

Public Accounts Committee

Oral evidence: Training New Teachers, HC 879

Monday 07 March 2016

Ordered by the House of Commons to be published on 07 March 2016

Watch the meeting: <http://www.parliamentlive.tv/Event/Index/541b77b2-3cfd-4ba5-bd32-b6dd02dd6f5d>

Members present: Meg Hillier (Chair); Chris Evans; Caroline Flint; Meg Hillier; Mr Stewart Jackson; Stephen Phillips; John Pugh; Karin Smyth; Mrs Anne-Marie Trevelyan

Amyas Morse, Comptroller and Auditor General, Adrian Jenner, Director of Parliamentary Relations, National Audit Office, Tim Phillips, Director, National Audit Office, and Marius Gallaher, Alternate Treasury Officer of Accounts, were in attendance.

Witnesses: Philip Eastwood, Director of ITT, Mersey Boroughs ITT Partnership, Russell Hobby, General Secretary, National Association of Headteachers, Professor Kevin Mattinson, Head of School of Education, Birmingham City University, and Rachael Shaw, Headteacher, Branston Junior Academy, gave evidence.

Chair: Good afternoon. This is a popular session today—standing room only. Welcome to the Public Accounts Committee on Monday 7 March 2016. We are here to talk about the National Audit Office's Report into training new teachers, a hugely important subject. I will touch on some of the issues in the Report when we introduce our second panel. The point of the first panel is to hear from people at the coalface about how these things are working on the ground. We hope that you will be able to give us your candid views about how well it is going. Any comments on the NAO's findings will be welcome as well.

I am delighted to welcome Rachael Shaw, the head teacher of Branston Junior Academy in the constituency of Stephen Phillips, MP. Russell Hobby is the general secretary of the National Association of Head Teachers. Welcome, Mr Hobby. Professor Kevin Mattinson is head of the School of Education at Birmingham City University. Philip Eastwood is the director of initial teacher training at Mersey Boroughs ITT Partnership, which covers John Pugh's constituency, so we have some constituency interest on the panel today.

Please be relaxed and open with us. We are not out to get anyone. Even though Mr Wormald may not agree, even permanent secretaries are accountable. *[Laughter.]* We are not out to get anyone; we are out to hear your views. You are here to help inform our questions of the next panel. The man who manages the taxpayers' money on our behalf is sitting behind you, so you have

a great opportunity to get your point of view across, and we will drink it in. Stephen Phillips is going to kick off.

Q1 Stephen Phillips: Ms Shaw and I know one another, and may I say how nice it is to have someone down from Lincolnshire to try to educate my colleagues and Whitehall as to where Lincolnshire is and how fabulous we all are?

How do you think teacher training is going from where you are as a headteacher of a junior academy, and do you think that the training in school for new teachers has improved the training and the end product?

Rachael Shaw: My school is not far from Lincoln, so I work in a collaborative partnership of schools with Bishop Grosseteste University, which is in Lincoln and does teacher training. We take great pride in working with Bishop Grosseteste and we have a lot of School Direct places, but we ensure there is firm pedagogy behind it, and a lot of theory work that goes in. I worry that the other schools that offer School Direct places might not have the same theory underpinning it. My staff make sure that they invite the students to our staff meetings. We do a lot of work together.

I personally have been able to appoint quite a few members of staff to my school, but then I'm not far from Lincoln. So long as the teachers realise they can't afford a house straight away, they will be able to find places, but I know that the east coast—Skegness way and Louth—find it difficult to appoint. I have found that the standard of applications has gone down. I have been a headteacher for eight years and I have found that, whereas in the past we had a wealth of applicants to choose from, the standard is now somewhat less, shall we say.

Q2 Stephen Phillips: We are going to come back during this hearing and the next one to the number that DFE is managing to get into training. Is your impression that, in a rural county like Lincolnshire, the quality of applicants is falling because there are too few people coming through, or is it more that people want to go to the larger centres—perhaps cities, where they might have better weekends, or so they think?

Rachael Shaw: I think, sadly, that it is not a respected profession any more. I recently went to a headteachers' conference, and someone pointed out that a graduate can earn far more money going to work in Aldi than they can from being a teacher, which is a bit worrying. I am worried that we are not getting a high calibre of students. I also take part in the interviews at Bishop Grosseteste University, and the high calibre is not coming through, even at the interviews, which worries me. Like I say, Lincoln is a nice area to be in; it's not in the middle of nowhere.

Q3 Stephen Phillips: For the record, we have a very, very good nightlife in Lincoln. I would just like to point that out.

Rachael Shaw: We do have a very good nightlife.

Q4 Stephen Phillips: If anyone would like to join me at Home on a Saturday—Home is a nightclub, not my home. Can I ask Mr Hobby, Professor Mattinson and Mr Eastwood whether they have got any comments on the questions that I just asked Ms Shaw?

Professor Kevin Mattinson: I would concur with what my colleague just said. I think School Direct represents a great opportunity for the development of deeper partnerships between schools, SCITT—school-centred initial teacher training—and higher education institutions. Where it is working well, there is a deeper partnership and a greater understanding, and a lot of high quality is coming through, in terms of the quality of the training. One of the consequences is that it's far more variable. There are challenges in terms of developing preparation for a career, rather than training within a particular context. That is a tension that exists. Certainly from my own experience, there are some interesting nuanced differences in the quality coming through School Direct, compared with, for want of a better term, the mainstream routes. We in Birmingham are very successful at recruiting minority ethnic students. It is very noticeable that School Direct applicants tend to be far more localised, and there is much less ethnic diversity among School Direct applications. There is also generally a lower quality in the applicants.

Q5 Stephen Phillips: Mr Hobby and Mr Eastwood, do you want to add anything?

Philip Eastwood: Just carrying on from what Rachael was saying, we represent the north-west of England, and we are the opposite picture: the number and the quality of applicants has not really changed over the last few years because there are more opportunities and more trainees for us to apply to. For our particular course, we have not found a dip or an increase in terms of the quality of the trainees at the start of the programme.

Stephen Phillips: Thank you very much. I will hand over to one of my colleagues.

Q6 Caroline Flint: Welcome, everybody. My constituency is in Doncaster. It's only 45 minutes' drive from Lincoln, and I very much enjoy the Lincoln markets. I will take you up on your offer, Stephen. Maybe I will trundle over there on a Saturday night with my husband to show how we have a good time in that neck of the woods.

What is interesting, Rachael, is that I emailed heads—both primary and secondary school heads—in my constituency of Don Valley the other week. Some of the comments that I got back from some of the most outstanding schools in my area said that even outstanding schools are struggling to recruit, and the quality of applicants is variable. Those heads have a real concern that not enough attention is being given nationally to what is happening at a local and regional level, beneath the national figures. Do you think that the national figures, which tell us that there are more teachers than ever before—of course, there are more pupils than ever before—have given us a false sense of security? Do we need to look at the local and regional patterns that may be emerging and causing worry?

Rachael Shaw: There are cold spots. Looking at a national service for teaching, you can't just zip a teacher in; they have to be local. Our east coast really struggles. They have to come up with some very imaginative ways to cover classes. I believe that it's worse in secondary, because if you

need a physics teacher, you need a physics teacher. You can't just slot someone else in there. At least in primary, I guess you've got a little bit of manoeuvrability. They are really struggling. I have been able to appoint but the choice I have had has been limited.

Q7 Mr Jackson: Can I just ask you a specific question? There is an interesting graph in the Report about the link to the proximity to universities that have education departments, for teacher training. Obviously, in the east, with the exception of Norwich, which is a long way from anywhere, and Lincoln, we do not have that many higher education institutions, essentially from Hull all the way down to the Thames estuary. Are teacher shortages in places such as Mablethorpe, Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth a function of that? Would you say that that lack of higher education provision is an issue, that it is why you cannot get people to the east coast?

Rachael Shaw: I don't know.

Q8 Caroline Flint: I tell you what, I will come back to that—to figure 11. We have the statistics here that show the number of trainees for every 100,000 pupils. We have this national picture, which, on the surface could look reasonably good, but Russell, could you speak a bit more to my question about what is happening at a local or regional level and why we are not picking up the picture that is happening there—and who should be responsible for picking that up?

Russell Hobby: I think that there are three reasons why the national statistics do not fully inform us about the situation. One is that they are based on estimates of demand, and there are certain assumptions underpinning them about retention and about where people move that are best guesses. So the targets we are working to may be inaccurate.

The second reason, as Rachael was indicating, is that it is not a national labour market for teachers. It is a fragmented labour market. Teachers in the past have not moved long distances to go to new schools. That might change as career patterns change, but certainly they do not do that at the moment. Obviously, if you have trained as a history teacher your ability to redeploy as a physics teacher is limited, although some will have a go. But it is particularly challenging as we move to the EBacc formula; we are already finding that something like a quarter of the teachers in these EBacc subjects are not specialised in that area, and if we are demanding new subject content, that is a problem.

The final point is that quality does not show up in the figures, and that is what we are starting to get at here. The problem is that we measure the vacancies in November and most headteachers have already taken whatever steps they need to take to make sure there is someone in front of their class at that time. Whether that is the teacher they would ideally have wanted to have in those circumstances, with the qualification or the specialism, is much more open to debate. I think that if we just throw around the raw figures we will not get the full picture.

Q9 Caroline Flint: On this point about the point in time at which the vacancy rate is looked at, do you have an alternative for how we can have a more real-time idea of what is going on, in terms of recruitment—and retention for that matter—or of where teachers are going?

Russell Hobby: That is certainly not an easy one because it will vary over the whole year, but an ongoing dialogue with groups of school leaders in each area would get you a better picture of what was happening behind those scenes. It is unrealistic to expect a centralised department to know what the particular recruitment challenges of Lincoln might be, but if they talked to people in Lincoln and used that as part of the data set for making some of the assumptions about where we need to recruit we would have a more nuanced picture, and I think that that was one of the recommendations in the Report.

Q10 Caroline Flint: So, just so we are clear, the Department for Education could have a role in assisting pulling together this information so that we can look clearly at a national level at what is happening in some of the localities, and you think that that would be a good thing for the DFE to pull together, lead on and do.

Russell Hobby: They definitely have a role in making sure that we have an adequate number of teachers. They have to work with local leaders and local groups to make sure that they understand what the full picture is, and local groups have a role to play as well. You can go out there and make a case for why you should teach in Lincoln and what the advantages of that are—beyond the nightlife and other things—but, ultimately, headteachers will not have that big long-term data set to be able to adjust the initial training going in.

Q11 Mr Jackson: If I may just come back in, Chair, what does ongoing dialogue mean? Does it mean a quarterly return to the DFE?

Russell Hobby: A conversation, on a termly basis, with a selected number of headteachers from particular parts of the country, which perhaps could be done with the regional schools commissioner or with local groups. I do not think that we want to fill in more forms. It is very much a qualitative thing about people being able to give leading indicators rather than results and data that came a year or two ago. If we fed that in, it would be a big step forward.

Q12 Caroline Flint: It sounds to me a bit like what we have with crime—not that I am trying to compare education and crime—but you have the actual statistics of crimes that are committed, but you also have the crime survey of what the public report, so you get that nuance between the pure statistics and what people are saying in terms of their engagement in the process, as well as what they say as victims. Something like that might work.

Russell Hobby: Absolutely.

