



Department
for Education

Independent Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme Year 2: Implementation and Process Evaluation

Technical Appendix

Contents

Contents	2
List of tables	3
A Quantitative Methodology	6
Statistical Analysis	6
B Data Tables	9
Participation in the National Tutoring Programme (Chapter 2)	9
Implementation of the National Tutoring Programme (Chapter 3)	23
Tutors involved in School-Led Tutoring (Chapter 4)	27
Satisfaction with the National Tutoring Programme (Chapter 5)	30
Perceived impact of the National Tutoring Programme on pupils, schools and staff (Chapter 6)	41
Impact of the National Tutoring Programme on classroom management and workload (Chapter 8)	52
Funding the National Tutoring Programme (Chapter 9)	53

List of tables

Table 1 Derived analysis variables	7
Table 2 Derived FSM quintile for each phase	7
Table 3 Survey respondents' participation in the NTP routes	9
Table 4 Survey respondents' participation in the NTP routes by phase.....	9
Table 5 Survey respondents' participation in the NTP routes by FSM quintile	10
Table 6 The main reasons schools chose to use the School-Led Tutoring grant	10
Table 7 The main reasons schools chose not to use the School-Led Tutoring grant by phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	11
Table 8 The main reasons schools chose to use Tuition Partners by phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	13
Table 9 The main reasons schools chose not to use Tuition Partners by phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	14
Table 10 The main reasons schools chose to use Academic Mentors by phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	16
Table 11 The main reasons schools chose not to use Academic Mentors by phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	17
Table 12 Intention to participate in Tuition Partners in the future by Phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	18
Table 13 Intention to participate in Academic Mentors in the future by Phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	19
Table 14 Intention to participate in School-Led Tutoring in the future by Phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	19
Table 15 Factors that would increase the likelihood of schools using the School-Led Tutoring grant in the future (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	19
Table 16 Factors that would increase the likelihood of schools using Tuition Partners in the future (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	20
Table 17 Factors that would increase the likelihood of schools using Academic Mentors in the future (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	21

Table 18 Tutoring provision among schools not participating in any NTP	22
Table 19 Tutoring support used by schools instead of the NTP routes.....	22
Table 20 Pupils being prioritised by school to receive School-Led Tutoring (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	23
Table 21 Subjects prioritised for School-Led Tutoring by phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	24
Table 22 When School-Led Tutoring sessions are delivered by phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	25
Table 23 When School-Led Tutoring sessions are delivered by FSM quintile (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	25
Table 24 Frequency of School-Led Tutoring sessions in schools (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	26
Table 25 Length of School-Led Tutoring sessions in schools (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	27
Table 26 How schools have chosen to spend the School-Led Tutoring grant so far (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	27
Table 27 Types of staff employed by the school to deliver School-Led Tutoring (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)	28
Table 28 Number of tutors schools have funded using the School-Led Tutoring grant by phase.....	29
Table 29 Pupil numbers tutored per term and per session	29
Table 30 Perceived effectiveness of the School-Led Tutoring training at equipping tutors for delivering high quality tutoring by role (percentages refer to proportion of column totals).....	30
Table 31 Perceived satisfaction with the NTP overall and by role	30
Table 32 Perceived satisfaction with the NTP overall and by phase.....	31
Table 33 Perceived satisfaction with the Tuition Partners route	32
Table 34 Perceived satisfaction with the Academic Mentors route	34
Table 35 Perceived satisfaction with the School-Led Tutoring route	36
Table 36 Perceived satisfaction with the non-NTP tutoring	38

Table 37 School confidence in ability to access high quality tutoring when needed	40
Table 38 School confidence in ability to access high quality tutoring when needed compared to prior to the pandemic	40
Table 39 Perceived impact of the Tuition Partners route on pupils overall	41
Table 40 Perceived impact of the Tuition Partners route on schools overall	42
Table 41 Impact of the Tuition Partners route on teachers overall	42
Table 42 Perceived impact of the Tuition Partners route on pupils in primary schools	44
Table 43 Perceived impact of the Tuition Partners route on schools in primary schools .	45
Table 44 Perceived impact of the Tuition Partners route on teachers in primary schools	46
Table 45 Perceived impact of the Tuition Partners route on pupils in secondary schools	47
Table 46 Perceived impact of the Tuition Partners route on schools in secondary schools	47
Table 47 Perceived impact of the Tuition Partners route on teachers in secondary school	48
Table 48 Perceived impact of the Academic Mentors route on pupils	49
Table 49 Perceived impact of the Academic Mentors route on schools.....	49
Table 50 Perceived impact of the School-Led Tutoring route on pupils.....	50
Table 51 Perceived impact of the School-Led Tutoring route on schools	50
Table 52 Perceived impact of the School-Led Tutoring route on teachers	51
Table 53 Extent to which senior leader workload has changed due to involvement in the NTP	52
Table 54 Extent to which teacher workload has changed due to involvement in the NTP	52
Table 55 Change in pupil premium spending on tutoring activities since the pandemic ..	53
Table 56 Use of Covid-19 Recovery Premium budget to fund tutoring to support pupils' Covid learning recovery	54
Table 57 Sources of funding used to provide tutoring activities outside of the NTP	54

A Quantitative Methodology

As part of a mixed-methods approach, all schools in England were invited to respond to an online school survey in March 2022. It was sent to the headteacher and they were asked to either complete the survey or for it be completed by another senior leaders with an oversight of education recovery. To obtain views from classroom teachers involved in the NTP, senior leaders were asked to share the survey with teachers. All questions in the survey were closed and, where appropriate, included drop-down categories, rating scales and 'not applicable' response options. Respondents were routed to different survey questions depending on their role and participation in the NTP routes.

Responses were received from 821 members of staff, including those with partially complete survey responses: 665 senior leaders; 52 middle leaders; and 104 classroom teachers. For analysis purposes, middle leaders and classroom teachers were combined. This appendix discusses the statistical analysis undertaken on the survey responses.

Statistical Analysis

The data collected from the IPE survey was analysed through a series of frequency tables and cross-tabulations by school phase, NTP route participation, school-level FSM quintile and school geographical location. No inferential statistics or confidence tests have been conducted as part of this analysis.

For the numerical variables, means and standard deviations have been calculated, both at the overall level and by the cross-tabulation variables as appropriate. For one question concerning the maximum number of pupils tutored together in a tutoring session, outliers were defined as more than 3 standard deviations above the mean. This resulted in 5 cases flagged as an outlier. These cases were excluded from the analysis undertaken on this question.

There are a number of questions that have collected data using a Likert scale. All but one use a 5-point scale, with a 6 representing 'Don't know/Not applicable'. The only question not using a 5-point scale used a 3-point scale and did not offer 'Don't know/Not applicable' response option. Questions where responses are presented in the form of a Likert scale have been analysed into two ways. Proportions answering within each value on the scale are presented, both overall and split by the requested variables.

As part of the analysis, a number of variables have been derived, as shown below in Table 1.

Table 1 Derived analysis variables

Characteristic	Derived variable
Role	Senior Leader
Role	Middle leader or classroom teacher
NTP route participation	No NTP Scheme
NTP route participation	TP only
NTP route participation	AM only*
NTP route participation	SLT only
NTP route participation	TP & AM
NTP route participation	TP & SLT
NTP route participation	AM & SLT
NTP route participation	All pillars
Phase	All through*
Phase	Primary
Phase	Secondary (Includes middle deemed secondary)
Phase	N/A (Special schools and alternative provision)

*These derived variables had a sample size of less than 10.

