

# EEF, EFA Mailer Trial Nimble Trial Protocol

Evaluator (institution): The Behavioural Insights Team

Principal investigator: Alex Sutherland



Template last updated: January 2021

<b>PROJECT TITLE<sup>1</sup></b>	Embedding Formative Assessment Mailer Trial: A randomised controlled trial of testimonial versus evidence-based marketing in the adoption of evidence-based programmes in schools.
<b>DEVELOPER (INSTITUTION)</b>	The Behavioural Insights Team
<b>EVALUATOR (INSTITUTION)</b>	The Behavioural Insights Team
<b>PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR</b>	Alex Sutherland
<b>PROTOCOL AUTHOR(S)</b>	Kimberly Bohling, Pujen Shrestha, Alex Sutherland
<b>TRIAL DESIGN</b>	A two-arm randomised controlled trial with random allocation at school level
<b>NUMBER OF SCHOOLS</b>	2000 secondary schools (outcomes measured at school level)
<b>PRIMARY OUTCOME MEASURE AND SOURCE</b>	Expressions of interest (EOI) in Embedding Formative Assessment (EFA) programme (source: SSAT marketing database)
<b>SECONDARY OUTCOME MEASURE AND SOURCE</b>	Purchase of Embedding Formative Assessment (EFA) programme (source: SSAT marketing database)

## Protocol version history

VERSION	DATE	REASON FOR REVISION
1.1		
1.0 [ <i>original</i> ]	24 February 2021	N/A

<sup>1</sup> Make sure that the project title here matches the title of the document. Please ensure that there is an identification as a randomised trial in the title as per CONSORT requirements.

## Table of contents

<b>1. Study rationale and background</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Intervention and implementation</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Impact evaluation</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. Impact analysis</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5. Risks</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>6. Timeline</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>7. Ethics and registration</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>8. Data protection</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>9. Personnel</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Appendix A — Illustrative design of intervention materials</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Appendix B — Additional data protection information</b>	<b>18</b>

## 1. Study rationale and background

**Purpose of this study:** To test whether certain marketing messages can encourage the adoption of an evidence-based programme by school leaders. We will test two message variations - 'evidence' and 'testimonial'. Specifically, the aim of this field trial would be to assess which type of message is more effective in encouraging school leaders to adopt the Embedding Formative Assessment (EFA) programme.

**Brief description of supporting evidence:** Our research builds on an unpublished pilot survey conducted by Dr. Todd Rogers, Professor of Public Policy at the Harvard Kennedy School. He wanted to explore why innovative ideas with research backing fail to be widely adopted and theorised that some leaders find anecdotes more motivating than evidence. He conducted a survey of 200 US school principals about their interest in learning about a low-cost, well-evidenced absenteeism intervention—more principals indicated that they would be interested in learning about the intervention when they were told that a single principal recommended it as opposed to being presented with evidence from three large scale randomised controlled trials (RCTs).

While there has been a significant effort to produce better evidence about what works in education - which the EEF has been integral to—there is still very little known about how to encourage schools to adopt evidence-based interventions and thus answer these questions. This means that many well-researched interventions 'sit on the shelf' rather than being put to use to improve the lives of pupils. Therefore, insights generated from this research could help the EEF, researchers and practitioners better design communications that promote the adoption of evidence-based practices, which might otherwise not achieve the optimal uptake and impact.

Messaging will be sent as a printed material via post, as we hypothesise that this messaging medium will be more effective than email for several reasons:

- Email messages are easily skipped, deleted, or filtered out. Sending the materials via post with recorded delivery ensures the message stands out and may be more likely to be opened and read.
- Email marketing is very common; whereas mail-based marketing now has a novelty factor.
- Some research indicates that printed materials have a greater likelihood of becoming a "social artifact"; that is, they can easily be shared with others and can serve as a reminder until an action is taken.<sup>2</sup>

Additionally, given the 'novelty' feature of print-medium (as opposed to the primary digital marketing of the EFA) there may not be any differential effect between two arms in terms of EFA adoption outcomes such as interest and conversion but a differential effect between print-medium and current marketing strategies—in this research we assume print-medium outperforms current marketing strategies.

