reinforcing existing knowledge. To engage those 20 per cent of children in the PIRLS 2016 study who said that they didn't like reading and rarely read outside school, perhaps sharing a great story or a fascinating information book will show them what they're missing – particularly if they're not going to pick up a book voluntarily.

The importance of school leaders encouraging this passion for reading throughout the school shouldn't be overestimated. The evidence shows us how reading fully justifies its place at the heart of the curriculum. hu

• *Liz Twist is head of assessment research at the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER).*

References

- Cunningham & and Stanovich (2001). *What reading does for the mind. J of Direct Instruction*. Vol. 1, 2, 137-149.
- Department for Education (2013). English programmes of study: key stages 1 and 2 National curriculum in England.
- McKenna, Kear, & Ellsworth (1995). *Children's Attitudes toward Reading: A National Survey*. *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 30, 4, 934-956.
- Mullis, Martin, Foy, & Hooper (2017). PIRLS 2016 International Results in Reading. TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Lynch School of Education, Boston College.
- Ofsted (2017). *Bold Beginnings: The Reception curriculum in a sample of good and outstanding primary schools*.
- Stanovich (1986). *Matthew Effects in Reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy*. *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 21, 4, 360-407.
- Sullivan & Brown (2013). *Social inequalities in cognitive scores at age 16: The role of reading*. CLS Working Paper 2013/10.

Interpreting the outcomes of standardised tests

Many schools use standardised tests as part of their assessment practices. To help you get the most out of standardised tests, **Liz Twist** outlines some of the key terms and information

Thousands of primary schools choose to use standardised tests as part of their approach to assessment. For many, the benefit lies in the reliable outcomes, the results of the tests having been trialled with a large nationally representative sample during development. Standardised tests also enable pupil performance to be benchmarked against the national average and meaningfully compared with other pupils and standardised scores from other tests.

While most tests will provide a raw score (the actual mark or score obtained by a pupil), these do not enable meaningful comparisons between tests or between pupils. From standardised tests there are at least three further outcomes that can be obtained: standardised scores, age-standardised scores, and age-related expectations.

It is easy to confuse standardised scores with scaled scores, and to misinterpret the results without appreciating the role that confidence bands have to play. To help you get the most out of standardised tests, below is an outline of the key terms you need to know.

Department for Education scaled scores

At the end of key stage 1 or key stage 2, the scaled score of 100 on the national curriculum tests represents the "expected standard" as defined by the Department for Education (DfE). This is not the average and is not the same as, nor equivalent to, a standardised score of 100. For standardised tests, a score of 100 represents the average performance, based on a normal distribution, of the sample of pupils on which the tests were standardised.

Standardised scores

Standardised scores compare a pupil's performance to that of a nationally representative sample of pupils from the relevant year group, who will have all taken the same test at the same time of year.

The average score on most standardised tests is 100. Technically a score above 100 is above average and a score below 100 is below average. About two-thirds of pupils will have standardised scores between 85 and 115. Almost all pupils fall within the range 70 to 140, so scores outside this range can be regarded as exceptional.

If you wish to group pupils according to standardised (or age-standardised) scores, the following descriptions may be useful. These may vary between test providers, but this example from NFER tests gives you an idea of what the range of scores may mean:

Below 70	70-84	85-94	95-104	105-114	115-129	Above 129
well below average	below average	low average	average	high average	above average	well above average

Confidence bands

Confidence bands (sometimes called confidence intervals) are used to show the extent of the margin of error in the standardised scores. In other words, how accurately the test measures a pupil's attainment. The margin of error is simply a statistical estimate, based on the fact that tests can only sample the particular area of learning which they assess and therefore the score a pupil achieves may vary within a few points of their "true score". In NFER tests, to indicate how wide this margin of error is likely to be, a "90 per cent confidence band" has been calculated. This means that you can have 90 per cent certainty that the true score lies within the confidence band.

Image: Adobe Stock

Age-standardised scores

These follow the same principle as standardised scores in that they are comparing performances of pupils based on their raw (total) score. However, age-standardised scores take the pupil's age into account and compare their performance with that of pupils of the same age at the time of testing (in years and months). Again, this uses information derived from the large scale trial. In practice, age-standardised scores mean that, with two pupils who have the same raw score, it is likely that the younger pupil will have a higher age-standardised score.

Age-related expectations

The Standards and Testing Agency (STA) scaled score of 100 on the year 2 and year 6 national curriculum tests represents the "expected standard" for the end of the relevant key stage. It is inappropriate to apply this standard to tests in other year groups when pupils have not been taught all the relevant content.