The FSM quintiles were calculated using a subset of Get Information About Schools (GIAS) data¹, with separate derivations for each of the phases represented in the data (Table 2).

Table 2 Derived FSM quintile for each phase

FSM Quintile	Primary	Secondary	All Through	N/A
Lowest 20%	0 – 8.5	0-10.3	1.9 - 12.74	0
Medium-lowest 20%	>8.5 - 14.1	>10.3 - 15.4	>12.74 - 20.46	>0 - 34.0
Middle 20%	>14.1 - 21.7	>15.4 - 21.46	>20.36 - 27.4	>34 - 43.94

¹ GIAS is the Department for Education's (DfE) register of educational establishments in England and Wales. It contains vital information about children's centres, academies, free schools, maintained schools, independent schools, further education colleges (further education and sixth form corporations, specialist designated colleges and special post 16 institutions) and higher education institutions.

Medium-highest 20%	>21.7 - 33.5	>21.46 - 30.1	>27.4 - 36.18	>43.94 - 55.82
Highest 20%	>33.5 - 86.5	>30.1 - 68.4	>36.18 - 69.0	>55.82 - 100

Taken from <https://www.get-information-schools.service.gov.uk/Downloads> on the 25th April 2022

The results of these analyses can be found in the data tables below in Section B.

B Data Tables

This appendix contains the results of the statistical analysis (frequencies and cross-tabulations) included in this report.

Participation in the National Tutoring Programme (Chapter 2)

Table 3 Survey respondents' participation in the NTP routes

Route in which their school is participating	Number N	Percentage %
Tuition Partners	279	34
Academic Mentors	103	13
School-Led Tutoring	585	71
We are not currently using any of the NTP routes	90	11
I'm not sure	10	6

Base: All senior leaders, middle leaders, and classroom teachers (N=821).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 4 Survey respondents' participation in the NTP routes by phase

Phase	Tuition Partners % (N)	Academic Mentors % (N)	School-Led Tutoring % (N)	We are not currently using any NTP routes % (N)	I'm not sure % (N)	Total N
Primary	29% (183)	10% (62)	71% (445)	12% (77)	5% (6)	625
Secondary	51% (90)	22% (40)	75% (133)	3% (5)	11% (4)	178
All-through	25% (1)	25% (1)	25% (1)	25% (1)	0% (0)	4
N/A	36% (5)	0% (0)	43% (6)	50% (7)	0% (0)	14
Total N	279	103	585	90	10	821

Base: All senior leaders, middle leaders, and classroom teachers in each school phase (see each row for N).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 5 Survey respondents' participation in the NTP routes by FSM quintile

Phase	Tuition Partners % (N)	Academic Mentors % (N)	School-Led Tutoring % (N)	We are not currently using any NTP routes % (N)	I'm not sure % (N)	Total N
Lowest 20%	21% (28)	7% (9)	70% (94)	16% (22)	8% (2)	135
Medium-lowest 20%	29% (45)	5% (7)	71% (110)	12% (19)	7% (2)	154
Middle 20%	37% (67)	8% (14)	71% (128)	9% (17)	6% (2)	180
Medium-highest 20%	41% (79)	18% (35)	73% (141)	8% (16)	7% (3)	192
Highest 20%	39% (59)	24% (37)	69% (105)	11% (16)	4% (1)	152
Missing	13% (1)	13% (1)	88% (7)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8
Total N	279	103	585	90	10	821

Base: All senior leaders, middle leaders, and classroom teachers in each FSM quintile (see each row for N).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 6 The main reasons schools chose to use the School-Led Tutoring grant

Reason	Percentage %	Number N
The school wanted to use tutors pupils were already familiar with	72	337
The SLT grant offered the opportunity to use tutors who we as a school think best meet the needs of our pupils	69	322

Reason	Percentage %	Number N
The SLT grant gave us the opportunity to train and pay staff who were already providing tutoring	21	99
The SLT grant offered the opportunity to expand the school's tutoring offer	36	167
The SLT grant offered the opportunity to train internal staff as tutors	30	138
The SLT grant can be used to provide tutoring to disadvantaged pupils	55	258
The school has autonomy over the delivery of tutoring in school	76	354
Other	5	23
Not sure	<1	1

Base: All senior leaders taking part in the SLT route (N=466).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 7 The main reasons schools chose not to use the School-Led Tutoring grant by phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

Reason	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All-through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
The grant is insufficient to cover the cost of providing tutoring in school	30% (40)	21% (6)	33% (1)	14% (1)	28% (48)
An insufficient number of our pupils are covered by the SLT grant	7% (9)	3% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	6% (10)
The school has been unable to identify any suitable candidates to become tutors	17% (22)	10% (3)	67% (2)	14% (1)	16% (28)

Reason	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All- through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
My school preferred a different route of the NTP	30% (39)	38% (11)	0% (0)	14% (1)	30% (51)
There is not sufficient time and resource in school to manage and deliver the tutoring	38% (50)	45% (13)	33% (1)	14% (1)	38% (65)
My school has concerns about whether the programme represents value for money	14% (19)	7% (2)	33% (1)	0% (0)	13% (22)
My school does not think the programme will improve pupil outcomes	8% (11)	0% (0)	33% (1)	0% (0)	7% (12)
My school does not need/want to use tutoring at this time	7% (9)	7% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	6% (11)
Other	15% (20)	10% (3)	0% (0)	57% (4)	16% (27)
Not sure	8% (10)	17% (5)	0% (0)	14% (1)	9% (16)
Total N =	132	29	3	7	171

Base: All senior leaders not taking part in the SLT route (N=171).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

**Table 8 The main reasons schools chose to use Tuition Partners by phase
(percentages refer to proportion of column totals)**

Reason	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All-through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
TP offered the opportunity to choose the subject in which each pupil receives tuition	22% (32)	25% (18)	0% (0)	60% (3)	24% (53)
My school liked the delivery model of TP (e.g. having external tutors who deliver tutoring over a 15 hour block of sessions)	45% (64)	37% (26)	0% (0)	40% (2)	42% (92)
My school wanted to offer small group and individual tutoring	59% (84)	62% (44)	0% (0)	60% (3)	60% (131)
TP does not rely on the school's internal staff capacity	57% (82)	61% (43)	100% (1)	80% (4)	59% (130)
70% of TP costs were subsidised	86% (123)	79% (56)	0% (0)	40% (2)	82% (181)
My school felt confident in the quality of the TPs	30% (43)	27% (19)	0% (0)	40% (2)	29% (64)
TP offered the opportunity to expand the school's tutoring offer	27% (38)	37% (26)	100% (1)	60% (3)	31% (68)
TP can be used to provide tutoring to disadvantaged pupils	50% (71)	54% (38)	100% (1)	40% (2)	51% (112)
My school accessed TP last year as part of the NTP and wanted to continue with the same support	32% (46)	46% (33)	0% (0)	40% (2)	37% (81)

