

REGULAR Meeting of the AMHERST School Committee
6:00 PM, TUESDAY, January 17, 2016
Library
Amherst Regional High School

AGENDA

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Welcome | 6:00 p.m. |
| A. Call to Order | |
| B. Approve Minutes—December 20, 2016 | |
| 2. Science Presentation—Animal Adaptations Unit | 6:05 p.m. |
| 3. Announcements and Public Comments | 6:20 p.m. |
| 4. Interim Superintendent’s Update | 6:30 p.m. |
| 5. New and Continuing Business | |
| • Vote on formal position on January 30th Town Meeting ARTICLE 1.
Petition – Bond Authorization for Co-located Elementary School Project
on Wildwood site | 6:40 p.m. |
| • Implications/Actions regarding MSBA Statement of Interest if Town
Meeting Vote Fails | 6:45 p.m. |
| • FY18 Budget Presentation | 6:55 p.m. |
| • School Choice Hearing | 7:15 p.m. |
| • Special Education Stabilization | 7:25 p.m. |
| • Superintendent Goals | 7:35 p.m. |
| • Elementary Homework Presentation and Discussion | 7:55 p.m. |
| • Sabbatical Request Vote | 8:15 p.m. |
| • Accept Gifts | 8:30 p.m. |
| 6. School Committee Planning | 8:35 p.m. |
| 7. Adjournment | 8:45 p.m. |

**Amherst School Committee Meeting
Tuesday, December 20, 2016
Library, Amherst Regional High School**

IN ATTENDANCE

Katherine Appy, Chair
Phoebe Hazzard
Eric Nakajima
Vira Douangmany-Cage
Anastasia Ordonez

Mike Morris, Interim Superintendent
Faye Brady, Student Services Director
Derek Shea, Crocker Farm Principal
Nick Yaffe, Wildwood Principal
Elizabeth Pretel, Math Coach
Mary Lambert, Math Coach
Public and Press
Sasha Figueroa, Recorder

1. Call to Order and Approve Minutes

6:02 p.m.

Ms. Appy called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. Ms. Hazzard moved to approve the minutes of November 15, 2016. Mr. Nakajima seconded and the motion was unanimously approved, with Ms. Ordonez abstaining.

2. Mathematics Presentation

Dr. Morris introduced the district's Math Coaches, explaining that they perform a variety of services and duties that adjust every year according to the needs of the district. Math Coaches Mary Lambert and Elizabeth Pretel gave a presentation of their duties for the 2016-2017 school year and some information on the previous year. Primary goals of the Math Coaches are to provide data analysis at each school and to provide professional development and advice for math instruction to teachers. They introduced Math Recovery to the district this year, which helps students become flexible in numeracy early. The coaches also thanked the School Committee for allowing the district to use the Literacy Math Substitutes that leave classrooms in capable hands while teachers are taking courses/trainings. There was a question on whether this information pertains to PreK students/teachers as well. Dr. Morris explained that as this was the first year of Math Recovery implementation, but it is something that will be considered in the future. There was another question on how children are measured as to where there are in mathematics ability. One-on-one interviews are helpful in assessing students' confidence and ability. There was question on outreach and how work was being done for ELL students. The coaches explained that there is a limit to how many teachers can sign up due to the follow-up work that happens after the training, and there are goals to continue to work with ELL students as well as special education. There is a five-year plan for more of this work.

3. Announcements and Public Comment

There were no announcements or public comments.

4. Interim Superintendent's Update

Dr. Morris reported that a Fort River and ARHS alumnus is hosting an event regarding immigrant populations and resources available to the public and immigrants. He thanked the School Committee for their support to the district, which enables Math Recovery and other programs to happen. Dr. Morris also noted that ARPS bumper stickers have been created and provided to families and staff to show that support to our district.

4. New and Continuing Business

A. Elementary Building Project Update

Dr. Morris reviewed new information regarding the elementary building project, noting that a letter was written to the MSBA asking if the project design could be changed and, if not, whether there is any flexibility in the timeframe for a possible revote. The response was no, with MSBA noting that the reimbursement was only guaranteed for the design that was submitted. There was a question on how much time there is for a new

proposal should the vote remain the same. Dr. Morris explained that the priority for a school may change, but both schools would be submitted. It is unknown when a school will be re-invited to the MSBA process. There was extensive discussion regarding possible designs and time frames should renovation be chosen rather than building a new school. There was also clarification that the MSBA is an open process and there will be no priority what so ever. The first week of April 2017 would be the earliest possible date for the next submission should Town Meeting not pass the vote.