Instead, in order to provide a curriculum-related outcome, some standardised test providers undertake a standard setting exercise. NFER uses "bookmarking", an internationally recognised procedure that combines statistical information from the large scale trial with the judgements of groups of teachers who scrutinise the new assessments.

As part of this exercise at NFER, teachers worked with the test developers to identify the knowledge, skills and understanding that can be expected by the end of a given year, in the 2014 national curriculum. This information was combined with statistical information from the large trial to arrive at a guide to the number of marks a pupil needs to achieve on a particular test in order to have achieved an appropriate standard on the curriculum, given that they are part way through the programme of study. A range of marks, rather than a definitive mark, is published.

Continuing with bookmarking, teachers also scrutinised the tests to look at high achievement and this was combined with the statistical information to arrive at a range of marks. This range, generally of three or four marks, gives an indication of a pupil's standard of achievement not in comparison to his or her peers (which is what standardised scores do) but in relation to the expectations of the national curriculum for that particular year group.

In NFER's view, it is important that teachers use their professional judgement when interpreting test outcomes and for this reason a range of marks is used to suggest where the age-related threshold lies.

An example of how to interpret results

Emma's date of birth is November 27, 2008, and she took the year 4 summer maths test on June 12, 2017, scoring 64.

Jay, whose date of birth is March 3, 2009, took the same test on the same day and scored 68.

Emma's standardised score is 109. With a confidence interval of –5 and +4, there is a 90 per cent likelihood of her "true" score being between 104 and 113 and her performance on the test could broadly be described as "high average".

Jay's raw score of 68 converts to a standardised score of 111 which is also "high average". The confidence band around Jay's score (also –5 and +4) indicates that his "true" score has a 90 per cent likelihood of being between 106 and 115.

Their age-standardised scores are 114 for Emma and 118 for Jay. This takes into account the difference in their ages.

A total score of 64 suggests that Emma is comfortably reaching age-related expectations as measured by the summer year 4 maths test. Jay's 68 suggests that his teacher should consider whether other evidence of his work supports a grading of "high achievement" as he is at the borderline between the age-related expectation and the high achievement band.

"Standardised tests should form just one part of a school's approach to assessment, with on-going formative assessment informing teaching throughout the year"

Conclusion

By utilising standardised tests and applying their own professional judgements when interpreting the results, teachers can build a profile of attainment and progress for their pupils and be confident in their conclusions and next steps. Standardised tests should form just one part of a school's approach to assessment, with on-going formative assessment informing teaching throughout the year. But when it comes to choosing summative assessments to assess learning at the end of a teaching period, high-quality standardised tests can ensure the data gained is reliable and meaningful. hu

• *Liz Twist is head of assessment research and product development at the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER).*

Further information

If you found this valuable and would like further guidance to help the teachers in your school to brush up on their understanding of assessment, there is a wealth of free support on the NFER website. You can also sign up to receive a series of free assessment guides direct to your inbox this autumn. Visit www.nfer.ac.uk/assessment-hub

Image: Adobe Stock

Making the most of assessment data

Collecting assessment data is easy – but with so much data available, collecting the right information and ensuring you are using it effectively to support pupils' learning can be more difficult. Emily Jones explains

With the end of the academic year fast approaching, schools across the country will have their summative assessment processes well underway.

However, while it is relatively easy to collect assessment data, interpreting it can be harder. Schools hold and generate a large amount of data. In order to make the most of it, teachers need to know what data they have, how to interpret it and, crucially, how best to use it to promote further learning.

What data are schools likely to have?

In terms of numerical or statistical attainment data, there are several types which schools commonly collect. These include individual raw scores, standardised scores or scaled scores from national or optional assessments, information drawn from question-level analysis of tests, and teacher assessment data expressed numerically. Schools are also likely to have background data on pupils, which can be used to analyse and compare attainment of particular groups, such as boys and girls or eligibility for Pupil Premium.

When used effectively, data is valuable in enabling schools to highlight gaps in attainment, identify patterns of achievement and make insightful comparisons. For example, by comparing pupils' standardised scores over time, schools are able to identify pupils making more, the same or less progress than the national average. These scores can also be used to compare pupil attainment and progress across different subjects.

Despite the opportunities that data offers schools in terms of improving teaching and learning, it is important to remember that data recording and tracking should not be burdensome and all data recorded should have a useful purpose.

As Sean Harford, the national director for education at Ofsted, warned in a recent blog post, an over-reliance on "meaningless data" is currently the biggest flaw in assessment across schools (April 2018).

He writes: "I think there is too much marking being expected compared with the resultant benefits to pupils' learning; too much reliance on meaningless data; and too little meaningful assessment of the right things at the right point in the curriculum."