Reason	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All-through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
My school was already working with the tutoring organisation before the NTP began and so transferred on to the TP route when it started.	13% (19)	23% (16)	0% (0)	20% (1)	16% (36)
Other	6% (8)	4% (3)	0% (0)	20% (1)	5% (12)
Not sure	1% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	<1% (1)
Total N =	143	71	1	5	220

Base: All senior leaders taking part in the TP route (N=220).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022)

Table 9 The main reasons schools chose not to use Tuition Partners by phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

Reason	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All- through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
My school is not able to meet the 30% funding requirement	15% (52)	10% (6)	0% (0)	13% (1)	14% (59)
The number of hours of tuition allowed per pupil within TP does not meet the needs of the school	9% (31)	3% (2)	33% (1)	0% (0)	8% (34)
My school preferred a different route of the NTP	30% (101)	44% (28)	67% (2)	0% (0)	32% (131)
Difficulties with the online booking system	5% (16)	6% (4)	0% (0)	13% (1)	5% (21)

Reason	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All- through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Insufficient time and resource to complete the application	9% (30)	3% (2)	33% (1)	0% (0)	8% (33)
Insufficient time and resource to manage the tutoring in school	18% (60)	22% (14)	33% (1)	13% (1)	18% (76)
My school preferred to use our own staff who are known to pupils	70% (238)	68% (43)	33% (1)	63% (5)	69% (287)
My school has concerns about the quality of TP	32% (110)	57% (36)	67% (2)	13% (1)	36% (149)
My school has concerns about whether the programme represents value for money	25% (84)	49% (31)	33% (1)	0% (0)	28% (116)
My school does not think the programme will improve pupil outcomes	14% (46)	21% (13)	67% (2)	0% (0)	15% (61)
My preferred tutoring organisation is not an NTP provider	3% (10)	5% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	3% (13)
My school does not need/want to use tutoring at this time	5% (17)	5% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (20)
Other	16% (55)	16% (10)	0% (0)	38% (3)	16% (68)
Not sure	2% (8)	2% (1)	0% (0)	13% (1)	2% (10)
Total N =	339	63	3	8	413

Base: All senior leaders not taking part in the TP route (N=413).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 10 The main reasons schools chose to use Academic Mentors by phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

Reason	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All-through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
My school valued the opportunity to have AMs as an employee of the school	52% (28)	50% (15)	0% (0)	0% (0)	51% (43)
AMs can work closely within my school with classroom teachers and leaders	63% (34)	70% (21)	100% (1)	0% (0)	66% (56)
The AM route provided school autonomy over delivery in school	54% (29)	73% (22)	100% (1)	0% (0)	61% (52)
The AM route can be tailored to suit my school and pupils	67% (36)	63% (19)	100% (1)	0% (0)	66% (56)
The AMs can be guided by our classroom teachers	65% (35)	70% (21)	0% (0)	0% (0)	66% (56)
My school felt confident in the quality of the AMs	28% (15)	27% (8)	0% (0)	0% (0)	27% (23)
95% of the AM cost were subsidised this year	89% (48)	73% (22)	100% (1)	0% (0)	84% (71)
AM can be used to provide tutoring to disadvantaged pupils	57% (31)	67% (20)	0% (0)	0% (0)	60% (51)
My school accessed AM last year as part of the NTP and wanted to continue with the same support	31% (17)	40% (12)	0% (0)	0% (0)	34% (29)
Other	6% (3)	3% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (4)
Not sure	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Total N =	54	30	1	0	85

Base: All senior leaders taking part in the AM route (N=85).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 11 The main reasons schools chose not to use Academic Mentors by phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

Reason	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All- through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
My school is not eligible for Academic Mentors	13% (54)	29% (30)	0% (0)	0% (0)	15% (84)
My school is not able to fund the costs of academic mentor(s)	15% (62)	7% (7)	0% (0)	8% (1)	13% (70)
My school preferred a different route of the NTP	23% (99)	21% (22)	33% (1)	15% (2)	23% (124)
Difficulties with the online booking system	3% (13)	4% (4)	0% (0)	8% (1)	3% (18)
Insufficient time and resource to complete the application	5% (21)	4% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (25)
Insufficient time and resource to manage the tutoring in school	9% (37)	9% (9)	33% (1)	23% (3)	9% (50)
My school preferred to use our own staff who are known to pupils	47% (199)	32% (33)	33% (1)	54% (7)	44% (240)
My school has concerns about the quality of AM	16% (68)	18% (19)	33% (1)	8% (1)	16% (89)
My school has concerns about whether the programme represents value for money	11% (48)	14% (15)	33% (1)	0% (0)	12% (64)
My school does not think the programme will improve pupil outcomes	9% (39)	10% (10)	33% (1)	0% (0)	9% (50)

Reason	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All- through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
My preferred mentoring organisation is not an NTP provider	2% (9)	1% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (10)
My school does not need/want to use mentoring at this time	9% (39)	12% (12)	0% (0)	0% (0)	9% (51)
Other	16% (66)	13% (14)	0% (0)	31% (4)	15% (84)
Not sure	6% (24)	5% (5)	0% (0)	8% (1)	6% (30)
Total N =	424	104	3	13	544

Base: All senior leaders not taking part in the AM route (N=544).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 12 Intention to participate in Tuition Partners in the future by Phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

Intention to participate	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All-through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Yes	6% (18)	10% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)	6% (24)
No	58% (185)	55% (33)	100% (3)	38% (3)	57% (224)
Not sure	37% (117)	35% (21)	0% (0)	63% (5)	37% (143)
Total N	320	60	3	8	391

Base: Senior leaders not taking part in the TP route (N=391).

A single response question. Due to rounding the percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 13 Intention to participate in Academic Mentors in the future by Phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All-through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Yes	7% (28)	12% (12)	0% (0)	8% (1)	8% (41)
No	53% (211)	51% (52)	100% (3)	38% (5)	52% (271)
Not sure	40% (161)	37% (37)	0% (0)	54% (7)	40% (205)
Total N =	400	101	3	13	517

Base: Senior leaders not taking part in the AM route (N=517).

A single response question. Due to rounding the percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 14 Intention to participate in School-Led Tutoring in the future by Phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All-through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Yes	22% (28)	17% (5)	0% (0)	14% (1)	21% (34)
No	22% (28)	17% (5)	67% (2)	57% (4)	24% (39)
Not sure	56% (70)	66% (19)	33% (1)	29% (2)	56% (92)
Total N =	126	29	3	7	165

Base: Senior leaders not taking part in the SLT route (N=165).