B. Homework Discussion

Dr. Morris noted that the current homework model is for students to receive an amount of homework based on their grade. This is a difficult model as it assumes that students work at the same level and that students have the same amount of support at home. There is also a question as to what happens if the homework is not done. There is no clear solution for this currently. Mr. Shea expressed concern that students are sometimes stressed about homework and there are social justice issues since not all parents can assist their children with homework. Mr. Yaffe also commented, noting that research and projects are all done at school. There was discussion regarding how homework is received as well as regarding the homework standards between teachers. Ms. Ordoñez asked to have pros and cons of homework presented to the community. Mr. Nakajima asked to have the conversation focus on what is more valuable developmentally for students instead of whether they should have homework. Possible next steps will be to gather the information and hold a joint Amherst and Pelham School Committee meeting to present the information and gather feedback to move forward.

C. Approve Policy

DOCUMENT: Policy JKAA: Physical Restraint and Behavior Support

Ms. Appy asked for a motion to approve Policy JKAA: Physical Restraint and Behavioral Support. Mr. Nakajima so moved, Ms. Hazzard seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved.

5. School Committee Planning

Ms. Appy and Ms. Hazzard volunteered to serve on the Sabbatical Request subcommittee. Ms. Douangmany Cage asked when in their career teachers can apply. Dr. Morris noted that he does not believe there is a requirement for number of years in the profession, they just have to be a Unit A professional.

6. Adjourn

7:46 p.m.

Mr. Ordonez moved to adjourn at 7:46 p.m. Ms. Hazzard seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully Submitted,
Sasha Figueroa

Statement of Interest (“SOI”) for Accelerated Repair Program

Introduction

The Massachusetts School Building Authority’s (the “MSBA”) grant program is a non-entitlement, competitive program, and its grants are distributed by the MSBA Board of Directors, based on need and urgency, as expressed by the district and validated by the MSBA. The MSBA completes a review of available information regarding all districts that submit a Statement of Interest (“SOI”) for the Accelerated Repair Program (“ARP”) each year. The MSBA encourages all interested districts to submit an SOI to the MSBA, but the ARP is not appropriate for all potential projects. The ARP is for the partial or full replacement of roofs, windows/doors, and/or boilers.

The following information provides an overview of the SOI process from initial opening of the SOI period each January until the Board of Directors votes to authorize invitations at a subsequent late spring/summer Board meeting.

The SOI Filing Period

The MSBA opens its Statement of Interest system annually for districts to file one or more SOIs for either the Core Program or the ARP. The SOI is the process districts follow to identify the deficiencies and/or programmatic issues that exist in their facilities. Districts should submit one SOI per school for each school that they believe requires a project. An SOI should only be filed for a facility where a district has the ability to fund a project in the next two years. Over the last several years, the SOI system has opened in early January. SOIs are typically due for the ARP in early February and for the Core Program in early April.

Historically, the MSBA has invited approximately 40 to 50 SOIs for the ARP annually. The number of invitations that the Board is allowed to authorize each year varies. Among the factors the MSBA may consider should the MSBA be required to limit the number of invitations due to its annual statutory budget cap are the degree of the disrepair of the systems to be replaced and the frequency with which issues associated with that disrepair arise. As a project would not qualify for the ARP, a district should not file an SOI for the ARP if:

- the roof/boiler/windows/doors are less than twenty years old;
- the proposed project cost is projected as less than \$250,000;
- the school is judged by the District to be over-crowded;
- the primary use of the building is for non-educational purposes;
- the SOI itself seeks construction beyond roofs, windows/doors, or boilers;
- the SOI itself seeks boiler construction, excluding heating fuel storage and/or delivery, beyond the physical limits of the existing boiler room(s);
- or the District plans a future construction project for MSBA participation going beyond roofs, windows/doors, and boilers for the school.