**Brief overview of the integrated evaluation design:** This is a two-arm randomised controlled trial, randomised at school level with outcomes, which will broadly measure EFA

---

<sup>2</sup> Rogers, T. How to communicate with families effectively. Accessed from: <https://f.hubspotusercontent00.net/hubfs/3412255/Resources%20Page%20Files%20-%20Public/Todd%20Rogers%20-%20How%20to%20Communicate%20with%20Families%20Effectively%20Article%20v1.pdf>

adoption, measured at the school level. As this is comparing two treatments, rather than a treatment and control, it is assessing whether one treatment performs better than the other, or if the two are equivalent.<sup>3</sup> Based on the previous work by Professor Rogers, the working assumption is that the testimonial approach will be more effective when compared to the evidence-based marketing material approach.

## 2. Intervention and implementation

**Table 1. Intervention description**

<b>INTERVENTION NAME</b>	<b>EFA Mailer Trial: Mail delivered testimonial and evidence-based marketing material</b>
<b>WHY (THEORY/RATIONALE)</b>	The rationale of this study is to explore whether testimony or evidence-based marketing material will result in differential expressions of interest (EOIs) and sales of EFA. This would enable us to make recommendations about how to improve design of school recruitment materials, as well as make a contribution to the wider knowledge about the adoption of evidence-based practices at scale.
<b>WHO (RECIPIENTS)</b>	Head teachers of secondary schools will receive the intervention.
<b>WHAT (MATERIALS)</b>	The two treatment groups receive a letter and a supplemental programme description for EFA that was either constructed using solely testimonial (from a previous case study) or evidence-based support (from the previous EEF-funded evaluation).  See <a href="#">Appendix A</a> for intervention materials and paragraph below on intervention design.
<b>WHAT (PROCEDURES)</b>	Schools will receive the intervention by mail using recorded delivery. If interested in learning more about the programme, schools are given three ways they can express interest: 1) download additional informational materials after providing contact details; 2) register online for an informational Open Day; 3) request a consultation.  For all activities, recipients will be directed to individual webpages for each type of EOI request set up specifically for this trial, which are not linked elsewhere on the Schools, Students, and Teacher Network (SSAT) website. Recipients will be asked to provide their school's URN to track outcomes more easily, and the

<sup>3</sup> There is a long-standing distinction in the medical literature between equivalence, inferiority and superiority trials (see e.g. [Dunn et al., 2018](#)). We are agnostic on what label to apply here, so instead describe what we are trying to achieve.

	school's URN will be included on the letter to ensure the recipient has the number easily available.
<b>WHO (PROVIDER)</b>	BIT designed the intervention materials in collaboration with SSAT. The intervention will be disseminated via a printing/mailing service.
<b>HOW (DELIVERY MODE)</b>	The intervention will be mailed to the identified schools using Signed For delivery.
<b>WHERE (LOCATION)</b>	The intervention will be delivered at the identified schools.
<b>WHEN &amp; HOW MUCH (DOSAGE)</b>	The marketing material is delivered once.
<b>TAILORING (ADAPTATION)</b>	N/A

#### Further detail on intervention design:

We aimed to keep the letters as similar as possible in overall appearance and length, so that differences in outcomes could not be attributed to the design of the page (e.g., being easier to read, fewer words, etc).

We have also made the evidence/testimonial distinction as salient as possible by featuring the words in a call-out box at the top, and then describing the data source in the box in the body of the letter. The supplement that provides further information about the programme also explicitly mentions evidence/testimony.

One element to note in the design is that we needed to rely upon evidence and testimony that had already been collected. Each letter consisted of three primary pieces of evidence, we ensured both letters' first data point was in regards to impact on Attainment 8, which is an important metric of attainment that will be of interest to school decision-makers. However, we did not have comparable data points for the remaining two pieces of information presented, but this is precisely due to the nature of the two interventions we are presenting – evidence-based and testimonial data points can be inherently different ([Appendix A](#)). A case study/testimonial can speak in detail to an individual school's experience and will generally be very positive about the impact of the programme on their particular school, whereas an RCT will be generating average findings across many schools. We do not see the differences in findings presented as a limitation of the design, but a feature of how evidence and testimony vary in the types of findings they can produce.