Schools should therefore ensure that any assessment information collected can be used to support better pupil achievement.

With this in mind, schools may want to consider the following when collecting and recording assessment data:

- Rationalise the data you record to make sure it meets your needs.
- Ensure that you comply with legal requirements such as those in the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).
- Centralise responsibility for managing the school's database and entering data to make the process more efficient and to minimise the risk of errors or lost data.
- Seek out training and keep skills up-to-date. Allow teachers to invest time in working with the system to increase familiarity. This time will be repaid in what they can then achieve with it.
- If paper records are kept in classrooms, be aware of confidentiality issues.
- Be wary of tracking systems which reduce the curriculum to a series of points and which claim to help teachers to track termly and half-termly progress.

Using assessment data to improve teaching and learning

Data is useful on different levels: for monitoring individuals, developing learning targets, grouping pupils, allocating resources, evaluating teaching initiatives, and for whole-school accountability and reporting.

Data from early or mid-year assessments is particularly useful for identifying areas for development or further consolidation, since there is time following the assessments to respond to identified needs. A question-level analysis of the data at this stage can highlight areas of individual or class misunderstanding and so can help teachers to identify exactly what they need to clarify for their pupils.

Data from year-end assessments offers a valuable way to evaluate pupil progress over the duration of a learning period, measure success of interventions and teaching strategies implemented, and help schools plan for the following year.

"Effective use of data should stimulate questions about the standards achieved, the learning that is taking place and inform the next steps for teaching and learning"

It is worth bearing in mind that in summarising data numerically, some detail is inevitably lost. Therefore it is important to review your data and draw conclusions with care. Don't be afraid to ask critical questions. For example, if data for a particular pupil or class is not what you expected, think about contextual factors that may explain the differences.

Ultimately, assessment data should be used to deliver better learning outcomes for pupils. To do this effectively, schools may want to consider the following:

- Look not only at present attainment, but at pupils' rates of development as they move through the school and use this insight to shape classroom practice.
- Refer to assessment data regularly throughout the year, comparing achievement across subjects to guide evaluations of progress.
- Remind teachers that pupils' progress may not be linear: they appear not to progress at some times (e.g. while consolidating learning) and may progress more rapidly at others.
- Teachers can use question-level analysis (of national or published tests) to inform subject, class or year-group planning, but should draw conclusions carefully (e.g. avoid bold statements about attainment in a particular subject on the basis of just a few questions about part of that subject).
- Remember that, in a small school, class or year group, individual pupils can have a disproportionate impact on percentages.
- Aim for a culture of using data constructively for positive, supportive change.

As the academic year draws to a close, schools should remain mindful that data collection should not be viewed solely as a means of accountability. Effective use of data should stimulate questions about the standards achieved, the learning that is taking place and inform the next steps for teaching and learning.

• *Emily Jones has been developing tests for more than 15 years, mainly for primary-age pupils. She now leads the development of the National Foundation for Educational Research's (NFER) own suite of standardised curriculum tests.*

Further information

- For more information on NFER's work in assessment, visit www.nfer.ac.uk/key-topics-expertise/assessment/
- *Assessment – what are inspectors looking at?* Sean Harford, Ofsted April 2018: http://bit.ly/2IMrE2Q

Image: Adobe Stock

Tackling teacher retention and turnover challenges

A major on-going research project by the National Foundation for Educational Research is helping us to gain a deeper understanding of the dynamics within retention and recruitment for the teacher workforce in England. Dorothy Lepkowska looks at the latest findings

Teacher recruitment and retention remains one of the biggest issues facing policy-makers. But how to solve this is one of the great unanswered challenges in education.

Understanding how and why teachers are leaving is key in tackling retention. This is an important issue as pupil numbers are projected to increase by nearly 500,000 in the next five years. Fewer new trainees and teacher shortages in some key subjects further add to classroom pressures.

Recently published research from the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER), funded by the Nuffield Foundation, has looked at the factors associated with teacher retention and turnover.

The *Teacher Retention and Turnover Research: Interim Report* (2017) found that between 2010 and 2015 the number of working-age teachers who left the profession each year has risen steadily from nine to 11 per cent for primary teachers, while the number leaving their school to work in another has risen from five to seven per cent. This has left some schools struggling to fill vacancies.

Flexible working in schools

One in four teachers in primary schools is currently employed part-time, compared with one in six in secondary schools. The prevalence of primary part-time working is partly due to more women working in the sector. However researchers said that much of the gap between primary and secondary persisted even when gender and age were accounted for.

"This suggests that primary schools are better able, or more willing, to accommodate part-time teachers," the report said. It added that part-time workers in secondary schools were more likely to leave the profession than primary teachers working on a similar basis, which suggests that primary schools are better at making part-time employment work.