If a project does qualify for the ARP, the scope of the project may not be fully reimbursable. Scope that may be required to complete the project but will not be eligible for reimbursement include:

- Building systems in spaces deemed ineligible per MSBA Regulations (swimming pools, hockey rinks, field houses and other such systems)
- Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) upgrades necessitated when the estimated cost of the repair project exceeds 30% of the assessed value of the building
- Building systems beyond ARP scope (extended floor or ceiling replacements, fire protection systems and other such systems)
- Installation of canopies and vestibules
- Partial replacement of building systems with less than 20 years of service
- Replacement of underground storage tanks or gas lines up to the boiler room
- Replacement of rooftop heating, ventilation and air conditioning units
- Site work associated with sub-grade roof drainage
- Temporary repairs to building systems

The Funding Cap

The Commonwealth irrevocably dedicated a 1% statewide sales tax, known as the School Modernization Trust fund (‘SMART Fund’), to the MSBA’s capital program. The sales tax collection informs the amount of the annual funding cap to which the MSBA can obligate funds for projects. The enabling legislation limits increases or decreases annually thereafter by the lesser of four and one half percent (4.5%) of the limit for the prior fiscal year or the percentage increase or decrease of the dedicated sales tax revenue amount over the prior fiscal year.

The SOI Due Diligence Process

The SOI process involves the filing of an electronic and print version of an SOI with the MSBA by the dates established, with MSBA staff readily available to address concerns, questions and issues during the filing period. Once the filing period has closed, MSBA staff commence the due diligence process for all SOIs.

This 4-phase process includes:

1. Review SOI submissions for completeness;
2. Review SOI submissions and accompanying documents for content;
3. Conduct staff study visits, if required; and
4. Recommend SOIs for invitation into the ARP

During this process, the MSBA may seek to obtain additional or clarifying information from districts. As the MSBA reviews the entire cohort of SOIs received, it will determine the appropriate level of due diligence that will be required for each SOI and will notify districts of next steps accordingly.

1. Review SOI submission for completeness:

Once the SOI system has closed, MSBA staff review each submission to check that all of the required materials have been received. The MSBA works with districts throughout the filing period to ensure that the SOI is complete.

For all SOI submissions, the district needs to provide:

- A hard copy of the SOI with the required signatures; there are two separate certification locations in each SOI where district officials need to sign;
- A hard copy of the closed schools information with the required signatures;
- Hard copies of the required local vote documentation that is detailed in the SOI; and
- Any supporting materials required to be submitted with the SOI.

Districts are expected to submit the hard copies of the materials and have them post-marked on or before the due date for the ARP submission deadline. The district and the MSBA should discuss in advance of the filing date any extenuating circumstances or requests for exceptions to receipt of the hard copy material.

2. Review each SOI submission and accompanying documents for content:

Once an SOI is determined to be complete, MSBA staff review the information and any additional documents submitted by the district. MSBA staff then compile the data necessary to assess which SOIs filed in that calendar year may qualify for the ARP. Evaluating the qualifying factors relies on many different data sources. MSBA staff use the SOI, the MSBA project management system, the MSBA's 2010 Needs Survey, as well as information from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education ("DESE") website. There are many factors that can impact the assessment of an SOI, such as overcrowding, building condition, general environment and program deficiencies. As such, it is important to assemble as much data as possible so that staff may gain a thorough understanding of the issues identified in the SOI. An analysis of the qualifying factors produces a group of SOIs for further consideration. This further review may or may not require a staff study visit.

3. Conduct Staff Study Visits, if required:

If MSBA staff determine that a staff study visit is needed to complete the due diligence process, MSBA staff will visit the facility identified in the SOI. The staff study visit lasts approximately one hour and is an opportunity for the MSBA to further understand the issues identified in the district's SOI. MSBA staff request that the district have someone familiar with the facilities and systems present for the visit. The district is requested to provide a copy of the SOI floor plans (emergency/evacuation plans are sufficient) ahead of the MSBA's visit.

The staff study visit starts with a meeting to review the SOI and the MSBA process, and then to hear district concerns. The discussion is followed by a tour of the main areas of the school, as well as typical general classrooms and specialty spaces. If the district's SOI includes the replacement of the roof, then access to the roof should be provided to MSBA staff.

Dependent upon the number of staff study visits that are required, this phase can take approximately 4 to 6 weeks, with visits typically scheduled from March through April.

4. Recommend SOIs for Invitation into the Accelerated Repair Program:

Once the content review and staff study visits have been completed, MSBA staff once again review the factors, noted above, that can impact the assessment of the SOIs. As stated above, due to the statutory cap, the MSBA may be constrained to limit the number of ARP projects in a given year. Among the factors that MSBA may consider should it be required to limit the number of ARP projects, are the degree of the disrepair of the systems to be replaced and the frequency with which issues associated with the disrepair arise.