### 3. Impact evaluation

#### 3.1 Research questions

RQ1: The primary research question of this study is does **testimonial or evidence-based** marketing material perform better in encouraging school leaders to **express interest** in EFA.

RQ2: The secondary research question of this study is does **testimonial or evidence-based** marketing material perform better in encouraging school leaders to **purchase** EFA.

### 3.2 Design, participants and outcome measures

**Table 2: Trial design and outcomes**

<b>Trial design, including number of arms</b>	Two-arm, randomised control trial
<b>inclusion criteria</b>	Secondary schools in England
<b>Participants exclusion criteria</b>	<p>Schools were excluded from the trial if they had previously used or expressed interest in EFA. Specifically, the exclusion criteria included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Schools that had taken part in the EEF EFA research</li> <li>2. EFA Mentor and Ambassador schools</li> <li>3. Schools that are or have undertaken the EFA support package (toolkit + support from an EFA mentor)</li> <li>4. Schools that have purchased the EFA toolkit (without support package)</li> <li>5. Schools that expressed an interest (EOI) in EFA or requested a EFA consultation</li> <li>6. Schools that have had staff members booked to or attended EFA open days</li> <li>7. Schools that have had a staff member download content from SSAT website related to EFA in an identifiable manner<sup>4</sup></li> </ol> <p>We also excluded schools that had no listed address or headteacher in the GIAS Edubase dataset, as we would not be able to deliver or personalise the material.</p>
<b>target number</b>	2000 schools
<b>Unit of randomisation</b>	School
<b>Stratification variables (if applicable)</b>	N/A
<b>Primary outcome variable</b>	Expression of interest (EOIs) submitted by 28 May 2021.

<sup>4</sup>It's possible that some school staff members downloaded information without identifying themselves. However, we theorise these are less interested schools if they are not identifying themselves, so would be a "colder" contact than those schools described in item 7.

	measure (instrument, scale, source)	EOI is recorded by SSAT. This will be a binary indicator generated from whether the school expressed interest through one of the three options described above (download, Open Day registration, consultation request).
	direct measure or proxy?	Direct
	baseline measure	N/A
	time of collection	16th March 2021 through 28th May 2021
<b>Secondary outcome(s)</b>	variable(s)	Purchase of EFA by 1 September 2021. This will be a binary indicator.
	measure (instrument, scale, source)	Purchase of EFA is recorded by SSAT. This will be a binary indicator.
	direct measure or proxy?	Direct
	baseline measure	N/A
	time of collection	16th March 2021 through 1st September 2021
	adjusting for multiple comparisons?	No – only considers primary outcome

Additional design note: SSAT will know which schools are involved in the trial, as they have agreed not to market EFA further to these schools. SSAT will be blinded to allocation to ensure they do not interact differently with schools in either trial arm.

Timelines for outcomes were decided in collaboration with SSAT and the EEF, based on: (i) what SSAT believed would be reasonable for schools to respond to; (ii) SSAT's data on how long it takes for schools to 'convert' from marketing to EOI, and from EOI to purchase; (iii) timelines for the project itself; (iv) the 'rhythm' of the school year.

Additional outcome measure note: We are measuring outcome at the school-level rather than headteacher for several reasons: 1) In the interest of minimising personal data use, SSAT are not providing BIT with any personal data; 2) The person(s) responsible for school programme purchases may vary by school, so we would not wish to exclude EOIs/sales made by another school decision-maker. We have sent the mailer specifically to the headteacher, so that it is addressed to one person in the school to mitigate the risk it is not opened by anyone. They may then pass the letter along to someone else responsible for these sorts of decisions (e.g., the social artifact element described previously). As such, we feel a school-level analysis is appropriate here.