A single response question. Due to rounding the percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 15 Factors that would increase the likelihood of schools using the School-Led Tutoring grant in the future (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

Factors	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All-through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Increasing the grant available to cover the cost of providing tutors	52% (50)	50% (12)	0% (0)	17% (1)	49% (63)

Factors	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All-through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Expanding the proportion of pupils covered by the SLT grant	24% (23)	25% (6)	33% (1)	17% (1)	24% (31)
Reduce the burden of managing SLT funded tutors in school	42% (40)	54% (13)	67% (2)	0% (0)	43% (55)
Having suitable candidates to deliver SLT in school	31% (30)	50% (12)	67% (2)	0% (0)	34% (44)
More information about the SLT grant	20% (19)	25% (6)	33% (1)	33% (2)	22% (28)
Other	8% (8)	8% (2)	0% (0)	50% (3)	10% (13)
Nothing would increase the likelihood of my school using SLT in future	9% (9)	0% (0)	33% (1)	17% (1)	9% (11)
I'm not sure	7% (7)	8% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (9)
Total N	96	24	3	6	129

Base: Senior leaders who said they do not or are not sure about accessing SLT in future (N=129).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 16 Factors that would increase the likelihood of schools using Tuition Partners in the future (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

Factors	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All-through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Increasing the subsidy provided to schools for TP	44% (132)	41% (22)	0% (0)	13% (1)	42% (155)
Extending the hours of tuition allowed per pupil	13% (40)	6% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	12% (43)

Factors	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All- through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Shortening the hours of tuition allowed per pupil	2% (5)	7% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (9)
A different model of TP tutoring delivery	19% (57)	28% (15)	33% (1)	13% (1)	20% (74)
Making it easier to identify providers that meet my school's needs	34% (102)	46% (25)	0% (0)	63% (5)	36% (132)
More information about the TP route	16% (47)	11% (6)	0% (0)	13% (1)	15% (54)
Other	8% (23)	17% (9)	33% (1)	38% (3)	10% (36)
Nothing would increase the likelihood of my school using TP in future	24% (72)	15% (8)	33% (1)	13% (1)	22% (82)
I'm not sure	8% (24)	9% (5)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (29)
Total N	301	54	3	8	366

Base: Senior leaders who said they do not or are not sure about accessing TP in future (N=366).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 17 Factors that would increase the likelihood of schools using Academic Mentors in the future (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

Factors	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All- through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Changing the eligibility criteria for the AM Programme	18% (65)	38% (34)	0% (0)	17% (2)	21% (101)
Increasing the subsidy provided to schools for AMs	30% (111)	24% (21)	0% (0)	8% (1)	28% (133)
Making the AM application and/or matching process easier	20% (74)	25% (22)	0% (0)	17% (2)	21% (98)
More information about the AM route	23% (86)	26% (23)	0% (0)	25% (3)	24% (112)

Factors	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All- through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Other	8% (29)	4% (4)	33% (1)	50% (6)	8% (40)
Nothing would increase the likelihood of my school accessing AM in future	25% (92)	13% (12)	33% (1)	0% (0)	22% (105)
I'm not sure	15% (55)	17% (15)	33% (1)	17% (2)	15% (73)
Total N	370	89	3	12	474

Base: Senior leaders who said they do not or are not sure about accessing AM in future (N=474).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 18 Tutoring provision among schools not participating in any NTP

Are you providing tutoring outside of the NTP?	Percentage %	Number N
Yes	63	47
No	37	28

Base: Senior leaders not using any NTP route (N=75).

A single response question. Due to rounding the percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 19 Tutoring support used by schools instead of the NTP routes

Reason	Percentage %	Number N
Use our own teachers as tutors	74	34
Use other internal staff as tutors (e.g. teaching assistants)	59	27

Reason	Percentage %	Number N
Use external teachers who we have worked with in the past (e.g. supply teachers)	24	11
Use external tutors who we have worked with in the past.	7	3
Use external tutors who are new to our school.	4	2

Base: Senior leaders not using any NTP route but who provide other tutoring (N=46).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Implementation of the National Tutoring Programme (Chapter 3)

Table 20 Pupils being prioritised by school to receive School-Led Tutoring (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

Pupil group	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All- through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Pupils eligible for Pupil Premium	90% (300)	98% (97)	100% (1)	83% (5)	91% (403)
Pupils eligible for free school meals	54% (180)	72% (71)	0% (0)	67% (4)	58% (255)
Pupils with SEND	34% (115)	66% (65)	0% (0)	83% (5)	42% (185)
Pupils who have fallen the furthest behind in their learning	84% (282)	85% (84)	100% (1)	67% (4)	84% (371)
Pupils with low prior attainment	42% (140)	28% (28)	0% (0)	33% (2)	39% (170)
Pupils with English as an additional language	15% (50)	18% (18)	0% (0)	33% (2)	16% (70)

Pupil group	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All- through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Other vulnerable pupils (e.g. young carers, looked after children or children who have a social worker)	50% (166)	57% (56)	0% (0)	50% (3)	51% (225)
Other	3% (11)	4% (4)	0% (0)	17% (1)	4% (16)
We haven't decided yet	<1% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	<1% (1)
I'm not sure	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Total N	335	99	1	6	441

Base: Senior leaders using the SLT grant (N=441).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 21 Subjects prioritised for School-Led Tutoring by phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

Subject	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All- through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Maths	87% (281)	93% (88)	100% (1)	50% (3)	88% (373)
English	96% (311)	94% (89)	100% (1)	67% (4)	95% (405)
Science	0% (0)	60% (57)	0% (0)	33% (2)	14% (59)
Humanities	0% (0)	35% (33)	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (33)
Modern Foreign Languages	0% (0)	32% (30)	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (30)
Art subjects	0% (0)	12% (11)	0% (0)	0% (0)	3% (11)

Subject	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All- through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Other subjects	2% (5)	15% (14)	0% (0)	33% (2)	5% (21)
We haven't decided yet	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
I'm not sure	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Total N =	324	95	1	6	426

Base: Senior leaders using the SLT grant (N=441).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 22 When School-Led Tutoring sessions are delivered by phase (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All-through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Before school	28% (92)	21% (20)	0% (0)	0% (0)	26% (112)
During lesson time	66% (214)	47% (45)	0% (0)	50% (3)	61% (262)
During lunchtime	9% (28)	14% (13)	0% (0)	17% (1)	10% (42)
After school	54% (174)	72% (68)	100% (1)	17% (1)	57% (244)
Other	2% (8)	15% (14)	0% (0)	17% (1)	5% (23)
We haven't decided yet	<1% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	<1% (1)
Not sure	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Total N =	325	95	1	6	427

Base: Senior leaders using the SLT grant (N=427).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 23 When School-Led Tutoring sessions are delivered by FSM quintile (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

	Lowest 20% % (N)	Medium-lowest 20% % (N)	Middle 20% % (N)	Medium-highest 20% % (N)	Highest 20% % (N)	Missing % (N)
Before school	19% (13)	20% (17)	26% (23)	38% (39)	23% (18)	67% (2)
During lesson time	66% (45)	63% (53)	64% (58)	56% (58)	58% (46)	67% (2)
During lunchtime	12% (8)	6% (5)	10% (9)	9% (9)	14% (11)	0% (0)
After school	41% (28)	56% (47)	52% (47)	66% (68)	66% (52)	67% (2)
Other	3% (2)	8% (7)	6% (5)	6% (6)	4% (3)	0% (0)
We haven't decided yet	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (1)	0% (0)
Not sure	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Total N =	68	84	90	103	79	3

Base: Senior leaders using the SLT grant (N=427).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 24 Frequency of School-Led Tutoring sessions in schools (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All-through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Less than once a week	<1% (1)	7% (7)	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (8)
Once a week	57% (184)	78% (74)	100% (1)	67% (4)	62% (263)
Twice a week	39% (128)	31% (29)	0% (0)	17% (1)	37% (158)
Three times a week	22% (71)	13% (12)	0% (0)	17% (1)	20% (84)
Four times a week	6% (20)	3% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (23)
Every day	12% (39)	3% (3)	0% (0)	17% (1)	10% (43)
We haven't decided yet	1% (2)	1% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (3)
I'm not sure	1% (3)	1% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (4)
Total N =	325	95	1	6	427