Professor Kevin Mattinson: Many providers have felt that the teacher supply model has not reflected and captured the regional differences on the ground that people raise. Until a couple of years ago, I had spent many years working with schools in Stoke-on-Trent, where we were told that

there was not a shortage of English teachers. In the previous allocations model, around 26 universities lost 100% of their allocation for English, and they were all good, or good with outstanding features. We recognise—the Report picks this up—that some adjustment was made in terms of English. We have raised with colleagues at the National College the issue of how one can nuance the regional dimension. We know that a number of the providers are not regional providers—a number of universities tend to be national recruiters and supply nationally—which is why it has always been said that there are some difficulties in setting about creating a regional model, but it is true that something needs to be done.

Take the example of the north-west. You have already referred to the different number of trainees per 100,000 pupils. The north-west has always been presented as a net exporter of trained teachers. It gets increasingly hard to see that mobility with student debt and the differential in house prices. One of the successes over the years has been in bringing mature trainees into the profession. We train mature people, but they then cannot move because their partner has a job and their children are in school, so we see a distortion in employment rates, and so a reliance on exporting from one region to another is increasingly difficult as well.

Q13 Caroline Flint: Referring back to Mr Jackson's point, figure 11 of the Report breaks down on a regional basis the number of trainees for every 100,000 pupils. In the north-west there are 547 trainees for every 100,000 pupils, compared with 294 in the east of England. Given the fact that the evidence seems to suggest that trainees might like to stay in their own area—you have just highlighted some of the reasons why—does that put the east of England at a disadvantage when it comes to recruiting teachers? The number is so low. Isn't that something that the DFE should be looking at that?

Professor Kevin Mattinson: I think it is. There is interesting work being done by, for instance, Teach First, which has been looking at the east and at coastal regions—another under-represented area in terms of the supply of teachers to make a difference for the children.

Q14 Mr Jackson: Is it a quality of life thing? Or is it just about remuneration? For example, is it about housing? What are the main features?

Professor Kevin Mattinson: I think housing has impacted upon mobility. Salary is key, because apart from outer and inner London, the salary is the same nationally, therefore what one can buy with one's salary is very different. I think that will restrict mobility as we move ahead.

Chair: Certainly if I think of the house prices in my constituency, there is a big crisis.

Q15 Caroline Flint: I have just one more question. Russell, I think you referred to this. It is four years since the Department's trainee recruitment targets were met, and in 14 out of 17 subject areas, they are not meeting their targets. It used to be that they were meeting them in all but two. What is your sense of what is going on? Why is the Government's ambition to have more subject-led teaching in our country, which I think we would agree would not be a bad thing at all, particularly for secondary education, not working? What is going wrong?

Russell Hobby: Ultimately, over that same time period, teachers' salaries have been held either at zero or at 1% increases, and starting salaries have gradually fallen behind what some people with, for example, STEM-type degrees could earn in other sectors. For example, an accountant can start on £30,000, whereas a teacher's salary outside London is £22,000 on that front. Ultimately, that is going to affect people's choices.

Over the same time period, schools have been given more flexibilities on their pay, but their budgets have not been increased so that they can use those flexibilities, so when a school deploys its flexibility to offer more to a physics teacher, it is effectively taking that physics teacher from somewhere else. It is starting salaries that send the indicator to people at the start of their careers about what jobs are valued. Saying that they will be able to earn £65,000 later on might not mean much to someone who doesn't plan to spend more than five years in any single job, which is how particular careers are developing at this point in time.

So we are falling short on that, and then at the same time, we are increasing the demand for these subjects by putting more pressures on secondary schools to have a higher percentage of children entered for the EBacc subjects. That may very well be the right thing to do—I am all in favour of a strong academic education—but you have to ensure that the physics, maths, history and modern language teachers are there. And someone with a physics degree has such an immense amount of opportunities available to them, and we need such a large number of them. We need something like a quarter, or maybe a fifth, of all physics graduates in the country to enter teaching. We will have to make it a really attractive proposition if we are to get that many.

Professor Kevin Mattinson: Could I just add something, if I may? Regarding physics and other shortage subjects, one of the important initiatives over the last 10 years has been the development of what we call subject knowledge enhancement courses, and the pipeline of those were disrupted a few years ago when it changed to the allocation system. We are now in a situation where my own institution and many other institutions are working hard to develop these programmes, to provide a pipeline into the teacher training programmes, but the uncertainty around funding means that it's difficult to plan ahead at this moment in time.

We have just been told that funding is now guaranteed for any course commencing before the end of July 2016. In terms of supporting recruitment to teaching for 2018, that means we can't move forward with full confidence to say, "Let's interview you, put you on for a physics enhancement course for some time in 2016-17 for a programme in 2017." We're playing catch-up all the time, three months at a time. If we had some sense of security around the funding for the enhancement courses, and they really do make a difference to teacher training, we could work and significantly increase—

Q16 Chair: Can I ask Professor Mattinson about that, before I go to Chris Evans? The Get Into Teaching website, referring to subject knowledge enhancement, says, "You may still be able to train to teach these subjects (and be eligible for the bursaries they attract) by building up or refreshing your existing knowledge with a subject knowledge enhancement programme." So, we're giving bursaries to people who have got a degree in one subject—

Professor Kevin Mattinson: And it is a conversion course, yes.

Q17 Chair: And they have to have an A-level in the conversion course subject?

Professor Kevin Mattinson: Not necessarily an A-level. I think that any course over eight weeks in duration will be funded. Therefore, the nature of the profile of the entrant will depend in part on the length of the course.

Q18 Chair: Have you at Birmingham, or anyone else, got anything to say about the calibre of the candidates who come out? For example, if you had a PE degree, that counts as a sports science degree, so you could train to be a physics teacher with a £30,000 bursary and you would be a qualified physics teacher at the end of it?

Professor Kevin Mattinson: Certainly, someone with A-level, and up to a one-year course, there are programmes that will deliver level 4 first-year undergraduate physics—

Q19 Caroline Flint: Wouldn't it be better to put money into actually enhancing the pay of physics teachers, or attracting those who have physics as a degree subject?

Professor Kevin Mattinson: No, I think you find, with the people undertaking these courses, there is interaction with the schools, because often it's a partnership delivery, and the development of the pedagogy alongside that means that they end up as a successful teacher with more than one subject specialism.

Q20 Chair: Well, you say "successful", but I suppose it depends—I don't know which one of you wants to answer this question—on how you measure the calibre of a teacher. If you've got a very good degree in physics and you're a physics teacher, and a good teacher, presumably—without being detrimental to other people who teach physics—that is better than if you have an A-level or a GCSE in physics and you learn in a year with a subject knowledge enhancement course.

Professor Kevin Mattinson: I don't think there is an absolute correlation between a very good physics degree and being a good physics teacher.

Q21 Chair: No, no—I was saying that if you've got a good physics degree and you're a good teacher, compared with being a subject knowledge enhanced physics teacher, who has got limited formal training before that—

Professor Kevin Mattinson: I think there are different views. Again, if you look at the success of Teach First, one of the mantras there is that a significant minority of those students don't have a degree in their subject. With many subjects, under 50% of the students on a Teach First programme have a degree in that subject.

Q22 Caroline Flint: But with the Get Into Teaching website that my colleague refers to, if I have understood this correctly, you don't necessarily know that they are good teachers.

Professor Kevin Mattinson: No.

Q23 Caroline Flint: So your risk in this is that you will get people who have not focused on the subject discipline that we're trying to fill shortages in; we don't know as yet, all things being equal, that they will be a good or not-so-good teacher, but they will get a bursary; and we've got no way of seeing whether that's good value for money.

Professor Kevin Mattinson: Except that the selection process is predicated upon them going into teaching, so the same criteria for judging suitability for teaching will be applied. The only caveat is that relative weakness in subject knowledge, hence the subject knowledge enhancement course. So we are working with schools for School Direct. Our partners join us for the interviews. We use exactly the same criteria and judge their suitability based on their personality and skills in the classroom.

Q24 Chair: I don't know, perhaps this is an unfair question for you and it is more for the Department, but do you assess the outcomes of students taught by teachers who have gone through the knowledge enhancement programme as compared with those who have been taught by someone with a deeper subject knowledge? If you are going to get more physics graduates going through schools as a result of good teachers, surely that measure would be important.

Professor Kevin Mattinson: I think, increasingly, the Ofsted inspection framework looks at pupil outcomes as opposed to retention and training.

Q25 Chair: But it does not look at what the type of teacher is that—

Professor Kevin Mattinson: I think there is insufficient research on that. However, I would say that my experience over many years on this is that the levels of retention are at least as good. To add one specific example, on a maths programme at my previous university four years ago, the students who had done the enhancement course were employed much more quickly than those on a straight PGCE. They were seen to be very attractive to the schools in terms of the sets of skills that they had.

Q26 Chair: Okay. I would still be interested to see the outcomes. Does anyone have anything quick to add on that before I go to Chris Evans?

Russell Hobby: To be fair to the training providers, it may be unfair to hold them accountable for raw pupil outcomes, because they—

Q27 Chair: Absolutely. I was not doing that; I was just asking whether they knew.

Russell Hobby: I think teacher retention from the different routes into it is a really good proxy for this. If the teachers are still teaching after three years, it does at least imply that the school regards them as a good teacher at the level they are starting off at, and that the teacher felt well prepared, had been prepared for their career and had thrived in their early years. If increasingly we could look at the retention rates from the different routes in and get it down to as micro a level as we could, we would start to have some good data to judge on.

Chair: I know we will be looking at that. I want to go to Chris Evans, and then I will come back to you, Dr Pugh.

Q28 Chris Evans: Professor Mattinson, you are very worthy in your praise of Teach First, and Teach First has proven to be effective in England. I know that it is a devolved matter, but a recent Estyn report in Wales says that only one third of all teachers who have come through Teach First are still teaching two years later or are still teaching in Wales. Wales is an impoverished area, just like many of the Teach First locations in England. Why has the success of Teach First not been replicated in Wales? That is all I want to know.

Professor Kevin Mattinson: I don't think I can comment on that. We are the provider for Teach First in the west midlands.

Q29 Chris Evans: What I'm saying is that I'm looking at a similar demographic to what we have in Wales. A lot of the knock-on effect is that, if they are not being mentored properly, it is failing. That is one of the areas that they have seen. Is that something that you have seen in your experience with Teach First—that where the mentors are failing, inevitably the graduates fail, too?

Professor Kevin Mattinson: I think mentoring is absolutely key in all programmes, hence why work was being undertaken post the Carter review about the framework for mentoring in any case. It is absolutely key.

Q30 John Pugh: You made a very interesting set of observations. What you basically said is that, from your professional point of view, you cannot see a huge difference between those who have done a degree in their subject and have started teaching and those who have some aptitude and have done a subject enhancement course. I do not find that too surprising, because people who do a degree in a subject often find the subject very easy and are then confronted with lots of pupils who do not, and they cannot understand why. Obviously, if you are on to something here, it is something that needs some serious research, does it not? I noticed that in paragraph 1.8, it states that 43% of teaching in Spanish is done by non-specialists. I would have thought that that would be really hard. Are you pressing the Department—particularly you, Mr Hobby—to do some more work on this?

Professor Kevin Mattinson: Given the demographic of secondary pupils and given that the true shortage—vacancy rates are hidden because, as colleagues have said, schools are very adept at plugging gaps because children need teaching—is hidden, we must work together to try to—

Q31 John Pugh: Clearly, it might depend on the level of your conversion course. You might be able to teach physics to GCSE, but you might be struggling and out of your depth when you are teaching A-level. There is a lot that can be found out. What I am trying to say is that it could be extraordinarily useful if it was found out and there was the evidence. You indicated that there is not so far. The jury is out.

Professor Kevin Mattinson: About five years ago there was a report, but nothing has moved on since then.

Russell Hobby: Simon Burgess has just published something that does not find strong evidence for degree class as an indicator. It does not go into whether the degree itself is required, but aiming for a 2:1 over a 2:2 may not be a differentiator of teacher quality, so it is worth digging into these things.