### 3.3 Randomisation

**Specify who is responsible for designing and undertaking randomisation:** BIT will design and undertake the randomisation process and send two sets of letters (with publicly available recipient name and address already merged into the correct letter) directly to our partner printing agency. This is to guarantee that the SSAT will be blind to allocation and ensure that if a school submits an EOI, any subsequent sales interactions will not be influenced by SSAT's knowledge of the treatment arm. Additionally, schools will be blind to allocation because they will not know they are part of a trial. Our mailer partner will be responsible for the printing and delivery of the letter.

**Randomisation method:** SSAT provided a list of 2887 schools that met the inclusion/exclusion criteria. BIT will randomly select 2000 schools from the list to be included in the trial.

In addition to the random sampling, schools will be randomly assigned into the two treatment arms. Random allocation will be simple with a 50/50 allocation to be conducted in February 2021. Randomisation will be conducted using RStudio with R version 4.0.3.

**Balance Check:** Using relevant school-level pre-intervention characteristics, which are publicly available data via GIAS EduBase datasets Establishments and Establishment Groups (accessed: 3rd February 2021<sup>5</sup>), we will conduct a balance check regression on our randomisation against available school-level data. These characteristics are: proportion of FSM eligible pupils; Government Office Region; whether the school is located in a DfE opportunity area; whether or not the school is part of a multi-academy trust; and latest available Ofsted rating.

**Documentation and quality control:** Analysts at BIT will archive all randomisation-related data and code files as well as drafting documentation of the process. The primary analyst will not be blind to allocation. However, as part of the quality assurance process, another analyst will independently conduct the analysis while blinded to allocation. Results will also be quality assured by a senior member of the research team.

### 3.4 Sample size calculations

We conducted power calculations to estimate the minimum detectable effect size given the estimated effect size, desired significance level, and statistical power.

Justification for the assumptions in the table 3 are as follows:

- **Alpha and Power:** These are standard assumptions.
- **One or two-sided test?:** A two-sided test was performed to err on the side of caution. There is little existing evidence relating to the effect of interventions of this type of marketing material, so we cannot assume the direction of any effect that we might observe.
- **Number of schools:** The estimate of 2000 schools is based on the number of schools needed in order to achieve an MDES in line with expectations for this sort of light-touch intervention. The sample size is also partially determined by not wanting to limit the market for SSAT too much for EFA, as they have agreed to changes in

---

<sup>5</sup> Datasets accessible from <https://www.get-information-schools.service.gov.uk/Downloads>



their marketing practices for the duration of the trial (see Risk section for further detail). Further, as described in the exclusion criteria, we exclude a number of schools based on previous engagement with SSAT/EFA, which limits our eligible sample.

- **Baseline:** SSAT does not routinely engage in cold-call mass mail-outs, so we do not know what a typical response rate is. We propose a sample of 2000 schools with an equal allocation between the two arms. The minimum detectable effect size (MDES) for a range of response rates (EOIs) to the lowest performing arm is presented in the table 3.

**Table 3: Sample size calculations**

		OVERALL
Alpha		0.05
Power		0.8
Number of schools	Testimonial intervention	1000
	Evidence-based intervention	1000
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2000</b>
Software used for calculations		Rstudio 1.1.42 & R 3.6.0

  

Baseline (EOI rate in lowest performing arm)	1%	5%	10%
Minimum Detectable Effect Size (MDES)	1.6pp	3.1pp	4.1pp

## 4. Impact analysis<sup>6</sup>

**Table 4: Impact analysis summary**

Research question	RQ1 (EOI)	RQ2 (Sales)
Sample	Secondary schools that do not meet our exclusion criteria	
Dependent variable	EOI in EFA	Purchase of EFA
Independent variable	Treatment assignment	

<sup>6</sup> Please see the [Statistical Analysis Guidance](#).