MSBA staff then provide their findings to the Chief Executive Officer, Executive Director/Deputy Chief Executive Officer, and the MSBA's Facilities Assessment Subcommittee. Once the recommendations have been accepted, MSBA staff present the recommended SOIs to the Board of Directors for a vote to receive an invitation into the ARP.



Massachusetts School Building Authority

Funding Affordable, Sustainable, and Efficient Schools in Partnership with Local Communities



About Us ▶

Working With Us ▶

Building With Us ▶

Policies, Forms & Guidelines ▶

Our Programs & Initiatives ▶

Your School ▶

News & Events ▶

Public Records Requests ▶

* MSBA APPLICATIONS

:: Enrollment Projection

:: Maintenance and Capital Planning

:: OPM Report

:: Pro-Pay Reimbursements

* YOUR STATEMENT OF INTEREST



Statements of Interest

The Massachusetts School Building Authority's 2017 Statement of Interest ("SOI") submittal period will open on Friday, January 6, 2017.

2017 Statement of Interest Submittal Period

Submitting an SOI is the critical first step in the MSBA's program to partially fund the construction, renovation, addition or repair of municipally or regionally owned school facilities located in cities, towns and regional school districts. The SOI allows districts to inform us about deficiencies that may exist in a local school facility and how those deficiencies inhibit the delivery of the district's educational program.

Below are links to information that will help you submit an SOI.

- Superintendent District User Management:
 - [Submit a Statement of Interest - Returning Superintendents](#)
 - [Submit a Statement of Interest - First-time Superintendents](#) (or Superintendents who have moved on to new districts)
- [SOI Pre-Population Form](#) (for Districts that submitted an SOI in 2016)
- [SOI Vote Requirements and Vote Language](#)
- [2017 Statement of Interest User Guide](#)
- [Core Program SOI Process Overview](#)
- [Accelerated Repair Program Overview](#)
- [2017 SOI Frequently Asked Questions](#)

SOI Submission Deadlines:

- Accelerated Repair Program: The SOI closing date for districts submitting for consideration in the Accelerated Repair Program ("ARP"), which is primarily for the repair and/or replacement of roofs, windows/doors, and/or boilers in an otherwise structurally sound facility, is Friday, February 17, 2017 at 11:59pm.
- Core Program: The SOI closing date for districts submitting for consideration in the Core Program, which is primarily for projects beyond the scope of the Accelerated Repair Program, including extensive repairs, renovations, addition/renovations, and new school construction, is Friday, April 7, 2017 at 11:59pm.

MSBA ACCELERATED REPAIR PROGRAM:

The MSBA Accelerated Repair Program ("ARP") encourages all eligible applicants to apply, but the ARP is not appropriate for all potential projects. The ARP is for the partial or full replacement of roofs, windows/doors, and boilers. As a project would not qualify for ARP, a district should not file an SOI for ARP if:

- the roof/boiler/windows/doors are less than twenty years old;
- the proposed project cost is projected as less than \$250,000;
- the school is judged by the district to be over-crowded;
- the primary use of the building is for non-educational purposes;
- the SOI itself seeks construction beyond roofs, windows, or boilers;
- the SOI itself seeks boiler construction, excluding heating fuel storage and/or delivery, beyond the physical limits of the existing boiler room(s); or
- the district plans a future construction project for MSBA participation going beyond roofs, windows, and boilers for the school.

In some cases, a project which is inappropriate for the MSBA ARP may be appropriate for the MSBA CORE program.

Please note that the MSBA may be constrained to limit the number of ARP projects in which it participates based on the number of SOIs that are received in a given fiscal year and on the MSBA's available funds. Among the factors the MSBA may consider, should it be required to limit the number of ARP projects, are the degree of the disrepair of the systems to be replaced and the frequency with which issues associated with that disrepair arise.

2017 Statements of Interest

▶ 2016 Statements of Interest

The deadline for submitting Accelerated Repair Program SOIs is Friday, February 17, 2017 at 11:59pm.

The review process for ARP SOIs will begin after the February 17, 2017 deadline for districts that have submitted a properly completed SOI and all the required documentation, including the required votes of the municipal governing body and the school committee.