Rachael Shaw: As a head teacher, it is a very big gamble to take on a newly qualified teacher. My school has only got six classes, so it is a big gamble for a school of my size to take someone on, because of the high stakes and the testing and so on that goes on in schools. So when I shortlist, obviously I look at whether they've got QTS, but I do not tend to look at whether they have come through the Teach First or the School Direct route. I look for their pedagogy. Do they know about child development? That is important to me—the way they are with children—because I can't teach that passion. I can help a student or newly qualified teacher do displays or mark books—I can provide them with coaches and mentors to do that—but for me in primary school, I am looking for the vocation, the passion. So I don't look at what route they've come in by.

Q32 Mrs Trevelyan: Just to drill down a bit more on the quality of trainees, I get a strong sense that there are perhaps fewer coming through and that they're not necessarily always what you'd look for. How do you, within your own spheres, assess the quality of the trainees you are seeing? Do you think there is any support or even interest from the Department on how that is developing?

Rachael Shaw: Like I say, we are part of a partnership that works with Bishop Grosseteste University in Lincoln. They have lots of small partnerships with schools, and we work very hard to make sure that we are robust with the teacher standards. I have someone who is the main mentor in my staff. She will go and meet with the other mentors to make sure that what we are assessing in terms of the standards of teaching we are seeing is the same. Bishop Grosseteste University are very good: they provide a lot of support, to make sure that if they've got that university on their CV, people in the area who know that university will know that they have reached a certain standard, and I presume that is what happens in other places. I don't know what communication comes from the DFE to Bishop Grosseteste University—I don't worry about that bit; I worry about my bit.

Mrs Trevelyan: That is the key: you are working at the local level as effectively as you can for your children's particular needs, without real reference to the Department and how that might be filtering into the bigger picture.

Philip Eastwood: As a SCITT school, we also use the teaching standards, in terms of monitoring the trainees we train, to make sure they are reaching the required level. Also, being a school as well—we are on both sides of the fence—obviously we only want to train teachers who are going to be good or outstanding at the end of the programme and able to move forward into schools in our local area and also further afield. We've got that moral purpose around being the gatekeepers of the profession and wanting to train the best trainees to then become teachers of the future. Using various quality assurance procedures that we have built into our programme, we make sure that the trainees who exit our programme are good or better at the end of every year.

Q33 Mrs Trevelyan: Do you feel that the Department is interested and wants to find best practice and share it more widely, or are you doing that autonomously?

Philip Eastwood: We went through a rigorous accreditation process with the Department and the national college, so they are aware that we have got our strict, stringent systems in place, and we had to go through various systems to get approved. Since we have been accredited, they don't particularly follow up on that, although we also have Ofsted that is interested in that, which is obviously a different area—they will be monitoring the quality of the trainees and the systems we have in place to make sure that quality continues and is maintained over the number of years we run.

Q34 Mrs Trevelyan: That is helpful. Just to give you an idea, I am very involved with all my local schools, and I contacted them and asked for comments from teachers. One young trainee teacher came back to me and said, "I was outstanding in my PGCE training. I was the top of my class, and I've been in school 18 months and I'm ill. It's just killing me. I can't teach at all." So, somewhere in there, someone got it wrong: she's in the wrong profession or what it's really like to teach in, not a particularly frighteningly difficult school, but a school that's understaffed, is something she wasn't trained for at all. That worries me: that there's a missing link somewhere. Is it the quality of student coming through or is the training not really focused on what it's like to be in a school day to day?

Rachael Shaw: I think there are some differences in training. Like I say, we have our own student placement, but we were asked if we would take another student. They have to do six weeks in another school. They were doing a completely different route, and the amount of time they were not in the classroom was quite shocking. That was their route in, compared with our student—they're in four days, with one day in the university. And yes, they do have time of their own to catch up with work, learn about pedagogy, visit other classrooms and so on, but I was quite surprised at the difference. I kept walking through the staff room and thinking, "Why are they still sitting here and not in the classroom?" It was quite strange to see those differences.

Q35 Mrs Trevelyan: So that variety of different methods of training could—

Rachael Shaw: I think it is very confusing, the amount of routes in, and they all have slightly different nuances, which I do not understand. As I say, I don't look for that in their CV, but I think that the amount of different routes in is very confusing for students.

Russell Hobby: We surveyed our members for the Carter review of initial teacher training and identified their three biggest concerns about the quality of new entrants. The first was being prepared for the pressure of the job, which I think resonates with the story we have just heard. The second, interestingly, was subject knowledge. They did not talk about whether or not it is degree class, but they wanted subject knowledge and the ability to teach within the subject, which is slightly different from subject knowledge itself. The third was classroom management and behaviour management skills. I wouldn't be surprised if the first and third interacted to create that sense of pressure. If the job is more intense and the hours are longer than you expected, and if you are not thriving in terms of classroom management, you are going to have a pretty miserable experience. That is why I think a decent amount of in-classroom practise is needed. I do believe that there is a role for theory and the abstract nature of it, but unless you really understand what it means to have the level of energy required to lead a class successfully day in, day out, I don't think you are going to thrive.

Rachael Shaw: In your first year as a newly qualified teacher, you get extra non-contact time, but only for that first year. During the first year, you are not allowed to be given a subject to develop. I am thinking about primary here. Come the second year, a headteacher, especially in a small school, doesn't have the luxury of being able to say, "Carry on having another afternoon of no children, and I won't give you a subject." They are given a subject, and it is hard, because you still have to support them, but by the second year they have to be hitting the ground running, because you have no capacity to keep easing off for them. There is a lot of pressure after that first year, in particular, when you are really piling it on.

Q36 Mrs Trevelyan: Is that the reason for the 10% attrition rate in the first year? Do you think there are people who are just not in the right profession?

Philip Eastwood: Yes, I think that it could be. In terms of our school-based route, we are a SCITT and we train them in-house. In answer to your earlier question, they spend a much longer period of time in school on a SCITT route, compared with some other routes that we have been talking about, so actually they are much more aware of the pressures and what is involved and they actually take much more ownership of the schools they are in because they are placed in them for a much longer period of time. From our point of view, in our SCITT we actually find that retention is much higher, so 100% of the trainees we trained three years ago are still in post. Also, the area we work in is aimed primarily at challenging schools, so the trainees are trained in challenging schools. Otherwise they might struggle post-qualification, because they have not been immersed in that during their training. We find that that is much more positive in terms of retention for a longer period of time.

Mrs Trevelyan: Thank you.

Q37 Mr Jackson: I have a very quick question. Am I picking up that the issue, as in some other graduate professions, is about work readiness? Are you saying that it is not just about ability in the subject; that generic issues about management, time-keeping and that sort of thing, the general heading for which is work readiness, are also an issue?

Philip Eastwood: From a primary point of view—which is our course—I don’t think the subject is as important, because you have to have a generalist knowledge to be able to teach primary. I think that the ability is to be able to manage your time, to manage the workload and to manage behaviour, the expectations that are currently put on to schools and the pressure that schools are under at the moment. From a primary perspective, it is not necessarily their knowledge that is the key; it is what you have said about work readiness and an understanding of how schools work and the commitment that teaching involves.

Q38 Mr Jackson: So who is responsible for the systemic attempt to drive down that attrition rate? Is it HE institutions, or the Department? Mr Hobby, do you have a view on that?

Russell Hobby: At the frontline, school leaders can do a lot about that. I agree that teachers have to be massively resilient to survive in the climate that we have. I will freely admit that it is part of the responsibility of a school leader to create an environment in which they can thrive. School leaders will feel that there are a lot of external pressures on them, but you have to put out an umbrella and protect some of your teachers from that. You have to be able to choose between “Is this initiative important, and do I have to do it? Do I want them marking every piece of work extensively, or am I happy with a smaller sample of work marked?” You have to be brave on that, and very courageous. School leaders have part of it, but they are also operating within the climate created by the Department for Education. The volume of change that comes through—the number of new reforms—greatly adds to the stress experienced and distracts people from teaching. Just this year, in terms of, say, primary assessment, the framework for assessing key stage 2 children has changed a number of times, and we are only a couple of months away from the assessments. There is a price to be paid for the volume of reform, if not for the individual reforms.

Rachael Shaw: One thing about being work-ready is that some of the messages in the media, however they come out, do not help. The latest one that got me annoyed was the army of mums that are going to come in to the classroom and solve the teacher recruitment crisis. That is demeaning to the teaching profession, because it sounds as though anybody can just waltz into the classroom—that when we talk about being work-ready, teaching is as easy as that. You just turn up and, miraculously, the children are going to do what you say. I do not think that that helps. Young people might think, “If a mum can just sashay in, I can do it, and I am going to start on that wage.” It does not help that the message perhaps does not go out in the media that it is a hard profession and is respected. It would not be said in the media, for example, that we can send an army of mums in to rescue the NHS, but it seems to be fine to do troops to teachers and oil rig workers to teachers and all the rest, which I find quite hard.

Q39 Chair: I have a couple of quick questions. I, too, have written to my head teachers, and Richard Brown, the head teacher of Urswick, came back. He is not the only one who has raised this issue about agencies representing teachers, where instead of teachers applying to a school, they go through an agency. That means that you, Ms Shaw, are then saddled with a finder’s fee. Is that something happening in junior schools—has anyone got comments on whether that is a growing trend?

Rachael Shaw: We do work with a teaching agency. When I arrived at my school the business manager was having to locate staff, especially for sickness absence. We work closely with an agency—

Q40 Chair: That is for sickness absence?

Rachael Shaw: Yes. We can then say, “Actually, we know Mrs So-and-so or Mr So-and-so, can we have them back again?”—so they get to know our school. This year we are trialling a company that covers PPA time for you, which is also a difficult one to cover.

Q41 Chair: Just for those who are not experts, PPA time means—?

Rachael Shaw: It is non-contact time for teachers. We are trialling using an agency this year—we will see.

Q42 Chair: Can anyone else comment on whether that is now a growing trend?

Rachael Shaw: Schools such as those on the east coast, which cannot recruit at all, are having to come up with very imaginative ways to put a teacher in the primary classroom.

Q43 Chair: There is quite a hefty fine, is there not?

Russell Hobby: There is a growing use of supply agencies for finding full-time staff and recruitment agencies and a growing number of graduating teachers who go straight to the agency, as opposed to straight to the school. That adds significant cost to the system.

Q44 Chair: Do you know why graduates do that rather than choose a school for themselves?

Rachael Shaw: Yes—you do not have to do half of the job. As a supply teacher, they could theoretically leave the marking—

Q45 Chair: That is for full-time teachers?

Rachael Shaw: Yes. A supply teacher could theoretically not do some of the job. They would not have to run a club after school; most of my staff run clubs and do all the extras.

Q46 Chair: I was thinking about the people that Mr Hobby was referring to—correct me if I am wrong. If I am a graduate becoming a teacher, rather than applying to Rachael Shaw’s school, I might just go to an agency, tell them what I want and they will place me? What is the benefit to the graduate?

Russell Hobby: Rachael is right in the sense that staying as a supply teacher can be an attractive proposition. Going in, you have someone else to match you up with the school and someone else to negotiate a potentially higher salary for you on that basis. It is the same reason that other people use recruitment agencies in other walks of life. When school budgets are really tight, it is difficult that we are taking money out of the system for these sorts of payments.