<b>Analytical method</b>	Logistic regression	
<b>Interpretation</b>	The evidence-based marketing intervention affects EOI rate by X percentage points in comparison to the testimonial marketing intervention	The evidence-based marketing intervention affects purchase rate by X percentage points in comparison to the testimonial marketing intervention
<b>Approach</b>	Analysis will be Intention to Treat (ITT). Analysis will use the raw form of the outcome data (i.e. not transformed or scaled).	

#### 4.1 Primary outcome analysis

##### Outcome

The primary outcome is an EOI in the EFA programme being submitted by a school within approximately three months of the mail-out being received by the school. This will be a binary indicator.

##### Analysis

Primary analysis will be intention-to-treat (ITT). Analysis will be carried out using the following logistic regression model:

$$outcome_i \sim bernoulli(p_i); \text{logit}(p_i) = \alpha + \beta_T treatment_i + \beta_C covariates_i$$

where:

- $p_i$  is the outcome for EOI, binary (1 if the school expresses interest, 0 if not);
- $treatment_i$  is a binary indicator for the treatment assignment for school  $i$  (1 if the school is assigned to evidenced-based marketing treatment; 0 if not);
- and  $covariates_i$  is a set of all covariates of interest for school  $i$ : proportion of FSM eligible pupils, school size (number of pupils), opportunity area (1 if the school is located in an opportunity area; 0 if not), Government Office Region (as a dummy variable, 'London' as reference group), whether the school is part of a multi-academy trust (1 if the school is part of a MAT; 0 if not), and Ofsted rating (as a dummy variable, 'excellent' as reference group).

#### 4.2 Secondary outcome analysis

Secondary outcome analysis will follow the same model specification used for the primary outcome.

##### Outcome

The secondary outcome is Purchase of the EFA programme within approximately seven months of the school receiving the mail-out. This will be a binary indicator.

##### Analysis

Primary analysis will be intention-to-treat (ITT). Analysis will be carried out using the following logistic regression model:

$$outcome_i \sim \text{bernoulli}(p_i); \text{logit}(p_i) = \alpha + \beta_T \text{treatment}_i + \beta_C \text{covariates}_i$$

where:

- $p_i$  is the outcome for Purchase of the EFA programme, binary (1 if the school purchases the EFA programme, 0 if not);
- $treatment_i$  is a binary indicator for the treatment assignment for school  $i$  (1 if the school is assigned to evidenced-based marketing treatment; 0 if not);
- and  $covariates_i$  is a set of all covariates of interest for school  $i$ : proportion of FSM eligible pupils, school size (number of pupils), opportunity area (1 if the school is located in an opportunity area; 0 if not), Government Office Region (as a dummy variable, 'London' as reference group), whether the school is part of a multi-academy trust (1 if the school is part of a MAT; 0 if not), and Ofsted rating (as a dummy variable, 'excellent' as reference group).

## 5. Risks

**Table 5: Risk register**

Risk	Likelihood of occurring	Magnitude of impact	Strategy to mitigate risk	Responsible party	Timeframe (if applicable)
Randomisation failure	Low	High	BIT will conduct the merging of the randomisation allocation with the letter templates, therefore this stage will be quality controlled internally. Finally, we will embed one BIT staff member per mailing list to check delivery accuracy and timing.	BIT research team	
School closures due to Covid-19	Medium	Medium	As of writing, schools are open to some pupils, and complete school closure is unlikely. In the event of full closure, this might cause a delay in intervention delivery, but there is sufficient time in the project plan to allow for some delay in delivery and still be able to collect data within a 60-day time window for the primary outcome.	BIT evaluation team	
Missing data; Some schools may fail to list their URN or provide adequate/correct information in their EOI.	Medium	Medium	To mitigate the effect of schools providing inadequate or incorrect information (such as misspelling their school name) school URNs are being merged into the letters to make it easy for schools to use when expressing interest in the programme.	BIT research team	End of trial