The report calls for greater flexibility for teachers' working patterns in a bid to address recruitment and retention problems. Soon after the report was published, Justine Greening, the former education secretary, announced a pilot programme to encourage flexible working in schools to help schools "keep their valued teachers" and to enable them to stay in the profession while they raised families or approached retirement.

Ofsted ratings and MATs

The NFER report found that a school's Ofsted rating also influenced the movement of staff. Successive ratings of "inadequate" were likely to see a higher incidence of staff moving to another school or leaving the profession. Teachers working in schools which had been upgraded to "requires improvement" rating had a better chance of securing a new job than if their existing school had been downgraded "perhaps as the after-effect of previously being inadequate or because of the experience of delivering school improvement being viewed positively in the labour market", the research stated.

Multi-academy trusts (MATs) have a slightly higher than average rate of teachers leaving the profession compared to other school types, despite suggestions by another former education secretary, Nicky Morgan, that MAT models of staff development with opportunities for career progression would encourage more teachers to stay in their jobs.

The report said: "This may be due to different staff management practices in MATs but could also be due to the way that staff movements from a school to the MAT central team are recorded."

It went on: "After excluding internal moves within the same MAT, MATs had similar rates of teachers moving school when compared with other schools. There, therefore, appears to be little evidence to date to suggest that MATs are better able to retain their teachers."

The study recommended that MATs do more to promote career progression within their organisations and a feeling that the MAT was a structure to which teachers belong.

"The movement of teachers was found to be most acute in London, where considerably more staff were leaving compared with other parts of the country, including other large cities"

City living and job satisfaction

The movement of teachers was found to be most acute in London, where considerably more staff were leaving compared with other parts of the country, including other large cities. While the capital tended to attract staff aged in their 20s, it was losing one per cent of teachers in their 30s and 0.6 per cent of teachers in their 40s every year, at a time when pupil numbers were rising faster than in other parts of the country.

The report suggested that expensive housing was a deterrent to teachers wanting to work in London and recommended that policy-makers consider housing subsidies or other ways of reducing the costs of living in the capital.

Is the grass greener?

A subsequent study from the NFER in this Nuffield Foundation funded series, published in December, identified the aspirations and career paths of teachers who had left the profession. The research – *Is the Grass Greener Beyond Teaching?* (2017) – found that while those who had left teaching earned less pay in subsequent roles, they enjoyed increased job satisfaction and reduced working hours. Using data from the *Understanding Society* survey it recommended that teachers needed to be nurtured, valued and supported if they were to remain in the profession.

The study found that more than half of leaving teachers who were not retiring, remained working in education in some capacity, usually moving to the private sector or taking on a non-teaching role. Typically, these teachers earned up to 10 per cent less in a new role but gained other benefits, such as a reduction in working hours and increased job satisfaction.

The self-reported job satisfaction of teachers who left the profession declined in the years before they left. The authors recommended that school leaders, the government and school inspectors needed to jointly review the impact their actions were having on teachers' workload and how this could be mitigated.

Jack Worth, a senior economist at NFER, said: "This data gives us rich and valuable insights on what motivates teachers to leave teaching, because we can see how their lives change after leaving and taking up a new job. Policy responses that aim to increase teacher retention need to consider pay alongside other factors, such as teachers' workload, working hours and job satisfaction."

• *Dorothy Lepkowska is a freelance education journalist.*

Teacher Retention and Turnover Research

- NFER will be publishing further insights this year including a final report in the summer. To find out more about the on-going Teacher Retention and Turnover project and to receive the latest research directly to your in-box, visit www.nfer.ac.uk/research/teaching-workforce-dynamics/

Further information and reading

In recent years, NFER has published several research reports on the school workforce, examining the extent of the teacher recruitment and retention problems:

- *Teacher Retention and Turnover Research: Research update 3: Is the Grass Greener Beyond Teaching?* 2017: www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/NUFS04/
- *Teacher Retention and Turnover Research: Interim Report*, 2017: www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/NUFS03/
- *Teacher Retention and Turnover Research: Research update 2: Teacher dynamics in multi-academy trusts*, 2017: www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/NUFS02/
- *Teacher Retention and Turnover Research: Research update 1: Teacher retention by subject*, 2017: www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/NUFS01/
- *Keeping Your Head: NFER Analysis of Headteacher Retention*, 2017: www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/LFSC01/
- *Engaging Teachers: NFER analysis of teacher retention*, 2016: www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/LFSB01/
- *Should I Stay or Should I Go? NFER Analysis of Teachers Joining and Leaving the Profession*, 2015: www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/LFSA01/