Q47 Chair: Mr Hobby, and I think Mr Phillips as well, talked about the issue of Ebacc and training teachers. Forgive me—I forget who it was. It was Mr Brown, but other people have commented, too. He talked about there being too many BEd and PGCE courses featuring only one school subject, saying that teachers of subjects like PE and drama need to be trained in a second subject. That goes back to what we were discussing about enhancing qualifications. Does anyone have comments about whether it is realistic for someone who has qualified with a university degree in one subject going through a BEd to qualify seriously well in two subjects? Professor Mattinson, you are training teachers.

Professor Kevin Mattinson: It is a time factor, certainly in sciences, if we use that as an example. There is an expectation that anyone qualifying has to be able to teach all three of the main sciences at least up to the end of key stage 3. A number of programmes traditionally have had a subsidiary subject. One of the areas that I know a number of people are increasingly interested in is that work in special needs, which gives another dimension actually to understanding some of the more challenging issues in the classroom. A number of programmes are now certainly factoring in that kind of subsidiary supplementary subject.

Q48 Chair: Philip Eastwood, is this something you have come across?

Philip Eastwood: In primary, it is more general.

Q49 Chair: So you don't have that. Russell Hobby?

Russell Hobby: There are some subjects that have an affinity for each other and you can easily develop dual skills in them, and some people naturally have skills across different domains, so it is an opportunity. If we relied on that as a systemic solution, that would be difficult.

Chair: Thank you very much indeed for your evidence today. We will now call on our second panel of witnesses, from the Department, although you are welcome to stay. In the next couple of days, our transcript of the hearing will be available uncorrected on the website, but we will also send it to you. Our report is likely to be published after our Easter recess, which I guess for those of you in education is after your Easter break as well—obviously we have a few to get through between now and then. Thank you very much, especially those of you who have travelled to get here today, which I think is three out of four of you. Thank you for your time.

Examination of Witnesses

Witnesses: Sinead O'Sullivan, Director of Programme Delivery, National College for Teaching and Leadership, and Chris Wormald, Permanent Secretary Department for Education, gave evidence.

Q50 Chair: Good afternoon. Welcome to Chris Wormald, on my right, the Permanent Secretary at the Department for Education, and to Sinead O'Sullivan, the Director of Programme Delivery at the National College for Teaching and Leadership—did I get your title right, Sinead? I want to make sure I had it accurate.

Sinead O'Sullivan: Yes.

Q51 Chair: Well, you have heard the first panel and, obviously, seen the Report from the National Audit Office. You have clear objectives as a Department for training new teachers, for making sure that there is a supply—that is part of your responsibility—and for giving teachers and head teachers proper professional autonomy and responsibility for recruitment and training, Mr Wormald, but your Department, the NAO Report tells us, has missed recruitment targets for the past four years. This is in the light of growing signs of teacher shortages in the profession as a whole, as we have heard from our witnesses. A number of us have had witness of that from people in our own constituencies.

At the Department, you take a national view of the number of teachers needed, which at one level is fine, but you have heard—Caroline Flint will come in on this—that you are perhaps not paying enough attention to the patterns of where there might be vacancies. We want to question you about what planning you are doing on that. Those meaningful patterns of supply and demand are important.

We are also quite interested in looking at the different types of model of teacher training. There is quite a myriad—I cannot remember which page of the Report the graph is on, but there is quite a complicated chart of those who are applying for places. So we are keen to focus on that. Those confusing choices for applicants that we heard about from our earlier witnesses is something that we want to focus on as well.

Before we go into questioning, Mr Wormald, congratulations on your appointment as Permanent Secretary at the Department of Health. Do you know when you will be taking up that role?

Chris Wormald: No, I don't quite, because it partly depends on recruiting a replacement for me at the Department for Education. The current Permanent Secretary at the Department of Health leaves, I think, at the end of April, so it will certainly not be before then.

Q52 Chair: Are you hoping—we would be hoping, I think—that there will be no gap in either Department? Can you assure us that there will be a permanent secretary at the Department for Education in time for you leaving, to make sure that there is no gap?

Chris Wormald: I cannot assure you, because I am not running the recruitment.

Chair: Do you hope?

Chris Wormald: I certainly hope.

Q53 Chair: We do, too, so that is good news.

Generally on this issue, when we were discussing it as a Committee before the sitting, we thought that for what is not quite your valedictory appearance—

Chris Wormald: No, there might be some others.

Chair: Yes, there might be some others—we have you back quite regularly. We looked at this. I remember being in Barking town hall with you sitting in a similar position, although I was not Chair then. We were looking at school places. I summarise your evidence as saying that it is not the Department's responsibility. Perhaps that summary is a bit brutal.

Chris Wormald: Not entirely.

Chair: Well, some of the things. We heard that it was not all your responsibility. Children in care—a lot of that was deflected from your responsibility. Now we have this Report on teacher training. We hope that today you will be really clear about what is and what is not departmental responsibility. If it is not the direct responsibility of you and the Department, how are you ensuring—as a Department with strategic overview—that the gaps get plugged? A free economy on schools is central Government aim, but if there are gaps, the buck must stop somewhere. We hope that you will answer questions in that frame of mind. Caroline Flint will pick up on some of those issues.

Q54 Caroline Flint: Mr Wormald, given what we have heard from the previous witnesses and what we have said about feedback from teachers in our areas, including teachers as heads of outstanding schools, do you acknowledge that there is a mismatch between the national figures that are issued by the Department for Education and what is happening at a more local or regional level?

Chris Wormald: I do not think I would describe it as a mismatch but the conversation you had with your previous witnesses captured the nuance of the situation rather well. As you said yourself, a lot of the national numbers would give us reassurance, but that is clearly not the experience in every single part of the country. I would not say that there is a mismatch between the numbers. Our national numbers show exactly what they show, which is the picture when you average it across the country. There clearly are some issues at an individual or a local level, as there are in individual subjects, which comes out very clearly from the Report. I would not describe it as a mismatch. Your previous witnesses described the situation quite well.

Q55 Caroline Flint: Can you imagine how galling it is for headteachers in different parts of the country who are facing real difficulties in getting good new teachers in the disciplines they need

when it does not sound like the national Department responsible for education in England is taking seriously their concerns about shortages?

Chris Wormald: I hope we do take those concerns seriously. I was answering your question directly in terms of what we see from the national—

Chair: Sorry, Mr Wormald, could you speak up clearly because the room is not good for acoustics?

Chris Wormald: What we see from the national numbers does not deflect at all from the experiences of people locally.

Q56 Caroline Flint: The national numbers are showing that there are more teachers than ever before, and there are obviously more pupils than ever before. Some of the figures provided show that the teacher-pupil ratios are pretty static—obviously there is a difference between primary and secondary schools—and that those entering are balancing those going out. If I were to look at that at face value, I would say, “Yeah, that looks pretty good.” How much are you aware of in the Department? If you went back to the Department after this session, would you be able to put your hands on something that would show you some of the differences in shortages of teachers on a regional basis?

Chris Wormald: We look at numbers at a regional and at a local authority level. I would not be able to do it in the way that your previous witnesses described—at an individual school level. Actually, that is one of the reasons why we think that School Direct is the right way to go with teacher training. It does actually make it a lot more local than our previous approaches. We accept the challenge that the National Audit Office made in its Report that we need to look better at local and regional data. We can answer your question to that level.

Q57 Caroline Flint: How are you going to do that? That is really interesting because you seemed to acknowledge in that last answer that you need to look a bit more at the local and regional data. How will you do that and how will you incorporate that into the Department’s report on the state of recruitment and retention in education? How will you use that?

Chris Wormald: It is extremely difficult for some of the reasons mentioned by your previous witnesses. We review how the teacher supply model and our policies on teacher recruitment work every year in the light of changing labour market circumstances and we will be thinking about these issues as we review those. I do not have an easy answer for you because it is a very difficult thing to do.

Caroline Flint: You have acknowledged that you are going to have to look more at some of the local and regional data. How will you source that? How will you collect that data for us all to see?

Chris Wormald: There are sets of things that we can do to improve how we use our national data, some of which are set out in the National Audit Office Report. Some of what we need to do is

what your previous witnesses described. Sinead might like to say a bit more about how we actually do this in practice—

Q58 Caroline Flint: Who is collecting the data on the local and regional picture, for you to be able to pull that in from? If you could explain that to me—because one of the things I find more and more these days is it is quite hard to pinpoint who is responsible for collecting the data. Is it the local authority who should therefore do that on your behalf, and submit it in to you? Is it the schools individually, in their various different guises, from academies to free schools? Who is going to collect the data, to enable us to have a national picture of what has happened, so we can see where some of the problem areas are, on a national level?

Chris Wormald: I will deal with that one, and then I will ask Sinead to explain in rather more detail. Our primary data source, which I think Mr Hobby referred to, is the school workforce census¹ that we do every November. Do you want to describe how that works, Sinead?

Chair: I think we know how it works, in November. That is not the issue.

Sinead O'Sullivan: At the moment we collect the school workforce census data just once a year. I think that is what you were getting at, really, that it is a once-a-year collection. We are reluctant to run it more often, not least because of the burden it imposes on schools—and I think Mr Hobby was suggesting he did not really want further data collections. However, we do have relationships with those schools that are leading School Direct and, indeed, with providers—SCITTs and HEIs—who do ITT training. We are building our network of School Direct groups of schools, to find out what is going on in each area—not just each region, but below that. What we are hoping to be able to do is to work with them to develop, if you like, a basket of measures and an ongoing dialogue to find out what is going on.

There is just something else I wanted to add; you are right that there is a good deal of frustration out there about how much more challenging it is to recruit teachers. We are attempting to respond to that, even at a national level, so we are investing much more in marketing; we have invested much more in bursaries in those subjects where we think the challenge is greatest; but what we want to do in the future is to be able to work with groups of schools in localities, to see what more we can do to work with them to solve problems.

Q59 Caroline Flint: Thank you for that, Ms O'Sullivan. I think, though, that some of the evidence seems to suggest that some of the biggest challenges are in our poorer areas—I think coastal areas particularly have some problems—and our more rural areas. That is also often reflected in the number of trainees in those areas; I think in the east of England, particularly, the number of trainees per 100,000 pupils is the lowest of all the regions.

Chair: We have a reference in the Report.

Caroline Flint: We do. I think it is figure 11.

¹ Clarification made by the witness 23/03/2016

Tim Phillips: Page 30.

Caroline Flint: Thank you. We have got “547 trainees for every 100,000 pupils in the North West”—that is the top—“compared with 294 in the East of England”. As I asked in the previous sitting, given that we know, also, that trainees will often stay in an area to seek jobs in schools, is not there a mismatch there, which means that we need to look nationally at how we can incentivise and encourage maybe more trainees in those areas, but also incentivise them to stay on and go for jobs in the schools in the communities, as well? Is that your role?

Chris Wormald: This table largely reflects the historical pattern. I think Mr Jackson pointed to the way universities are dispersed around the country as being part of the cause of that; and actually School Direct gives us an opportunity to start addressing that question by encouraging schools in those areas to come forward themselves to run teacher training.

What we see with these numbers is they do not particularly correlate, then, with the number of teachers who actually teach in that area. So if I took the two extremes on this chart, the east of England and the north-west, the current pupil-teacher ratio in the east of England averages to about 17.2 and in the north-west it averages to 17.1; so we do not see in the overall workforce these numbers replicating—which does suggest people do move. That does not deflect from your main point. We do want to look, particularly through School Direct, at having a pattern of provision across the country that means that we are training people everywhere, and that is one of the advantages that we get from moving away from a purely HEI-led teacher training system.

Q60 Caroline Flint: Where are the greatest teacher shortages in England?

Chris Wormald: I would need to check in terms of our overall numbers.

Sinead O'Sullivan: Do you mean teacher training shortages?