Base: Senior leaders using the SLT grant (N=427).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 25 Length of School-Led Tutoring sessions in schools (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

	Primary % (N)	Secondary %(N)	All-through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Less than 15 minutes	1% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	<1% (2)
15-29 minutes	26% (85)	3% (3)	0% (0)	20% (1)	21% (89)
30-44 minutes	27% (87)	9% (9)	0% (0)	0% (0)	23% (96)
45-60 minutes	44% (142)	81% (77)	0% (0)	60% (3)	52% (222)
Over 60 minutes long	2% (5)	6% (6)	100% (1)	0% (0)	3% (12)
We haven't decided yet	<1% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	<1% (1)
I'm not sure	1% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (1)	1% (3)
Total N =	324	95	1	5	425

Base: Senior leaders using the SLT grant (N=425)

A single response question. Due to rounding the percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022)

Tutors involved in School-Led Tutoring (Chapter 4)

Table 26 How schools have chosen to spend the School-Led Tutoring grant so far (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All-through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
To pay for external staff or private tutors to deliver tutoring	30% (101)	43% (43)	100% (1)	33% (2)	33% (147)
To pay for internal staff to deliver tutoring	81% (273)	78% (77)	100% (1)	83% (5)	81% (356)

	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All-through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
To pay to cover the duties of internal staff released for tutoring	17% (56)	8% (8)	0% (0)	17% (1)	15% (65)
We haven't started spending the SLT grant yet	1% (4)	1% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	1% (5)
Other	1% (3)	1% (1)	0% (0)	17% (1)	1% (5)
I'm not sure	<1% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	<1% (1)
Total N =	335	99	1	6	441

Base: Senior leaders using the SLT grant (N=441).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 27 Types of staff employed by the school to deliver School-Led Tutoring (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All-through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
Qualified teachers permanently employed at the school	61% (205)	67% (66)	100% (1)	17% (1)	62% (273)
Qualified teachers who are not permanently employed at the school	37% (123)	37% (37)	0% (0)	33% (2)	37% (162)
Teaching assistants	45% (151)	31% (31)	100% (1)	33% (2)	42% (185)
Private tutors	12% (13)	43% (19)	0% (0)	0% (0)	21% (32)
Other external individuals	4% (4)	25% (11)	100% (1)	50% (1)	11% (17)
Other internal staff	5% (15)	18% (14)	0% (0)	20% (1)	8% (30)

	Primary % (N)	Secondary % (N)	All-through % (N)	N/A % (N)	Overall % (N)
We haven't decided yet	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Total N =	335	99	1	6	441

Base: Senior leaders using the SLT grant (N=441).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 28 Number of tutors schools have funded using the School-Led Tutoring grant by phase

Phase	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Median	N
Primary	5	4.7	1	30	3	318
Secondary	13	15.9	0	95	9	89
All-through	10	-	10	10	10	1
Not applicable	2	1.0	1	3	2	5
Overall	6	9.2	0	95	3	413

Base: Senior leaders using the SLT grant (N=413)

An open numerical question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 29 Pupil numbers tutored per term and per session

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min.	Max.	Median	N
Number of pupils tutored per term by each tutor	14	15.6	0	99	9	411
Maximum number of pupils tutored together in each tutoring session	4	2.3	1	20	4	406

Base: Senior leaders using the SLT grant (N=411 and 406).

An open numerical question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 30 Perceived effectiveness of the School-Led Tutoring training at equipping tutors for delivering high quality tutoring by role (percentages refer to proportion of column totals)

Effectiveness	Senior Leader % (N)	Middle leader or Classroom Teacher % (N)	Overall % (N)
Very effective	9% (27)	13% (8)	10% (35)
Effective	55% (164)	67% (40)	57% (204)
Neither effective nor ineffective	31% (94)	12% (7)	28% (101)
Ineffective	3% (10)	5% (3)	4% (13)
Very ineffective	1% (4)	3% (2)	2% (6)
Total N =	299	60	359

Base: Senior leaders using the SLT grant and middle leaders/classroom teachers involved in SLT (N=359).

A single response question. Due to rounding the percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Satisfaction with the National Tutoring Programme (Chapter 5)

Table 31 Perceived satisfaction with the NTP overall and by role

Role	Very satisfied % (N)	Satisfied % (N)	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied % (N)	Dissatisfied % (N)	Very dissatisfied % (N)	Total N
Senior Leader	11% (56)	50% (250)	25% (124)	10% (52)	5% (23)	505
Middle Leader or Classroom Teacher	21% (25)	53% (63)	17% (20)	8% (12)	1% (3)	118

Role	Very satisfied % (N)	Satisfied % (N)	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied % (N)	Dissatisfied % (N)	Very dissatisfied % (N)	Total N
Overall	13% (81)	50% (313)	23% (144)	10% (61)	4% (24)	623

Base: Senior leaders, middle leaders and classroom teachers involved in any route (N=623).

A single response question. Due to rounding the percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 32 Perceived satisfaction with the NTP overall and by phase

Phase	Very satisfied % (N)	Satisfied % (N)	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied % (N)	Dissatisfied % (N)	Very dissatisfied % (N)	Total N
Primary	15% (73)	51% (239)	23% (108)	8% (39)	3% (12)	471
Secondary	5% (7)	48% (68)	25% (35)	14% (20)	8% (12)	142
All-through	0% (0)	33% (1)	0% (0)	67% (2)	0% (0)	3
N/A	14% (1)	71% (5)	14% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	7
Overall	13% (81)	50% (313)	23% (144)	10% (61)	4% (24)	623

Base: Senior leaders, middle leaders and classroom teachers involved in any route (N=623).

A single response question. Due to rounding the percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 33 Perceived satisfaction with the Tuition Partners route

	Very satisfied % (N)	Satisfied % (N)	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied % (N)	Dissatisfied % (N)	Very dissatisfied % (N)	Total N
Quality of tuition	22% (44)	58% (115)	11% (22)	6% (12)	3% (5)	198
Tutors' relationships with pupils	24% (47)	59% (115)	12% (24)	4% (8)	1% (2)	196
Tutors' ability to manage pupils' behaviour	23% (44)	50% (94)	20% (38)	6% (11)	1% (1)	188
How well tuition aligns with the school's curriculum	18% (34)	60% (117)	17% (33)	3% (6)	2% (4)	194
Feedback from tutors on pupils	16% (30)	56% (107)	16% (30)	10% (20)	2% (4)	191
Feedback from pupils on tutors	16% (31)	59% (112)	16% (31)	7% (14)	2% (3)	191
Tutors' flexibility around delivery	20% (40)	50% (98)	15% (30)	10% (20)	4% (8)	196
Tutors' support with pupil attendance at tutoring sessions	10% (19)	42% (76)	31% (56)	14% (26)	3% (6)	183