Risk of bias in developer-led trials	Low	Low	<p>The risk is minimised by having a second independent analyst analysing the trial under blind allocation of treatment groups. BIT are independently funded by the EEF to conduct the trial so there is no conflict of interest in that regard.</p> <p>Additionally, this risk is minimised as BIT does not have a commercial interest in either of the two trial arms performing better, indicating there is no conflict of interest.</p> <p>The pre-registration of this trial with Open Science Framework (osf.io), the external peer review process conducted before the completion of this document, and transparency about the project all act to minimise risk of bias.</p>	BIT intervention development team	Beginning of trial
Fidelity to intervention plan	Low	Low	Intervention material is compiled by BIT and partner mailer will be fully brief on how interventions should be delivered	RIT implementation team	
Over-estimate of interest generated by the mailer. SSAT had already planned an article about EFA to be printed in the January 2021 edition of Sec Ed magazine.	Medium	Low	<p>Sec Ed magazine is sent to all secondary schools in England, so both groups will have potentially been exposed.</p> <p>It is possible this article may warm recipients up and increase likelihood of taking action. However, our primary interest in this trial is understanding the difference between the two groups, not the overall response rate.</p>	BIT research team	Trial period
Competing SSAT programmes may crowd out interest.	Medium	Low	<p>It was agreed with SSAT that they could market other programmes to schools, as long as the marketing was not targeted to headteachers. Any further restrictions would place a significant burden on their standard marketing practices, particularly for other programmes.</p> <p>It is possible that other marketing may dampen interest in EFA, but as SSAT are blind to condition, we do not expect any differences in additional marketing between the two groups.</p>	BIT research team and SSAT	Trial period

## 6. Timeline

- Timetable including specification of who is responsible for completing each task
- Include specific dates or date intervals (rather than, for example, school terms only).

**Table 6: Timeline**

Dates	Activity	Staff responsible/ leading
W/C 15th February	Randomisation	BIT (Research Team)
26th Feb	Finalising intervention materials	BIT (Project Team)
W/C 15th March	Launch trial; mailers sent out	BIT / Mailer Partner
May	Data collection (EOI)	BIT (Research Team)
September	Data collection (Purchase and EOI)	BIT (Research Team)

## 7. Ethics and registration

All BIT trials need to have been through BIT's internal research ethics process. This trial was assessed as being Low Risk with regards to the dimensions presented below.

On all dimensions this trial is determined to have minimal ethical risks. This is a light-touch intervention that is being delivered in the context of the EFA's scale up evaluation using materials that are inline with standard SSAT marketing. Additionally there is minimal use of personal data, which is limited at the use of head teachers names in the implementation of the intervention.

Dimension	Low risk	Medium risk	High risk
<b>Research methods</b>	Standard research methods commonly applied within the substantive area of the research.	Standard research methods that may not have been applied within a particular substance area and that may prove controversial or be sensitive.	Non-standard research methods that may be highly controversial or sensitive.
<b>Participants</b>	Non-vulnerable adults (i.e. 18 years+ in England & Wales or as stated in applicable national legislation).	Children without vulnerable characteristics in a regular setting (school/youth club).	Individuals from vulnerable groups (e.g. refugees) or are children outside regular settings or do not have legal capacity within the meaning of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 or relevant national legislation. (NB: any research

			with the latter group requires approval via an additional legally mandated process.)
<b>Subject matter</b>	Research relates to a politically and socially uncontroversial area, such as recycling.	Research relates to an issue of some contention but is relatively light-touch	Research relates to a highly-contentious, potentially currently debated or partisan issue
<b>Nature of data</b>	Aggregate anonymous data or data on non-contentious topics (e.g. recycling behaviour) or routinely collected admin data.	Individual-level data not routinely collected.	Individual-level, highly sensitive or special category data routinely or not routinely collected. Also, criminal offence data
<b>Legal exposure</b>	The legal framework in which we are operating is clear. If the project is in a foreign country: we have worked in this country and a similar context before and know the legal requirements.	The legal situation with respect to any aspect (data collection, participant group, intervention) is unclear.	The legal situation with respect to any aspect (data collection, participant group, intervention) is controversial or problematic.
<b>Unknown unknowns</b>	BIT has run a similar project in this domain before	BIT has some experience in the domain, but certain aspects of the project are new to BIT.	BIT has no prior experience in this policy domain.