Q61 Caroline Flint: I mean both. Where are the biggest teacher training shortages and where are the biggest teacher shortages? Because you cannot fill those jobs.

Sinead O'Sullivan: One of the things you said earlier is that most people work in the area in which they train. We are doing a piece of work to link our ITT data directly with the school workforce census data to understand that better, because actually, as the Permanent Secretary suggested, pupil-teacher ratios are not varying that much, so we need properly to understand just how far people are travelling for their first job.

Chris Wormald: I will say a little about that in a moment, but if we look at the regional breakdown, on our last census the areas with the most full-time posts vacant were: Yorkshire and Humber; inner London; and the south-east. That masks within it an awful lot of variation between individual local authorities, but just on a regional level that is what we see from the census.

Q62 Caroline Flint: Is there a better way to track what is happening to teachers and where they are going? This might be a crazy idea, but every teacher has a unique number linked to them, so—I am not arguing for a big, bureaucratic process—how difficult would it be to put those numbers into a system so you know where your trainee teachers are going and where teachers are? When they are leaving, you could also track teachers who go on maternity leave or those who want to come back into the profession. Why aren't we using that special way of following where teachers are?

Chris Wormald: We are going some of the way to that—

Sinead O'Sullivan: This year for the first time we have used unique teacher numbers to link those who trained in 2013-14 with those in teaching in 2014-15 who we see in the school workforce census. There is quite a lot more work to do, but I think there is quite a lot of potential for us to be able really to drill down—

Q63 Caroline Flint: Then you could have a more real-time sense of what is happening. Do you see—

Sinead O'Sullivan: Well, it has still got a lag. But yes, it should give us much better quality data, particularly over time.

Q64 Caroline Flint: Are the NCTL and the DFE the institutions in prime position to lead on that piece of work?

Sinead O'Sullivan: We are currently leading on that piece of work to link the ITT—

Q65 Caroline Flint: But you are only doing it for trainees at the moment—

Sinead O'Sullivan: Linking trainees through to the school workforce. Obviously, the particular cohort we started with have only been working for just over a year, but over time we will be able to see how long they have stayed, where they have gone and where they moved to for their second job.

Q66 Caroline Flint: That sounds like a much more effective way to track what is happening.

Sinead O'Sullivan: It will take a bit of time to build it up, but I think we have made a start.

Chair: Any new system requires a bit of time. So the system is there.

Chris Wormald: Just to be clear, what we are not doing is creating a giant tracking system of every teacher in the country in real time. I do not think anyone would particularly welcome that, and it would be extremely bureaucratic to collect the data. What we are doing is taking the data sets we currently have and linking them together much better, so every year we should have better data on

these things. I still do not think it is going to be a perfect answer to all these questions, and we do think that the bedrock of this ought to be autonomous schools running School Direct, but we do think there is more we can do on national data—

Q67 Chair: Before Caroline carries on, a point was raised with me by a primary headteacher in Hackney who runs two schools as an executive head who talks about the School Direct approach. Those schools, which are often outstanding—they would not be training schools otherwise—are able to cherry-pick the best candidates, so from the teachers they are training they think, “I’ll have them.” That means that often the weaker schools in the area end up with the less good candidates. Is that a fair comment—do you agree with that?

Sinead O’Sullivan: I have heard the comment made before. What we try to encourage—we are not yet insisting on it—is that School Direct partnerships include a range of schools. So they would include an “outstanding” school, “good” schools and schools in “requires improvement” so that the trainee gets a fairly wide range of training opportunities. Indeed, the partnership hopefully gets access to good quality people at the end of the programme. We are not in the position of insisting on that yet, but I have heard that comment, and we are in constant dialogue with schools about how much further we should go and whether or not their partnerships are working as effectively as they can. The best partnerships are helping their weaker schools, and doing a lot with them.

Chris Wormald: That challenge is also why the Government is looking to develop the National Teaching Service, so that we can increasingly move great teachers into challenging places. There is, of course, a trade-off. We want our next generation of teachers to be trained in good and outstanding providers, so—

Q68 Chair: I wasn’t saying they shouldn’t be.

Chris Wormald: We recognise the problem you are raising. As I say, that is one of the reasons why we are developing the National Teaching Service.

Q69 Chair: I should say, for balance, that in my area there are also federations where they have taken on weaker schools, and the teachers are being trained to go into leadership roles, which is a stretch. They enjoy it, and it keeps them in place. There are some perfect situations, I am sure, but there are many imperfect ones out there. The NAO is wanting to come in.

Tim Phillips: I just wanted to mention page 40, paragraph 3.12, where we describe how schools in different circumstances are currently participating: 57% of state-funded schools currently are not participating in School Direct. Those that do not participate are disproportionately primary schools in rural areas and secondary schools in areas of high deprivation. So the point you make, Chair, is absolutely correct at the moment.

Q70 Caroline Flint: To that end, why wouldn't you want to direct some resource into those particular areas to make sure that they can—using your national role, you can have that overview, and you should be able to see where the gaps are. Where you have got money, you could maybe push it into those areas to make things change and happen. Is that your job?

Chris Wormald: Yes. We do want to see School Direct running in all parts of the country. As I say, it is also why we are looking at things like the National Teaching Service.

Q71 Caroline Flint: But could you help it happen?

Sinead O'Sullivan: We have encouraged schools in all parts of the country to get involved in School Direct. It can be a challenge for them to recruit trainees, as well, because they are in a rural area.

Q72 Caroline Flint: But are you doing any specific work, Ms O'Sullivan? I understand you are saying "We encourage all schools," but that is a bit like motherhood and apple pie, isn't it? Given that we know there are particular gaps in different parts of the country, are you doing specific work to see how you can encourage and market it into those areas, both for the schools to pick up and looking at other training providers going in?

Sinead O'Sullivan: Yes, we do encourage it and market it into specific areas.

Q73 Caroline Flint: Could you give me an example of what you have done on that?

Sinead O'Sullivan: We go out to groups of schools and to teaching schools. We target specific areas where we encourage them to get involved in School Direct, and many of them do. We also have to balance that with whether or not they are in a strong position to actually recruit into training places in those schools. We have some really successful schools in market towns and untraditional areas that recruit well—for example, there is a primary school in Norfolk that has recruited really well to all the places given them—but others struggle. We help them develop their marketing activity. We run training days for them. We give them packages of materials they can use. We encourage them to come to Train to Teach events that we run on days, in evenings and on weekends, but ultimately, some of them still struggle to recruit enough trainees to meet their need.

Q74 Mrs Trevelyan: On that issue, Berwick-upon-Tweed, at the northernmost end of my constituency, has one high school, of which I have been a governor for many years. We went academy. We have a new head, and we have got a fantastic senior leadership team now. We were "RI"; we just missed coming up "good" in our last inspection, but we are very much there. The key problem is not enough teachers of quite the quality required in the subject areas. The head works incredibly closely as best she can, but the nearest school we can work with is 50 miles away.

It is not easy, but you are spending £167 million on bursaries. If you gave her an extra £100,000 a year, she could find ways to get teachers there. It would revolutionise that school. There

is no other way. There is the Scottish border, and there is a school 50 miles further south. Which bit of thinking about how coastal, white, poor areas are being left behind are we not doing to make sure those teachers can get people in—trainees or fully qualified teachers—to really make a difference? It doesn't feel like there is support from the Department.

Sinead O'Sullivan: One of the things we are doing this year is launching the National Teaching Service in the north-west. I would hope there is some assistance we could provide there. We are always interested in looking at new ideas and new ways we can use our resources to make this work more effectively.

Caroline Flint: They have already got more trainees in the north-west than anywhere else. What about within segments of the north-west? My colleague's point is that the north-west is a big region, but there are distinct areas across the north-west.

Q75 Mrs Trevelyan: We are the top, far right-hand corner of the north-east before Scotland. It is very isolated. The challenges of trying to get—the sense is that we can't be alone, there are others. If all else fails, the Department needs to be thinking more about those areas. I wonder if that is on your radar.

Chris Wormald: That is exactly the thinking that goes into the National Teaching Service—how do we get some of our best teachers to work in different places? It is a big challenge which we recognise.

Q76 Mr Jackson: What comes across, though, is it is a bit reactive. Referring back to the details of the per capita training positions, you said it is historic that the east of England is lagging in that because of higher education. Are you proactively looking at demographic changes, say the number of pupils and the number of new schools? Obviously, you know that Peterborough is the second fastest growing urban area in England. We are going to need new teachers because we have so many more pupils in new schools. Are you proactively looking at that and matching it up to the initiatives that you are pursuing at the moment?

Sinead O'Sullivan: The more local you get the more challenging it is for us to be able to analyse what is going on using data. That is why a dialogue with schools is so important.

Q77 Mr Jackson: We have got a lot of those difficult areas, so we have a lot of rurality, big counties with lots of little village schools, which is difficult; poor infrastructure; coastal communities like Lowestoft, Great Yarmouth, et cetera; and we have pockets of serious deprivation—Thurrock, Luton, Peterborough, Stevenage, et cetera. Using the east as an example, how would you do that? A few DVDs and a couple of posters is not really going to cut the mustard, with all due respect.

Sinead O'Sullivan: It was not my intention to suggest that that was what our answer was.

Mr Jackson: Perish the thought!

Sinead O'Sullivan: We also have Teach First which is targeted specifically at schools in areas of deprivation. They are helping us understand what they are learning from being in the east of England, which is one of the last of the regions they have moved into.

We talk to teaching schools all the time, which deliver a range of workforce initiatives for us. We have been growing the number of SCITTs in the east of England—school-centred ITT providers.

Q78 John Pugh: Can I just clarify? Did you actually say the more local it is the more difficult it is to match up needs?

Sinead O'Sullivan: I said the more local we get the more challenging it is to look at things at a national level.

Q79 John Pugh: Is that in no uncertain terms really just saying, you can't do it, from the centre?

Sinead O'Sullivan: I think because the data we have is always going to be historical, it is always going to be important to be talking to the schools about what is going on in the area.

Q80 Mr Jackson: That is why we need forward planning, which I have mentioned. Maybe you missed that.

Chris Wormald: We do that on a national level. I think there is some merit in what Mr Pugh says. Will we ever from a national Department be able successfully to predict some of these very local things? Certainly not on our current quality of data, and I think we would be quite a long way from that. It is one of the reasons why we think school-led approaches to teacher training are a good thing because they allow local leaders to react much more to individual local circumstances.

Q81 Chair: Can I just say, we have talked about local schools a couple of times. We know it is a good thing. One of my assistant heads said he feels worried that it is a bit of a cottage industry. That is even from an inner London perspective. Then there was a real concern about the number of schools that are involved. We heard from the NAO 57% are not, but also the number that are involved and the level of inspections. A very high percentage have not yet been inspected for the quality of their training. Do you worry about the quality of their training, Sinead O'Sullivan? Can you guarantee to the people watching this that their children are going to be taught by well-trained teachers coming through this programme?

Sinead O'Sullivan: A lot of schools are involved but we are encouraging them to work in partnerships rather than create a cottage industry.

Q82 Chair: It is still quite small—two or three small schools is still quite small.

Sinead O'Sullivan: The average is over five schools working together, and we are seeing further growth. I think your reference to inspections refers to the school-centred ITT providers, where we have grown the number of providers quite a lot over the last few years. Those providers, as I think one of your earlier witnesses said, are scrutinised quite heavily before they are set up and they are inspected within two years of operation. The fact that a number of them have not yet been inspected is because they are either not yet operating or have only recently started operating.

Chair: Does the NAO want to say anything on that, Tim?