	Very satisfied % (N)	Satisfied % (N)	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied % (N)	Dissatisfied % (N)	Very dissatisfied % (N)	Total N
Tutors' use of feedback they have received from teachers	15% (27)	49% (89)	27% (49)	9% (16)	1% (2)	183
Tutors' support to identify/monitor any issues	14% (27)	50% (96)	22% (42)	11% (22)	3% (5)	192
Tutors' ability to meet pupils' learning needs	19% (37)	59% (116)	13% (25)	7% (14)	2% (3)	195
Tutors' relationships with teachers	20% (37)	49% (88)	22% (40)	8% (14)	1% (2)	181
The Tuition Partners route overall	13% (27)	54% (109)	14% (28)	13% (27)	5% (10)	201

Base: Senior leaders, middle leaders and classroom teachers involved in TP (see rows for N)

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022)

Table 34 Perceived satisfaction with the Academic Mentors route

	Very satisfied % (N)	Satisfied % (N)	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied % (N)	Dissatisfied % (N)	Very dissatisfied % (N)	Total N
Quality of mentors	34% (23)	49% (33)	12% (8)	4% (3)	0% (0)	67
Mentors' relationships with pupils	42% (28)	45% (30)	9% (6)	4% (3)	0% (0)	67
Mentors' ability to manage pupils' behaviour	24% (16)	55% (37)	12% (8)	9% (6)	0% (0)	67
How well mentoring aligns with the school's curriculum	31% (21)	54% (36)	10% (7)	4% (3)	0% (0)	67
Feedback from mentors on pupils	29% (19)	57% (37)	8% (5)	6% (4)	0% (0)	65
Feedback from pupils on mentors	27% (16)	50% (30)	17% (10)	5% (3)	2% (1)	60
Mentors' flexibility around delivery	34% (23)	49% (33)	21% (8)	4% (3)	0% (0)	67
Mentors' support with pupil attendance at mentoring sessions	23% (15)	43% (28)	25% (16)	8% (5)	2% (1)	65

	Very satisfied % (N)	Satisfied % (N)	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied % (N)	Dissatisfied % (N)	Very dissatisfied % (N)	Total N
Mentors' use of feedback they have received from teachers	30% (20)	48% (32)	17% (11)	5% (3)	0% (0)	66
Mentors' support to identify/monitor any issues	29% (19)	46% (30)	15% (10)	9% (6)	0% (0)	65
Mentors' ability to meet pupils' learning needs	30% (20)	51% (34)	7% (5)	12% (8)	0% (0)	67
Mentors' relationships with teachers	35% (23)	58% (38)	5% (3)	3% (2)	0% (0)	66
The Academic Mentors route overall	25% (17)	49% (33)	13% (9)	9% (6)	3% (2)	67

Base: Senior leaders, middle leaders and classroom teachers involved in AM (see rows for N).

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 35 Perceived satisfaction with the School-Led Tutoring route

	Very satisfied % (N)	Satisfied % (N)	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied % (N)	Dissatisfied % (N)	Very dissatisfied % (N)	Total N
Quality of tuition	54% (218)	44% (175)	2% (7)	<1% (1)	0% (0)	401
Tutors' relationships with pupils	62% (246)	35% (141)	3% (12)	0% (0)	0% (0)	399
Tutors' ability to manage pupils' behaviour	58% (232)	38% (151)	4% (16)	<1% (1)	0% (0)	400
How well tuition aligns with the school's curriculum	55% (221)	42% (167)	3% (10)	1% (2)	0% (0)	400
Feedback from tutors on pupils	46% (180)	49% (194)	4% (16)	1% (3)	0% (0)	393
Feedback from pupils on tutors	43% (161)	48% (179)	8% (31)	0% (0)	<1% (1)	372
Tutors' flexibility around delivery	53% (207)	41% (162)	4% (17)	2% (7)	<1% (1)	394
Tutors' support with pupil attendance at tutoring sessions	39% (148)	43% (162)	15% (56)	2% (7)	1% (3)	376

	Very satisfied % (N)	Satisfied % (N)	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied % (N)	Dissatisfied % (N)	Very dissatisfied % (N)	Total N
Tutors' use of feedback they have received from teachers	45% (166)	49% (183)	6% (22)	<1% (1)	0% (0)	372
Tutors' support to identify/monitor any issues	47% (187)	48% (190)	4% (16)	<1% (1)	0% (0)	394
Tutors' ability to meet pupils' learning needs	55% (220)	42% (166)	3% (12)	<1% (1)	0% (0)	399
Tutors' relationships with teachers	58% (223)	38% (147)	4% (14)	0% (0)	0% (0)	384
The Tuition Partners route overall	42% (166)	50% (201)	5% (18)	3% (10)	1% (4)	399

Base: Senior leaders, middle leaders and classroom teachers involved in SLT (see rows for N)

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022)

Table 36 Perceived satisfaction with the non-NTP tutoring

	Very satisfied % (N)	Satisfied % (N)	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied % (N)	Dissatisfied % (N)	Very dissatisfied % (N)	Total N
Quality of tuition	60% (71)	38% (45)	1% (1)	0% (0)	1% (1)	118
Tutors' relationships with pupils	69% (81)	30% (35)	1% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	117
Tutors' ability to manage pupils' behaviour	62% (72)	38% (44)	1% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	117
How well tuition aligns with the school's curriculum	63% (74)	35% (41)	1% (1)	1% (1)	0% (0)	117
Feedback from tutors on pupils	53% (62)	41% (48)	5% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)	116
Feedback from pupils on tutors	49% (55)	45% (51)	5% (6)	0% (0)	1% (1)	113
Tutors' flexibility around delivery	57% (65)	37% (43)	4% (5)	2% (2)	0% (0)	115
Tutors' support with pupil attendance at tutoring sessions	44% (47)	45% (49)	9% (10)	2% (2)	0% (0)	108
Tutors' use of feedback they have received from teachers	53% (60)	42% (48)	3% (3)	2% (2)	1% (1)	114
Tutors' support to identify/ monitor any issues	57% (67)	41% (48)	1% (1)	1% (1)	0% (0)	117
Tutors' ability to meet pupils' learning needs	59% (70)	37% (44)	2% (2)	1% (1)	1% (1)	118
Tutors' relationships with teachers	66% (76)	33% (38)	1% (1)	0% (0)	1% (1)	116
The Tuition Partners route overall	58% (68)	40% (47)	1% (1)	0% (0)	1% (1)	117

Base: Senior leaders, middle leaders and classroom teachers involved in non-NTP tutoring (see rows for N).
A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 37 School confidence in ability to access high quality tutoring when needed

Effectiveness	Percentage %	Number N
Very confident	21	119
Confident	45	261
Neither confident nor unconfident	20	117
Unconfident	11	65
Very unconfident	2	13

Base: All senior leaders (N=575).

A single response question. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 38 School confidence in ability to access high quality tutoring when needed compared to prior to the pandemic

	Percentage %	Number N
Yes, I am more confident now than before the pandemic	39	225
My confidence level has not changed	51	295
No, I am less confident now than before the pandemic	10	55

Base: All senior leaders (N=575).