This trial does not alert participating schools to the fact that they are taking part in a trial.

Before launching the trial, BIT will register it at the Open Science Framework (osf.io). We will ensure the trial registry is updated with outcomes at the end of the project.

## 8. Data protection<sup>7</sup>

- BIT are acting as SSAT's data processor for the purposes of this evaluation. SSAT will provide BIT with school-level marketing data (not personal data) for the purposes of randomisation and analysis. BIT will combine this data with publicly available personal data to appropriately address the letters.
- All personal data collected as part of the study will be treated with the strictest confidence by BIT and processed only in accordance with the requirements of the

<sup>7</sup> Please see the [Data Protection Statement](#) for EEF Evaluations.

GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018. BIT will not use any personal data in any report arising from this project. BIT is collecting and processing personal data solely for the purposes of proper delivery of the intervention.

- We will need to employ personal data from the headteacher of all selected schools for the implementation of our intervention.
  - Head teacher names (so that the intervention can be personalised)
- BIT will not process any special data in this project.

## 9. Personnel

Project team member	Project role
Dr Alex Sutherland	Principal Investigator
Kim Bohling	Project Lead
Dr Jo Milward	Research and Analysis Advisor
Pujen Shrestha	Research and Analysis Advisor
Dr Todd Rogers (Harvard Kennedy School)	Academic advisor
James Lawrence	BIT Quality Assurance

## Appendix A — Illustrative design of intervention materials

### Evidence-based intervention material



Education  
Endowment  
Foundation



Central House  
142 Central Street  
London, EC1V 8AR

020 7802 2300  
info@ssatuk.co.uk  
@ssat

ssatuk.co.uk

<NAME>  
<ADDRESS 1>  
<ADDRESS 2>  
<ADDRESS 3>  
<ADDRESS 4>  
<POSTCODE>

**EVIDENCE from a  
RANDOMISED CONTROLLED TRIAL  
shows EFA improves students'  
GCSE attainment**

Dear <INSERT NAME>,

We invite you to learn more about Embedding Formative Assessment (EFA), a professional development programme designed to embed improved teaching practice.

Centred around monthly teacher-led workshops and peer observation sessions, EFA is a whole school approach where teachers work collaboratively to implement formative assessment strategies in their classrooms.

**Evidence from an EEF funded randomised controlled trial with 140 schools demonstrated that in schools using EFA, on average:**

- Pupils made the equivalent of two additional months' progress in their Attainment 8 GCSE score;
- The rate of learning was 25% greater compared to non EFA schools;
- The programme achieved these results at a cost of around £1.20 per student per year.

Find out more information by:

- Downloading additional information: **[redacted]**
- RSVPing to attend an online Open Day: **[redacted]**
- Requesting a free phone consultation: **[redacted]**

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'C Settle'.

**Corinne Settle**  
Senior Education Lead – Teaching and Learning

School URN: <URN>



## Testimonial intervention material



**ssat**  
the schools, students and  
teachers network

Central House  
142 Central Street  
London, EC1V 8AR

020 7802 2300  
info@ssatuk.co.uk

@ssat

ssatuk.co.uk

<NAME>  
<ADDRESS 1>  
<ADDRESS 2>  
<ADDRESS 3>  
<ADDRESS 4>  
<POSTCODE>

**TESTIMONIAL from a  
HEADTEACHER USING EFA  
indicates EFA improves students'  
GCSE attainment**

Dear <INSERT NAME>

We invite you to learn more about Embedding Formative Assessment (EFA), a professional development programme designed to embed improved teaching practice.

Centred around monthly teacher-led workshops and peer observation sessions, EFA is a whole school approach where teachers work collaboratively to implement formative assessment strategies in their classrooms.

**Assistant head Annabelle Taylor reports on the success of the EFA programme at Ricards Lodge High School. After embedding EFA:**

- Our Attainment 8 score was 54.4, which ranked us second out of 55 similar schools nationally.
- We achieved our best ever Progress 8 score (+0.71):
- Ofsted rated the school as outstanding, highlighting in their report observations of teachers using formative assessment in the classroom.