Chris Wormald: May I just add that within School Direct, it is the HEIs who are doing the quality control? So we have not changed the quality control system—

Chair: I think that this all just underlines the point that Caroline Flint and others have made about the complexity of the system. Tim Phillips, do you want to add anything?

Tim Phillips: So 81 out of 174 SCITTs are yet to be inspected. Of those, 22 are currently only at the stage of recruiting trainees but 41 are in the first year of training trainees, so they will be training trainees but they will come to be inspected by the end of 2018.

Q83 Caroline Flint: I find it interesting that, so far, every time we have asked about what is happening locally and regionally the response is, “We can’t manage that situation”. I do not think that anyone is suggesting that we want the DFE to be running every school, although I have to say that the schools commissioner seems to be in charge of a lot of things that are happening on a local level. My own area, Doncaster, does not have a single teacher on the board of the schools commissioner so I am not sure how she can decide what is best for those schools.

Before I move on to your missed targets, surely there is something that should be a national level responsibility, to have a better picture of what is happening at a local and regional level so that when the Department proclaims about what is happening in teacher training and recruitment they can reflect a more meaningful sense of what is happening and, in some ways, encourage good practice from the national level, for others to learn from each other—there are different communities with similar challenges, but some might be doing it better than others.

Chris Wormald: I’m sorry, I was not trying to suggest that the Department did not do those sorts of things. We want to do those things better, and that comes back to the point about how we are linking up our data, which we were discussing earlier. But that is definitely a role of the Department.

Q84 Caroline Flint: Let’s move on then to the targets. For four years now, the Department’s trainee recruitment targets have not been met. Why are you missing these targets for filling training places?

Chris Wormald: It is obviously disappointing that we have not recruited to a number of our targets in a number of subjects, and it is something that we worry about a lot. We particularly worry about STEM subjects, where we have launched a number of things.

Figure 10 on page 29 of the National Audit Office Report reflects a very tough year—2015-16—for graduate recruiting. It was a period when the number of graduates was going down and a number of our competitors in the market were recruiting more and more graduates. We found it extremely tough in a number of subjects, as that figure shows. As I said before, we review what we do on teacher recruitment every year and try to update our approaches, and this is something that we will need to be responding to, particularly around STEM subjects.

A lot of the missed targets are because our targets are going up, so when you look at the total number of graduates we recruited it actually went up, but not as fast as the need, and that is something we will need to be responding to via the various techniques that I am sure we will discuss, around bursaries and other things.

Q85 Caroline Flint: As I mentioned in the previous session, in 14 out of 17 subject areas you are not hitting your targets. It used to be that we met them in all but two subject discipline areas. What is going on here? Do you need to re-look at the model for how you ensure that you meet the targets?

Chris Wormald: As I said, we do—we look every year. Bluntly, while the economy was in recession we recruited very heavily, so some of those earlier figures were in times when the market was with us. In this year, 2015-16, the market was heavily against us and we struggled in the way that that chart describes. I think I am right in saying, Sinead, that our early numbers from 2016-17 suggest that we are moving in the right direction.

Sinead O'Sullivan: Yes. It varies by subject. We recruit, probably, one in five maths graduates. The demand for maths teachers outstrips the available supply to some extent, given the competing employers in the market. This is also true for physics and a number of other STEM subjects.

What we have seen is that in some subjects the new teacher supply model that was developed for 2015-16 changed the numbers required significantly, so we recruited more art and design teachers than we had the previous year, but the target had moved much further ahead. We recruited more physics teachers than we had the previous year, but we still missed the target. The reasons vary by subject, depending on what is going on, but in broad terms there aren't enough people coming through at undergraduate level for some of the subjects we really want to see more people taking A-levels in.

Q86 Caroline Flint: Given that I think I understand you feel that some subject areas need more specialists coming through, what can you do to incentivise that to happen, both in terms of training and also to continue to being a hands-on teacher?

Chris Wormald: Shall we take the example of STEM—science, technology, engineering and maths—where we probably have the biggest concerns. A year ago, we launched a new package STEM of £67 million, which was partly about recruiting more teachers in that subject and partly about upskilling people who were capable of teaching those subjects but were currently teaching other subjects. We also increased the level of bursaries—

Q87 Caroline Flint: Could you give me a breakdown of what the £67 million is paying for? For example, let's take physics. If someone had a degree in physics, what could they expect from that £67 million to encourage them to go into teaching—a ballpark figure.

Sinead O'Sullivan: So, someone who is a physics graduate—

Sir Amyas Morse: Could I just help with something before we move classes? The £67 million is over how many years?

Sinead O'Sullivan: Over five years.

Sir Amyas Morse: So, applying a small amount of division, that would be £13 million a year. I just thought it would be helpful to clarify that so we know what we are actually talking about.

Chris Wormald: That is part of what we are doing.

Sinead O'Sullivan: This is not about paying more money to people who would come into training anyway. They would get access to the bursaries as they always have had. This is about trying to see if we can get people who wouldn't otherwise come into training. For example, we have already been working with universities to develop an undergraduate physics programme that also gives people a qualification in initial teacher training at the end of it. We are going to expand that to look at maths and computing as well. We are running a programme to encourage schools to offer internships during university holidays, again to encourage people who might not otherwise think about teaching.

Q88 Chair: Are university holidays the same as school holidays?

Sinead O'Sullivan: Not entirely. There are months when they do not overlap. We are running future teacher scholarships to engage A-level students to commit to teaching in return for some financial incentives during their undergraduate programme. We are also, as the Permanent Secretary said, running training programmes through schools to provide greater knowledge enhancement in maths and physics for people already teaching in schools. These programmes are being designed in conjunction with the Institute of Physics and the Institute of Mathematics and its Applications.

This year is the first year we have been doing any of this and we will, of course, find that we need to tweak various strands of this work as we learn more, but for now over 2,000 people doing the training are existing teachers. What we hope to see as a result of that training is that they teach maths and physics for a greater number of hours at the end of the programme and do it well.

Q89 Stephen Phillips: So what is the answer to Ms Flint's question? Of this £13 million annually, if I am a physics graduate, how will I see that in some way enhance the attraction for me to enter the teaching profession to teach physics?

Sinead O'Sullivan: If you are a physics graduate considering teaching, it is not likely you will see it. It is more about catching people earlier in the pipeline, at A-level or during the time they are doing their degree. If you are doing a physics degree right now—

Q90 Stephen Phillips: All right; if I'm doing A-level physics, how does this £13 million that you are spending annually attract me into teaching?

Sinead O'Sullivan: If you were to sign up for our future teacher scholarships, you would be eligible for a £5,000 bursary.

Q91 Stephen Phillips: But how do you know those are not people who would have entered the profession to teach physics in any event?

Sinead O'Sullivan: That is a challenge, but it is—

Q92 Stephen Phillips: Can I have an answer to my question? How do you know that those are not people to whom you are paying £5,000 to study physics A-level who would have gone on to study physics at university and then gone on to teach physics anyway?

Sinead O'Sullivan: The blunt answer on that is, at the moment I don't know, but—

Q93 Stephen Phillips: So it's just a £5,000 gift to people who were intending to teach physics anyway.

Sinead O'Sullivan: It's not a gift because you have to pay it back if you don't go in.

Chair: You have to pay it back if you don't go into teaching?

Sinead O'Sullivan: If you don't go into teaching, you have to pay it back.

Q94 Chair: What if you decide that you're just not going to be a very good teacher—you don't like it and you wouldn't be good in the classroom? You might go into teaching anyway, in order not to pay back the £5,000 on top of your student loans.

Sinead O'Sullivan: At that point, you would be looking to the school to identify whether they were going to be—

Q95 Chair: Just to be clear, let's say I am a headteacher and I have one of these people who got £5,000. I have a candid chat with them and say, "Look, this is not for you. You're clearly not coping in the classroom," and they say, "But I would have to pay back my £5,000. I have to last the year"—or two years or whatever. How long do they have to teach for before they are off the hook?

Sinead O'Sullivan: I don't have the detail on that with me.

Chair: Could you write to us, because we would be interested to know that?

Q96 Stephen Phillips: I'm sorry to interrupt Ms Flint; I hope she will forgive me. This £5,000 is available, let's say, when you are at secondary school, studying physics.

Sinead O'Sullivan: No, it's available when you're an undergraduate.

Q97 Stephen Phillips: Right; so you get £5,000 as an undergraduate. Presumably, because of the rules by which we are presently governed, that applies to non-UK citizens as well. Is that right?

Sinead O'Sullivan: Well, the people we are targeting are people taking A-levels at the moment.

Q98 Stephen Phillips: But if I am studying an equivalent qualification in a European Union country, do I have access to the £5,000 bursary?

Sinead O'Sullivan: No.

Q99 Stephen Phillips: If I am coming from a European Union nation to the United Kingdom to read physics at an English university or a UK university, do I have access to the £5,000 bursary?

Sinead O'Sullivan: At the moment, we have been targeting it through UK schools, so—

Q100 Stephen Phillips: That wasn't my question, Ms O'Sullivan. If I am a European Union national and I come to a university in the United Kingdom to study physics, am I eligible for the £5,000 bursary?

Sinead O'Sullivan: I will have to check. You potentially—

Stephen Phillips: You had better write to us.

Q101 Chair: Yes, I have evidence from one of my assistant heads who is involved in this that there is a concern—it would be good if you could answer this in your written response—that people come, study for a year in London with a £30,000 bursary, do not enter the teaching profession and have no requirement to pay it back. It would be very interesting to get an answer on that, because that is a major leech of taxpayers' money, regardless of whether they are British or European citizens, if they do not go into teaching. Can we be clear: if they do not go into teaching after a £30,000 bursary, do they have to pay that back?

Sinead O'Sullivan: No, they do not, but that is only available to physics graduates with a first-class degree.

Q102 Chair: Obviously that narrows it down, but still, it's quite nice for a physics graduate with a first-class degree to spend a year training to be a teacher and never enter the classroom.

Sinead O'Sullivan: It is still a large commitment. It requires them to pay tuition fees and spend a year of their life training.

Q103 Stephen Phillips: And even with your £5,000 bursary, you only have to teach for a year. Is that right? And then you do not have to pay it back if you leave the profession.

Sinead O'Sullivan: I will have to check that, I'm afraid.

Stephen Phillips: You had better write to us on that as well.

Q104 Chair: There is a list of questions on which you are going to write to us. I am going to bring Anne-Marie Trevelyan in, but I just want to ask about international evaluation and models. I know that the Irish Government gave extra—whatever the equivalent is of UCAS points—university entrance points to students sitting the higher maths qualification, which apparently is devilishly difficult, and that massively increased the number of students at the leaving certificate end of the Irish education system getting a higher maths qualification. I do not know whether that led to more people doing maths degrees, but have the Government or the Department for Education thought about any incentive, if you're talking about down the pipeline, encouraging people to get higher grades at GCSE and an A-level in maths in order to get extra points for university, or some other incentive that will encourage more people to become maths undergraduates in the first place, or physics undergraduates or whatever?

Chris Wormald: I don't think we have looked at that specific idea. We have been looking at how we boost the number of people who do A-levels in maths and science, and we have seen the numbers go up quite rapidly.

Q105 Chair: Can you give a couple of examples of what you have done to boost people doing A-levels in maths?

Chris Wormald: Well, the A-level number has actually doubled over the last 10 years, I think—

Chair: Sorry, I couldn't hear that.

Chris Wormald: The number of people doing A-level maths, I think, has gone up from about 50,000 to about 90,000 in the last 10 years.

Q106 Chair: Do you know why? Is that just chance?

Chris Wormald: The Government have been promoting it.

Q107 Chair: Promoting it in adverts? When you say promoting it, what was the incentive? Presumably a good maths teacher in school is a good incentive. That is partly what I am driving at.