A single response question. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Perceived impact of the National Tutoring Programme on pupils, schools and staff (Chapter 6)

Table 39 Perceived impact of the Tuition Partners route on pupils overall

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...	Strongly agree % (N)	Agree % (N)	Neither agree nor disagree % (N)	Disagree % (N)	Strongly disagree % (N)	Total N
TP is helping pupils to catch up with their peers	8% (20)	63 % (150)	18% (44)	8% (18)	3% (7)	239
TP is improving pupils' attainment	7% (16)	60% (139)	26% (60)	5% (12)	3% (6)	233
TP is improving pupils' self-confidence	15% (38)	64% (157)	16% (39)	3% (8)	2% (4)	246

Base: questions asked of senior leaders, middle leaders and classroom teachers involved in TP (see each row for N).

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 40 Perceived impact of the Tuition Partners route on schools overall

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...	Strongly agree % (N)	Agree % (N)	Neither agree nor disagree % (N)	Disagree % (N)	Strongly disagree % (N)	Total N
TP is supporting my school to reduce the attainment gap for disadvantaged pupils	5% (10)	67% (131)	21% (41)	5% (10)	2% (4)	196
TP is well aligned to the curriculum and learning needs of pupils	8% (17)	65% (134)	16% (32)	8% (16)	3% (6)	205
TP is improving teaching capacity in school	5% (10)	38% (79)	30% (61)	20% (41)	7% (15)	206

Base: questions asked of senior leaders involved in TP (see each row for N).

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 41 Impact of the Tuition Partners route on teachers overall

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...	Strongly agree % (N)	Agree % (N)	Neither agree nor disagree % (N)	Disagree % (N)	Strongly disagree % (N)	Total N
TP is supporting me to meet the teaching and learning needs of my pupils	15% (6)	51% (21)	20% (8)	10% (4)	5% (2)	41
The tutors and I liaise regularly to discuss pupils needs and pupils progress	17% (7)	36% (15)	17% (7)	14% (6)	17% (7)	42

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...	Strongly agree % (N)	Agree % (N)	Neither agree nor disagree % (N)	Disagree % (N)	Strongly disagree % (N)	Total N
I find it easy to accommodate pupils missing lesson time for tutoring	6% (2)	32% (10)	32% (10)	13% (4)	16% (5)	31
I have to spend time helping pupils catch up on learning they missed while attending tutoring sessions	12% (4)	9% (3)	27% (9)	39% (13)	12% (4)	33
TP is improving my teaching capacity	7% (3)	26% (11)	28% (12)	26% (11)	14% (6)	43

Base: questions asked of middle leaders and classroom teachers involved in TP (see each row for N).

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 42 Perceived impact of the Tuition Partners route on pupils in primary schools

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...	Strongly agree % (N)	Agree % (N)	Neither agree nor disagree % (N)	Disagree % (N)	Strongly disagree % (N)	Total N
TP is helping pupils to catch up with their peers	12% (18)	65% (101)	15% (23)	7% (11)	1% (2)	155
TP is improving pupils' attainment	10% (15)	61% (95)	23% (36)	5% (7)	1% (2)	155
TP is improving pupils' self-confidence	21% (33)	67% (107)	10% (16)	2% (3)	0% (0)	159

Base: questions asked of senior leaders, middle leaders and classroom teachers in primary schools involved in TP (see each row for N).

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 43 Perceived impact of the Tuition Partners route on schools in primary schools

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...	Strongly agree % (N)	Agree % (N)	Neither agree nor disagree % (N)	Disagree % (N)	Strongly disagree % (N)	Total N
TP is supporting my school to reduce the attainment gap for disadvantaged pupils	5% (7)	72% (93)	17% (22)	6% (8)	0% (0)	130
TP is well aligned to the curriculum and learning needs of pupils	11% (15)	69% (92)	13% (18)	5% (7)	1% (2)	134
TP is improving teaching capacity in school	7% (9)	44% (60)	30% (41)	14% (19)	4% (6)	135

Base: questions asked of senior leaders in primary schools involved in TP (see each row for N).

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 44 Perceived impact of the Tuition Partners route on teachers in primary schools

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...	Strongly agree % (N)	Agree % (N)	Neither agree nor disagree % (N)	Disagree % (N)	Strongly disagree % (N)	Total N
TP is supporting me to meet the teaching and learning needs of my pupils	22% (6)	56% (15)	19% (5)	0% (0)	4% (1)	27
The tutors and I liaise regularly to discuss pupils needs and pupils progress	22% (6)	41% (11)	11% (3)	15% (4)	11% (3)	27
I find it easy to accommodate pupils missing lesson time for tutoring	9% (2)	36% (8)	27% (6)	14% (3)	14% (3)	22
I have to spend time helping pupils catch up on learning they missed while attending tutoring sessions	19% (4)	5% (1)	38% (8)	29% (6)	10% (2)	21
TP is improving my teaching capacity	11% (3)	36% (10)	25% (7)	21% (6)	7% (2)	28

Base: questions asked of middle leaders and classroom teachers in primary schools involved in TP (see each row for N).

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 45 Perceived impact of the Tuition Partners route on pupils in secondary schools

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...	Strongly agree % (N)	Agree % (N)	Neither agree nor disagree % (N)	Disagree % (N)	Strongly disagree % (N)	Total N
TP is helping pupils to catch up with their peers	3% (2)	61% (48)	23% (18)	9% (7)	5% (4)	79
TP is improving pupils' attainment	1% (1)	58% (42)	29% (21)	7% (5)	4% (3)	72
TP is improving pupils' self-confidence	6% (5)	58% (47)	26% (21)	6% (5)	4% (3)	81

Base: questions asked of senior leaders, middle leaders and classroom teachers in secondary schools involved in TP (see each row for N).

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 46 Perceived impact of the Tuition Partners route on schools in secondary schools

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...	Strongly agree % (N)	Agree % (N)	Neither agree nor disagree % (N)	Disagree % (N)	Strongly disagree % (N)	Total N
TP is supporting my school to reduce the attainment gap for disadvantaged pupils	5% (3)	60% (36)	27% (16)	3% (2)	5% (3)	60
TP is well aligned to the curriculum and learning needs of pupils	3% (2)	58% (38)	22% (14)	12% (8)	5% (3)	65
TP is improving teaching capacity in school	0% (0)	26% (17)	29% (19)	32% (21)	12% (8)	65

Base: questions asked of senior leaders in secondary schools involved in TP (see each row for N).

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022)

Table 47 Perceived impact of the Tuition Partners route on teachers in secondary school

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...	Strongly agree % (N)	Agree % (N)	Neither agree nor disagree % (N)	Disagree % (N)	Strongly disagree % (N)	Total N
TP is supporting me to meet the teaching and learning needs of my pupils	0% (0)	43% (6)	21% (3)	29% (4)	7% (1)	14
The tutors and I liaise regularly to discuss pupils needs and pupils progress	7% (1)	27% (4)	27% (4)	13% (2)	27% (4)	15
I find it easy to accommodate pupils missing lesson time for tutoring	0% (0)	22% (2)	44% (4)	11% (1)	22% (2)	9
I have to spend time helping pupils catch up on learning they missed while attending tutoring sessions	0% (0)	17% (2)	8% (1)	58% (7)	17% (2)	12
TP is improving my teaching capacity	0% (0)	7% (1)	33% (5)	33% (5)	27% (4)	15

Base: Questions asked of middle leaders and classroom teachers in secondary schools involved in TP (see each row for N).