MSBA CORE PROGRAM:

The Core Program is primarily for projects beyond the scope of the Accelerated Repair Program, including extensive repairs, renovations, addition/renovations, and new school construction. MSBA review of Core Program SOIs will begin after the April 7, 2017 deadline. The MSBA will not issue any decisions for any potential projects in 2016 until (1) the MSBA has received and reviewed the entire cohort of Core Program SOIs and (2) the MSBA has performed due diligence on district selected priority SOIs. Depending on the number of SOIs that are submitted, this review process could take several months. Invitations to the MSBA Eligibility Period are anticipated at the fall 2017/winter 2018 Board meetings.

Core Program SOI submissions will be accepted from January 6, 2017 - April 7, 2017.

Previously Submitted SOIs:

- View the list of SOIs submitted to the MSBA by district in [2008](#)
- View the list of SOIs submitted to the MSBA by district in [2009](#)
- View the list of SOIs submitted to the MSBA by district in [2010](#)
- View the list of SOIs submitted to the MSBA by district in [2011](#)
- View the list of SOIs submitted to the MSBA by district in [2012](#)
- View the list of SOIs submitted to the MSBA by district in [2013](#)
- View the list of SOIs submitted to the MSBA by district in [2014](#)
- View the list of SOIs submitted to the MSBA by district in [2015](#)
- View the list of SOIs submitted to the MSBA by district in [2016](#)

MSBA GRANT PROGRAM INFORMATION:

The MSBA's grant program is a non-entitlement, competitive program, and grants are distributed by the MSBA Board of Directors based on need and urgency, as expressed by the district and validated by the MSBA. Submitting an SOI is not an invitation into the MSBA's capital pipeline; it is the first step in the MSBA's program. Moving forward in the MSBA's process requires further collaboration between the district and the MSBA.

If you have any questions about the 2017 SOI process, please see the Statement of Interest User Guide or contact [Diane Sullivan](#), Director of Program Management, at the MSBA by e-mail or by phone at 617-720-4466.



[PRIVACY POLICY](#) | [SITE MAP](#)

©2011, Massachusetts School Building Authority, All Rights Reserved

Interim Superintendent's Goals 2016-2017

Amherst:

- Create an ALANA Staff Cabinet with ALANA staff members from all districts that meets regularly to share concerns, offer feedback, and provide candid reflections on the experience of ALANA staff members that will be utilized to inform district decisions and planning
- Facilitate a budget process that preserves the core functions of the schools while also reorganizing Central Office to be both efficient and effective
- Initiate and engage in dialogue about the role of out-of-school time in students' lives and develop a plan for stakeholder engagement in this critical issue
- Working with the School Committee and district staff, develop and implement communication strategies to improve internal and external communication and promote the excellent work of district staff and leaders

Homework Primer

January 17, 2017

A series of horizontal lines of varying lengths and colors (teal, light blue, white) extending from the right side of the slide.

Goals of Presentation

- Add framing to discussion around homework
- Share research evidence of the implications of homework on students and families
- Share family and staff survey results
- Gather feedback, questions, and areas for further research from Committee members
- Discuss next steps
 - February/April breaks
 - Process for further engagement and discussion
- NOT to close dialogue, but to engender it!

Ways We Know Something

(adapted from Ga, Airasian, and Mills, 2011)

1. Personal Experience
2. Tradition
3. Inductive Reasoning
4. Deductive Reasoning
5. Scientific Method

Scientific Method (Empirical Research)

- Goal is to explain or predict phenomena
- In educational research, complexities of human beings and their behavior is primary focus
- Challenges in Educational Research
 - Generalizability
 - Control measures
 - Indirect Measurements

Language of Ed Research

- Tends to be
 - “Suggests that”
 - “Correlates to”
 - “Implies that”
- Tends not to be
 - “Proves without a doubt”
 - Makes this “law” (like in natural sciences)
 - Absolute

Peer-Reviewed Research

- “Peer review” is an academic term for articles published in a journal whose articles are closely examined (for research methods, contributions to existing literature) by a panel of reviewers who are experts on the article's subject.
- Articles are either accepted (rare), sent back for edits/revisions based on feedback (common), or rejected (fairly common).

Homework Research—Longitudinal

- Homework has not increased in recent years.
(Loveless, 2014; Gill and Scholssman, 2004)
- However, anecdotally, many other aspects of life are taking more time than they used to.

Does homework positively influence achievement?

- Consensus is that homework does positively influence academic achievement as measured by end-of-unit tests and standardized test scores but differs based on grade levels.