Chris Wormald: That is undoubtedly true. I mean promoting as in encouraging people. We have not been putting in direct financial incentives to do that. But that is an extremely positive sign. Of course, the EBacc, which we discussed before, will hopefully get more people to do these subjects. In a combination of those things, we want to see a larger number of people doing maths and science at university, which is the ultimate answer to some of our problems.

Chair: That is one of my points. We will drop that for a moment, but we might come back to it. Anne-Marie Trevelyan is itching to get in on a number of issues.

Q108 Mrs Trevelyan: On maths, we are big into incentivising and trying to encourage people in STEM subjects, particularly maths and physics. Maths is my favourite subject, although I didn't become a teacher, I confess. I trained as a chartered accountant instead, not because it paid more at the time, but because it seemed to be a more attractive option. Many are coming out at the end of their teaching careers in their mid-50s with full pension pots, which is partly why they are coming out, and maybe they are fairly exhausted because it is quite hard work being a full-time teacher. After a few years, they often look for something new to do. Are we looking at how we might tap into that really experienced teaching and high quality, particularly maths, resource? We do supply and we do part time. We do all those things these days to work in schools. Can we locate and encourage those really experienced teachers to come back into the profession while we boost our numbers in those STEM subjects?

Chris Wormald: Yes, and it is one of the reasons why we wanted the salaried route in schools, School Direct, which is specifically for people who have work experience in other sectors to go straight into schools. We are also looking a lot at returners to teaching, where the numbers have been going up over the last five years from 10,000 to—*[Interruption.]*

Chair: Sorry, will you speak up? There is noise outside.

Chris Wormald: The numbers have gone up from 11,700 a year in 2011 to about 14,000 a year now². That is one of the trends that we are seeing.

Q109 Mrs Trevelyan: In maths and physics?

² Figures clarified by witness in writing on 23/03/2016

Chris Wormald: No, that is across the entire teaching profession. While we are on the subject, there was one thing from the previous hearing that we ought to correct. The Secretary of State's announcement at the weekend was about teachers who are mothers returning to teaching. It was not as it was described earlier. But on your basic point, yes, we are looking at that.

Q110 Mrs Trevelyan: In terms of accessing retired teachers—not a chartered accountant who retires and then decides to go into teaching, but people who have been in the teaching profession who have stepped away—how are you trying to reach out to them to get them to come back, particularly with those maths and physics subjects?

Sinead O'Sullivan: We are not specifically targeting retirees, but we are doing work to encourage people to return—specifically, maths, physics and STEM teachers. We are offering, again working through schools, retraining packages and refresher courses to help those who might lack confidence because of the changes to the curriculum, for example, while they have been out. We are also trialling offering childcare costs for the period that they are training and we are working closely to try and match would-be returners with the schools that are interested. We are also encouraging schools to look more at offering part-time opportunities and to flex their timetable to allow for a more diverse workforce.³

Chris Wormald: You raise an extremely important point. We are beginning to see, as has happened in a lot of professions, a change in the way that the labour market is working for teaching. Certainly from the numbers we are seeing, it is now much less likely that you will become a teacher aged 21 and stay in teaching for 40 years. It is much more likely that people will move in and out of teaching, and we will over time—as a lot of employers, including the civil service, need to do—look much more at those sorts of careers and how we help people back into teaching, as well as recruiting them in the first place. We are seeing that in the numbers, which are going up. The kind of thing that Sinead has described will be a much bigger part of the future.

Q111 Mrs Trevelyan: Is the Department planning ahead to support schools to actually run schools in that framework? Running a school is a fairly specific world. What is the Department doing to think ahead? It feels to me as though everything is very reactive. Do you actually plan ahead to say, “In the next 10 years, we expect half the schools teaching body to be a part-time workforce”? How does a school work with that?

Chris Wormald: Yes, and that requires a number of the processes that Sinead described. Those are the things that we are doing. Both you and Mr Jackson raised the reactive point. We do have to be reactive to some extent. Labour markets change very quickly and we look at what is happening out there and adapt our policies accordingly. Through the teacher supply model, we also try to take a longer-term view, but what we do not try to do is predict exactly what the world is going to be like in 10 years' time and make our policies adapt.

³ Clarification by witness 23/03/2016: “To clarify, what NCTL is actually doing is signposting Returners to childcare provision, and expect schools that are part of the Returners pilot projects to support any returning teacher who needs childcare, to do the same locally.”

Q112 Mrs Trevelyan: You have a pretty good idea of what the pupil numbers will be like in 10 years' time, because if they are born this year they will be in secondary school in 11 years' time. Do you feel that the teacher supply model is forward-thinking enough? The numbers seem to vary: from the report, there seems to be a huge potential gap in what you might come out with each year in teacher numbers that you are going to need.

Chair: And you abolished your target model for teacher trainees.

Tim Phillips: Are you referring to the target for undergraduates?

Chris Wormald: We stopped having the target for undergraduates, which was quite a small proportion. We have retained our overall targets. The model does produce variable results—particularly the further ahead one goes—because there is quite a lot of econometric data about the future performance of the economy, which is of course highly variable. I have discussed with the Committee before that, although our projections of pupil numbers at a national level can be reasonably easy to predict, actually predicting where in the country those pupils will be is increasingly difficult, given that we have a more mobile population. In the teacher supply model we currently look mainly three years ahead.

Q113 Mrs Trevelyan: Some of them will go much further forward.

Chris Wormald: Yes, but like any model, it becomes much more uncertain, particularly those bits that are dependent on economic data.

Q114 Mrs Trevelyan: I come back to the same word: reactive. With the secondary school area, where you have your subject need in a way that perhaps you do not have in primary in the same way, there is timing. Are you saying that, realistically, the boom and bust of the national economy is going to be what ensures whether you can get physics teachers or whether the Army or BAE Systems gets them?

Chris Wormald: I will speak specifically about maths and physics, because those are our two biggest challenges. We need to do two things: we need to increase the overall supply of graduates in those areas, to benefit not just teaching but the wider economy. It is hoped that teaching will get a proportion of those graduates. We have got encouraging numbers about people taking up A-levels in those subjects and we now need to see that translated into more graduates. That is the long-term part of the game. The shorter-term part is ensuring that we are competitive with other employers—that comes back to what we do about bursaries and looking at how we better upskill other teachers who can teach those subjects, as Sinead was describing earlier. We are trying—and some of it is reactive—to deal with those short-term issues at the same time as we look at the longer term drivers of how many scientists and mathematicians we need in the economy.

Q115 John Pugh: On the supply side, for the last year for which figures are available a quarter of all teachers who left were retirees; the other three-quarters left for other reasons—not to

retire. The startling thing is that in 2011 the proportion that left not for retirement was not three-quarters; it was only 64%. In 2014 it went up to 75%. In terms of your planning, you are seeing a trend here in the 10% rise over four or five years. Are you working on the assumption that that trend will persist, both in terms of the balance of people leaving the profession and also in terms of a 10% rise over five years?

Chris Wormald: Yes. One of the things the teacher supply model does, which is one of the variable parts, is that it takes forward economic numbers and predicts a number of leavers. Page 15 of the NAO Report has a helpful diagram at figure 3. The two numbers that are particularly relevant—

Q116 John Pugh: Could I just stop you there? I am surprised you answered yes, because that is obviously a dramatic trend. If that trend is going to persist, why do you think it is as marked as it is? A second supplementary question, putting them both together: do you think there is any policy change the Government could make that could alter or modify that trend? Or is it some inexorable rise that you just have to deal with?

Chris Wormald: I will say a couple of things. The conversation we were just having about the changes to the structure of the labour market does make the number on figure 3—that 31,350—that has been going up.

Q117 John Pugh: That is how you would explain it, by the labour market?

Chris Wormald: The other number that is going up is that of returners, that 14,100. What we see is that a little under half of the people who leave eventually come back to schools, and we do expect that sort of change to continue. In terms of what the future will look like, we will probably see that number of people who are leaving for non-retirement reasons go up and we will also see that number of returners to the profession go up. That is what gets built in to the teacher supply model. We do expect to see that as a change to the way the labour market operates.

There are various things—the Comptroller and Auditor General has raised this point—that we can look at around retention as well, so that we don't simply take that number as a given. Some of those things are in schools' hands, to do with how you deal with individual teachers and the use of the pay freedoms and such things. Some are things that national Government need to address around some of the issues that your witnesses raised about workload and some of the other pressures on teachers.

We will look at retention but we do think that there is an overall change in the structure of the labour market going on here. Where it is not happening is at the front end of teachers' careers. When we look at how many newly qualified teachers are still teaching five years later, that number has been steady at a little over 70% since 1996. On the specific topic of this Report, initial teacher training, we are not seeing the number of leavers go up. It appears to be later in people's careers that they are going in and coming out of the teaching profession rather more.

Q118 Mrs Trevelyan: Coming back to the bursary framework in more detail, I think we are looking at £167 million a year being spent. That is a big fat chunk of cash, so understanding how you are assessing the effectiveness and value for money of that money you are spending in a variety of areas is important. Are you getting the right people—as we discussed, would they have gone into the subject anyway? On retention, what are you doing, as you identified in one case, to get the money back if it is a failure and does not work out? Are you comfortable that you are getting value for money for that £167 million?

Chris Wormald: We assess the bursary route every year and move the bursaries up and down, and we analyse the effect on applications and retention rates every year. I think the NAO quotes in the Report the number we currently calculate, which is on average £1,000-worth of bursary equals a 2.9% increase in applications. So we can see that as bursaries go up and down, it is reflected in the number of people studying.

Tim Phillips: I don't think the Report says that you assess the impact of bursaries every year. You assessed it in 2012-13 and found a connection between an increase in the value of a bursary.

Chris Wormald: We do do that ourselves; I've been looking at in preparation for this hearing. We will do more and more of that as we do more years of bursaries. It is important that we do that because, as you say, it is a lot of money.

Sir Amyas Morse: Are you saying you are going to do that every year?

Chris Wormald: I think we do in continuously.

Sir Amyas Morse: So now you are doing it continuously every year from now on. We can look forward to that, can we?

Sinead O'Sullivan: Yes.

Q119 Chair: What a swift result.

Sinead O'Sullivan: Even before we had a model, though, we assessed each year how much of a bursary we should pay, based on how many applicants we had seen.

Q120 Chair: The Comptroller and Auditor General is grinning like a Cheshire cat at the idea that his Report has had such an impact.

Chris Wormald: I think he is right. It is obviously a lot of money, and we can measure the effect on applications of changing bursaries.

Q121 Chair: Anne-Marie is going to continue this line of questioning.

Chris Wormald: What I was going to add is the importance on average. What we do not currently know is the marginal impact of some of these very high bursaries, because we have not done that. That is a specific thing we will need to look at.

Q122 Mrs Trevelyan: So how many bursaries were handed out last year?

Sinead O'Sullivan: It would be a challenge to give you a specific number. I do not have the briefing with me.

Q123 Mrs Trevelyan: Do I take the Teach First number of 35,000 per year and divide it into £1.67 million, or are we looking at bursaries from—

Sinead O'Sullivan: No, because the 35,000 people includes undergraduates, who do not attract a bursary, and all those people who take subjects such as PE, which also does not attract a bursary.

Chris Wormald: About 17,000 trainees a year get bursaries, it says on my piece of paper.

Q124 Mrs Trevelyan: Right. So we are looking at an average of about £10,000.

Chris Wormald: Well, they vary considerably, don't they?

Sinead O'Sullivan: The smallest bursary we have this year is £3,000, and the largest is one for physics, which is £30,000 for a first-class degree.