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 48 Perceived impact of the Academic Mentors route on pupils

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...	Strongly agree % (N)	Agree % (N)	Neither agree nor disagree % (N)	Disagree % (N)	Strongly disagree % (N)	Total N
AM is helping pupils to catch up with their peers	18% (15)	66% (52)	10% (8)	5% (4)	0% (0)	79
AM is improving pupils' attainment	17% (13)	65% (50)	13% (10)	5% (4)	0% (0)	77
AM is improving pupils' self-confidence	23% (19)	58% (47)	12% (10)	6% (5)	0% (0)	81

Base: questions asked of senior leaders, middle leaders and classroom teachers involved in AM (see each row for N).

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 49 Perceived impact of the Academic Mentors route on schools

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...	Strongly agree % (N)	Agree % (N)	Neither agree nor disagree % (N)	Disagree % (N)	Strongly disagree % (N)	Total N
AM is supporting my school to reduce the attainment gap for disadvantaged pupils	22% (16)	60% (43)	13% (9)	6% (4)	0% (0)	72
AM is well aligned to the curriculum and learning needs of pupils	27% (20)	55% (40)	10% (7)	8% (6)	0% (0)	73
AM is improving teaching capacity in school	18% (13)	41% (30)	25% (18)	15% (11)	1% (1)	73

Base: asked of senior leaders, middle leaders and classroom teachers involved in AM (see each row for N).

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 50 Perceived impact of the School-Led Tutoring route on pupils

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...	Strongly agree % (N)	Agree % (N)	Neither agree nor disagree % (N)	Disagree % (N)	Strongly disagree % (N)	Total N
SLT is helping pupils to catch up with their peers	19% (92)	70% (347)	9% (45)	1% (6)	1% (4)	494
SLT is improving pupils' attainment	19% (90)	69% (337)	10% (49)	2% (8)	<1% (2)	486
SLT is improving pupils' self-confidence	28% (140)	62% (311)	8% (41)	1% (3)	1% (3)	498

Base: questions asked of senior leaders, middle leaders and classroom teachers involved in SLT (see each row for N).

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 51 Perceived impact of the School-Led Tutoring route on schools

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...	Strongly agree % (N)	Agree % (N)	Neither agree nor disagree % (N)	Disagree % (N)	Strongly disagree % (N)	Total N
SLT is supporting my school to reduce the attainment gap for disadvantaged pupils	18% (74)	67% (272)	12% (50)	2% (7)	1% (3)	406
SLT is well aligned to the curriculum and learning needs of pupils	38% (158)	58% (239)	2% (10)	1% (5)	1% (3)	415
SLT is improving teaching capacity in school	12% (48)	40% (162)	32% (130)	13% (53)	3% (14)	407

Base: questions asked of senior leaders involved in SLT (see each row for N).

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 52 Perceived impact of the School-Led Tutoring route on teachers

To what extent do you agree with the following statements...	Strongly agree % (N)	Agree % (N)	Neither agree nor disagree % (N)	Disagree % (N)	Strongly disagree % (N)	Total N
SLT is supporting me to meet the teaching and learning needs of my pupils	12 (14%)	58 (68%)	10 (12%)	4 (5%)	1 (1%)	85
The tutors and I liaise regularly to discuss pupils needs and pupils progress	23% (18)	49% (39)	15% (12)	11% (9)	1% (1)	79
I find it easy to accommodate pupils missing lesson time for tutoring	9% (5)	29% (17)	29% (17)	22% (13)	10% (6)	58
I have to spend time helping pupils catch up on learning they missed while attending tutoring sessions	12% (8)	24% (16)	24% (16)	22% (15)	19% (13)	68
SLT is improving my teaching capacity	9% (8)	45% (39)	33% (28)	10% (9)	2% (2)	86

Base: questions asked of middle leaders and classroom teachers involved in SLT (see each row for N).

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Impact of the National Tutoring Programme on classroom management and workload (Chapter 8)

Table 53 Extent to which senior leader workload has changed due to involvement in the NTP

Aspect of workload	Decreased to a great extent % (N)	Decreased to a small extent % (N)	No change % (N)	Increased to a small extent % (N)	Increased to a great extent % (N)	Total N
Management of tutoring in school	<1% (1)	1% (3)	5% (13)	45% (115)	48% (124)	256
Administration and preparation	<1% (1)	2% (4)	4% (10)	42% (109)	52% (133)	257
Overall workload as a senior leader	1% (2)	2% (6)	5% (14)	48% (124)	43% (110)	256

Base: Senior leaders involved in TP and/or AM (could also be involved in SLT but not SLT only) (see row for N)

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 54 Extent to which teacher workload has changed due to involvement in the NTP

Aspect of workload	Decreased to a great extent % (N)	Decreased to a small extent % (N)	No change % (N)	Increased to a small extent % (N)	Increased to a great extent % (N)	Total N
Management of tutoring in school	4% (2)	13% (7)	28% (15)	34% (18)	21% (11)	53

Aspect of workload	Decreased to a great extent % (N)	Decreased to a small extent % (N)	No change % (N)	Increased to a small extent % (N)	Increased to a great extent % (N)	Total N
Classroom teaching and learning activity	8% (4)	4% (2)	56% (28)	28% (14)	4% (2)	50
Administration and preparation	9% (5)	4% (2)	26% (14)	32% (17)	28% (15)	53
Overall workload as a teacher	8% (4)	4% (2)	25% (13)	40% (21)	25% (13)	53

Base: Middle leaders/classroom teachers involved in TP and/or AM (could also be involved in SLT but not SLT only) (see row for N)

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022)

Funding the National Tutoring Programme (Chapter 9)

Table 55 Change in pupil premium spending on tutoring activities since the pandemic

	Decreased to a great extent % (N)	Decreased to a small extent % (N)	No change % (N)	Increased to a small extent % (N)	Increased to a great extent % (N)	Total N
All senior leaders	<1% (3)	1% (5)	24% (148)	42% (260)	32% (200)	616
Senior leaders not accessing any of the NTP	0% (0)	0% (0)	59% (46)	29% (23)	12% (9)	78

Base: Senior leaders (see row for N).

A series of single response questions. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).

Table 56 Use of Covid-19 Recovery Premium budget to fund tutoring to support pupils' Covid learning recovery

	Yes % (N)	No % (N)	Not sure % (N)	Total N
All senior leaders	85% (518)	10% (64)	5% (31)	613
Senior leaders not accessing any of the NTP	62% (47)	34% (26)	4% (3)	76

Base: Senior leaders (see row for N)

A single response question. Due to rounding the row percentages may not sum to 100%.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022)

Table 57 Sources of funding used to provide tutoring activities outside of the NTP

Source	Percentage %	Number N
Pupil Premium	83	38
Covid-19 Recovery Premium	91	42
Main school budget	67	31
SEND funding	28	13
Funding for ethnic minority pupils	4	2
Funds received by the LA/MAT	7	3
Income from facilities and services	4	2
Other government grants	2	1
Other grants	11	5

Base: Senior leaders not involved in NTP but offering other tutoring (N=46).

A multiple response question.

Source: NFER Survey of Education Recovery: Evaluation of the National Tutoring Programme (2022).



Department
for Education

© Department for Education 2022

Reference: 20-21/055

For any enquiries regarding this publication, contact us at
www.education.gov.uk/contactus

This document is available for download at www.gov.uk/government/publications