(Gustafsson, 2013; McMullen, 2010; McMullen & Busscher, 2008; Cooper, Robinson, & Patall, 2006; Rock, 2005; Patton, 1994)

 - High School: Very strong evidence of influence
 - Middle School: Strong evidence of influence
 - Elementary School: Weak evidence of influence (especially in primary grades)
- Majority of studies analyzing this topic have come to similar conclusions; while there are critiques of these studies, few contrasting results can be found

Homework Research—Where did the 10 minute rule come from?

- 10 minute rule—increases of 10 minutes per year, ranging from 10 minutes in grade 1 to 120 minutes in 12th grade
- Origins—research by Cooper & Valentine (2001) and Cooper (2006)
- Supported by NEA and National PTA
- Questions about implementation

Homework Research—10 minute rule implementation

- Students work at different speeds, so either the assignments will take different amounts of time for different students or some students will complete the assignments and some will not.
- Evidence shows that even in districts with the 10 minute rule, it is not being followed (Pressman et al., 2015); primary grade students have more than the recommended amount of homework and the yearly increases are not linear.
- Aligning individual teachers to achieve consistency in homework assigned is a large task that would take significant time and resource investments.

Non-Academic Benefits to Homework

- **Develop study habits** (Falkenberg & Barbetta, 2013)
- **Independent work habits** (Bursuck et al., 1999)
- **Effective time management skills** (Cooper, 2001)
- **Organizational skills** (Hampshire, Butera, & Bellini, 2011)

Homework Practices

- Grading/feedback increases completion rates
(Xu, 2011)
- Quality of homework task is as important as time spent on it re: influence on achievement
(Bryan & Burstein, 2004)
- Special education, as well as many other students, require differentiated assignments, which are rarely offered and time-consuming to develop and implement
(Carr, 2013; Goldberg, 2007)

Impact of Homework on Families

- Major cause of stress and conflict between parents and children

(Katz, Buzukashvii, & Feingold, 2012; Pmerantz, Ng, & Wang, 2006)

- Taking the place of more pleasurable family pursuits; can correlate with lower measures of emotional well-being of both students and families (Katz, Buzukashvii, & Feingold, 2012; Pmerantz, Ng, & Wang, 2006)

Out-of-School Experiences

- Other structured activities can also have positive influences on academic achievements, such as **board games** (Scholtz et al 2008; Wood and Stewart 1987), **athletics** (Broh, 2002; Yiannakis & Melnick, 2005) **and arts/extracurricular activities** (Catterall, J.S., Chapleau, R., and Iwanaga, J., 1999; Darling, Caldwell, & Smith, 2005)
- **Balance between homework and these other extracurricular activities needs further exploration**

Social Justice Components of HW

- When families perceive that they can help their children with school, they engage more with homework, which is positive for academic outcomes

(Green, Walker, Hoover-Dempsey, & Sandler, 2007).

- When students struggle with homework, often leads to negative parent-child dynamics, negatively influencing student emotional well-being

(Offer, 2013)

- When parents of all educational backgrounds are involved in their child's homework in negative or controlling ways, negatively influences grades and self-confidence

(Press, Nemon, Owen, and Schettini, 2014)

- Students who perceive that they cannot access their parents for homework help are vulnerable to negative educational outcomes

(Martinez, 2011)

- Disabilities often get in the way of students' completion of homework (Alexrod et al., 2009; Bryan & Burstein, 2004) and strategies to manage that are not widely implemented (Charles, 2013; Carr, 2013)

Homework Quantity

- Research suggests that for any student, over 1.5-2 hours of homework does not further increase academic performance and has negative non-academic effects (Cooper, 2006; Galloway, Conner, & Pope, 2013)
- Over 2 hours of homework has been found to be academically counterproductive (Pope, 2014)
- Another study found that having over 90 minutes of homework a night negatively influenced high school students' achievement (Fernandez-Alonso & Suarez-Alvarez, 2015)

Completion/Grading

- Teachers tend to not be able to offer more help to students with low completion or success rates on homework due to time and resource issues
(Muhlenbruck, 2000)
- United States teachers use grading homework as part of calculating overall student grades much more frequently than other high performing countries, such as Canada and Japan
(Baker & LaTendre, 2005)

Caveats (“Limitations”)

- Most research looks at homework completed, not homework assigned
- Most research relies on self-reporting of time spent on homework (which is an acceptable method, but more challenging to use as compared to some other areas such as late start or early childhood education)

Proposed Next Steps