Find out more information by:

- Downloading additional information: **[redacted]**
- RSVPing to attend an online Open Day: **[redacted]**
- Requesting a free phone consultation: **[redacted]**

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "C Settle".

**Corinne Settle**  
Senior Education Lead – Teaching and Learning

School URN: <URN >

## Appendix B — Additional data protection information

- In an appendix:
  - Provide a clear rationale for the legal bases selected for personal and special data, with reference to your organisational policies and the design of the specific evaluation project. If relying on legitimate interests, clearly specify what specific interests your organisation has in conducting the evaluation.
  - Describe your approach to demonstrating GDPR compliance, including, but not limited to, how you will protect individual data subjects' rights, purposes for data processing, all parties with access to data (and reasons), retention periods.
  - Specify data processing roles (controller, any processors) during the evaluation up to the point of data being deleted from all locations by the evaluator and/ or delivery team. (N.B. The EEF becomes data controller for the datasets archived after the trial, once internal quality checks have been successfully completed by the archive manager.

BIT will be conducting this research as a data processor for SSAT. BIT and SSAT have entered into a data sharing agreement, which sets out the roles and responsibilities. BIT will also engage a printing company as a sub-processor for the purposes of implementing the intervention.

### 1. Our approach to GDPR compliance

BIT is minimising the collection of personal data wherever possible in this project. We are employing personal data for the implementation of our intervention but will not be collecting personal data after this point. Personal data will not be used in analysis or reporting.

As stated above, all personal data collected as part of the study will be treated with the strictest confidence by BIT and processed only in accordance with the requirements of the GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018.

#### 2.1. Data security

We take reasonable steps to protect personal information and follow procedures designed to minimise unauthorised access, alteration, loss or disclosure of personal information.

Taking into account the state of the art, the costs of implementation and the nature, scope, context and purposes of processing as well as the risk of varying likelihood and severity for the rights and freedoms of natural persons, we implement appropriate technical and organisational measures to ensure a level of security appropriate to the risk of processing.

We ensure that those who have permanent or regular access to personal data, or that are involved in the processing of personal data, are trained and informed of their rights and responsibilities when processing personal data. We provide such access on a need-to-know basis, and have measures in place which are designed to remove that access once it is no longer required.

Physical personal devices used by BIT are encrypted to protect personal data.

We have put in place procedures to deal with any suspected personal data breach and will notify participants and any applicable regulator of a breach where we are legally required to do so.

#### 2.2. All parties with access to the data

The personal data that BIT collects will be accessed by a limited number of researchers and advisors in BIT's team working on this project.

BIT may disclose information to third parties in connection with the purposes of processing personal data set out in the privacy notices. These third parties may include:

- other companies in BIT's group [that are based within the United Kingdom];
- regulators, law enforcement bodies and the courts, in order to comply with applicable laws and regulations, assist with regulatory enquiries, and cooperate with court mandated processes, including the conduct of litigation;
- suppliers, research assistants and sub-contractors who may process information on behalf of BIT. These third parties are known as data processors and when we use them we have contractual terms and policies and procedures in place to ensure that personal data is protected. This does not always mean that they will have access to information that will directly identify individuals as we will share anonymised or pseudonymised data only wherever possible. We remain responsible for personal information as the controller; and
- any third party to whom we are proposing to sell or transfer some or all of our business or assets.

We may also disclose personal information if required by law, or to protect or defend ourselves or others against illegal or harmful activities, or as part of a reorganisation or restructuring of our organisations.

### **2.3. Data retention**

We will not retain any personal data longer than it is needed to deliver, manage and evaluate the project. The anticipated date of deletion of personal data is October 2021.

### **3. Data processing roles**

For the personal data we collect (headteacher names): Behavioural Insights Ltd (the legal name of Behavioural Insights Team (BIT)) is a data processor.

As noted in the section above, we may share personal data with a trusted data sub-processor solely for the purposes of supporting the delivery of the project.

It will not be necessary to archive any data from this project.