Chris Wormald: There is another thing from earlier that we wanted to put on record. Those very high bursaries, such as the £30,000 for physics, are only available for people with a physics degree.

Tim Phillips: A first-class physics degree.

Chris Wormald: Yes. So it wouldn't be the people doing the subject below those levels.

Q125 Mrs Trevelyan: So of the sums that you handed out this year, you will be able to assess when you review it next year which ones have been value for money, and you will adapt how you do bursaries next year on the basis of what you get this year.

Sinead O'Sullivan: Yes. We look at the number of applicants and whether it has risen or fallen, and by how much. Where we have confidence, we tend to take money away; where we are concerned, we may look at trying to find ways to give more.

Q126 Mrs Trevelyan: On an annual basis?

Sinead O'Sullivan: Yes, we do that every year.

Q127 Mrs Trevelyan: So from the students' point of view, it could be a case of, "My big brother did it, and I hear he got £15,000, but by the time I get there, that may have gone."

Sinead O'Sullivan: That is possible, yes.

Q128 Mrs Trevelyan: Do you consider that to be a helpful way to develop that continuous flow, particularly in the STEM subjects? We have to keep building it.

Sinead O'Sullivan: In the STEM subjects, particularly maths and physics, it has been challenging for a number of years, so the bursaries have not been that volatile. Subjects where you have seen us move money around include primary, where we over-recruited last year; religion; history, where again we have a healthy pipeline. We have had one or two subjects where we have removed the bursary and then reintroduced it, because we saw the number of applicants fall quite significantly, so the bursaries are definitely having an effect.

Q129 Mrs Trevelyan: Are you tracking with those individuals what the retention is for them two years further down the line?

Sinead O'Sullivan: We are not at the moment, but we are hoping to be able to do that in future, with the—

Q130 Chair: You say you hope to in future. Will you be able to with the current cohort in future, or are you going to set up a system in future?

Sinead O'Sullivan: We would like over time to be able to develop the data linking project that I was talking about earlier. I cannot guarantee that we will be doing it with this cohort this year.

Q131 Chair: So, just to be clear, if I got a £30,000 bursary for my first-class physics degree—which I stress to the Committee I do not have—and I got a teacher training position, got my £30,000 and then did not go into teaching, can we be clear again what happens? Nothing? You do not know whether I have gone into teaching or not?

Sinead O'Sullivan: We do not claim it back.

Q132 Chair: But do you know if I have gone into teaching?

Sinead O'Sullivan: At the moment, no, but we are expecting to as a result of the work we are doing to link—

Q133 Chair: But there is a huge risk there, isn't there?

Chris Wormald: We know the overall numbers. We know that the rate of people training in physics who go into physics is about the same as for other subjects. It has been constant at about 90%.

Q134 Chair: How many drop out, then, if you have the overall figure? What percentage? When I say "drop out", I mean they do not go on to be teachers although they have a teaching qualification.

Chris Wormald: I think there is a table.

Chair: Which although you say is a hard thing, Ms O'Sullivan—

Chris Wormald: It doesn't show it by subject, but I don't think we see big differences in these numbers between subjects. That shows the percentage who then enter a teaching post per route.

Q135 Chair: But per route is different from per subject. That is the point. I think we as a Committee understand the crisis in STEM subjects. They are valuable and important. Any child in a Hackney school can tell me about when they have had a teacher not well qualified. They know. They say, "The teacher is one page ahead of us in the textbook." They get it. They can see when a teacher really knows and when a teacher doesn't. Pupils are not stupid.

There is an old statistic that I heard, so it is probably out of date, but in the past in the black country there was not a single teacher teaching chemistry with a chemistry degree. That meant that those pupils from the very beginning were not able to get into pharmacy, medicine and all sorts of things because they were not going to get a good enough chemistry education to get good enough A-levels to get into university. That is what we are up against and what we are anxious to pin down. You are paying these bursaries to people with taxpayers' money for good reason. How many people are dropping out and how much of taxpayers' money is going to people who then do not become teachers?

Sinead O'Sullivan: As the permanent secretary said, just short of 90% go into teaching.

Q136 Chair: That is overall, but what about the STEM subjects? It is the STEM subjects that the money is going to.

Sinead O'Sullivan: How long they stay in teaching is the challenge. What we have seen and built into this—

Q137 Chair: Are you saying that they do not drop out?

Sinead O'Sullivan: I am saying that they do not drop out in any greater numbers than in other subjects, that we are aware of.

Q138 Chair: Let me reiterate. If I have done my degree and self-funded through a PGCE and then do not go into teaching, that is my loss. If the taxpayer is giving me £30,000 to do a PGCE and to go into teaching and then I do not go into teaching, that is £30,000 of taxpayers' money that has not got the outcome that was intended. Anne-Marie is itching to get that money for Berwick, and I am sure Doncaster and Lincolnshire are keen to get it, too. *[Interruption.]* I can see the headteacher from Lincolnshire nodding with interest at the idea of having that £30,000. For a small primary school, that would be a lot of money. Seriously, we have got £30,000 possibly leaching out the system, and you cannot tell us how many people getting that £30,000 are not going into teaching.

Sinead O'Sullivan: I cannot tell you yet how many people will get £30,000 either. This is the first year that we are operating it.

Q139 Stephen Phillips: Isn't this madness? What you are really saying to graduates with a first-class physics degree is, "Why not have another year of being a student, and the Government will pay you £30,000? It does not matter if you go into teaching at the end of it." That is the message.

Sinead O'Sullivan: If that was the way it was received, I would expect to see higher numbers participating.

Q140 Stephen Phillips: With the publicity that this hearing may or may not generate, you may well see that.

Chair: Our hashtag is #trainingteachers.

Q141 Stephen Phillips: "Have another nice year at university doing a PGCE, which is another great qualification. You do not have to teach at the end of it, and the taxpayer will pay you £30,000."

Sinead O'Sullivan: And you will have to pay the student loans that you have taken out in order to do that.

Stephen Phillips: Even if we take those off, you are still quids in, are you not?

Chair: You are still earning about what a teacher would earn. Taking £9,000 of tuition fees off £30,000 makes £21,000. You earn £22,000-something as a new teacher.

Q142 Stephen Phillips: Did you sign this off as value for money, Mr Wormald?

Chris Wormald: As I said, we have not seen—

Q143 Stephen Phillips: No, Mr Wormald: who signed it off as value for money for the taxpayer?

Chris Wormald: We do think this is value for money and we do not want to put handcuffs on people who receive bursaries, because we are trying to create an incentive for people to train and not to create new barriers for people to train.

Stephen Phillips: Did you ask for a ministerial direction in relation to this programme?

Q144 Chair: The Comptroller and Auditor General has a point to make.

Sir Amyas Morse: I do think it is important—Ms O’Sullivan has mentioned it a couple of times—in getting the dynamics of this to set against it what people who are training have had to spend on tuition fees. It does give you a better rounded picture than just taking one side of the picture. When you are applying the detail, as I am sure you will, I suggest that you add that in as well.

Chris Wormald: Yes.

Q145 Mrs Trevelyan: In terms of the DfE stats, the average cost of training per trainee is £18,900 for university-led, £20,800 for a school-centred provider and £20,000 for the School Direct fee system and the School Direct salary system. For Teach First, it is £35,800. There are quite big variations in there. Obviously 57% are not in the school-led environment yet but are still in the university framework. How are you assessing how the value for money will pan out on that for us the taxpayer to ensure that all those are the very best they can be in terms of the future teachers we need? That is a big difference in the price of turning out a teacher.

Chris Wormald: The big difference in pricing is between Teach First and the others, which are all around the £19,000 to £20,000 mark. Teach First is the one that we typically pay more for. I think the Report sets out the extra investment is in return for the quality of graduate that we get from Teach First, and their wider impact on the system. The other routes, I think the National Audit Office said, actually come out at a very similar type of cost.

The way we judge the cost-effectiveness and value for money of those is by the numbers on figure 15 of the National Audit Office Report, which shows the number that go through to get QTS and the number that then enter teaching posts—those are absolutely key metrics. Over time, as Sinead was describing earlier, we will be able to do more of tracking what then happens to those people in their future.

Q146 Mrs Trevelyan: When did Teach First start?

Sinead O’Sullivan: 2003.

Q147 Mrs Trevelyan: So we have not been tracking it since then?

Sinead O'Sullivan: Teach First recruits—about 95% of its candidates have a 2:1 or a first. Many of them come from Russell Group universities. Those trainees are placed in schools in specific circumstances—areas of deprivation or areas of poor performance—and the cost is a two-year cost, because it is a two-year programme; and indeed they cover their recruitment costs out of the funding as well.

Q148 Mrs Trevelyan: But we have not tracked where they have ended up. I remember it being touted as “Try it out for two years; see if you like education.” That was the commitment from the student—it was a two-year investment of their time.

Sinead O'Sullivan: It is a two-year programme, yes.

Chris Wormald: But Teach First do track them.

Sinead O'Sullivan: Teach First track themselves. We don't distinguish at the moment between different routes when we look at potential.

Q149 Mrs Trevelyan: But the Department is handing out 35 grand a pop.

Sinead O'Sullivan: Twenty-six.

Q150 Mrs Trevelyan: Not 35, okay—2013-14?

Sinead O'Sullivan: Some of that is school payment.

Q151 Mrs Trevelyan: Okay. It doesn't interest you—something which is allegedly different, supposed to be very much more settled—enough to monitor it yourselves and to be really on top of that? You have just handed over that responsibility to them to monitor without any—

Sinead O'Sullivan: That has been the history, but again—sorry to belabour this—we are tracking teachers as of the 2013-14 cohort forward, so we would hope to be able to distinguish between routes in the future.

Chris Wormald: Yes, and all the providers are also inspected. I think Teach First has been.

Sinead O'Sullivan: Teach First was inspected again this year and seven out of nine of the secondary provision was outstanding—eight out of nine—

Q152 Mrs Trevelyan: I don't think I would question their quality, but it is no good if they all did two years in teaching and are now working as chartered accountants. That does not help my lack of maths teachers in Northumberland.

Sinead O'Sullivan: What Teach First tell us is that a significant number of the people who leave, whether after year 2 or year 3, are now coming back; so they say they have more people from their 2007 cohort, for example, in teaching now than they did at the end of the two-year programme. So they talk quite openly about this portfolio career, where you move in and out of teaching over time.

Tim Phillips: So it is true that we do not have the comparative data for other routes, but what the Report says at page 43, paragraph 3.20, is that for that first cohort in 2003, only 27% of Teach First people remained in the profession after three years, and that reached a peak with the 2010 cohort, where 62% remained after three years.

Sinead O'Sullivan: There were 186 in the 2003 cohort and about 900 in the 2009 cohort.

Tim Phillips: Figure 20 over the page then shows how as a general premise there is a drop-off after the two year point, and that continues to be the case, though more people are staying than previously; but it is lower than retention rates overall, I think it is correct to say.

Sinead O'Sullivan: It is so far, yes, although what we are particularly interested in is the people who are coming back.

Q153 Mrs Trevelyan: Are they getting the benefit of more investment from the Department's money so that they can come back into the system again?

Sinead O'Sullivan: Not as far as I know; they are coming back often working with Teach First.

Q154 Chair: Just remind me—are they qualified as teachers after the two years?

Sinead O'Sullivan: They have QTS after the first year.

Q155 Chair: I just have some quick questions, and then Stephen Phillips has got something to finish off with. Can I just say, in the first panel we heard—and I had this from some of my headteachers as well—that there is a concern that the standard of applicants has gone down. What I was hearing from one of my headteachers in particular was that they may have the qualifications in teaching, and their degree, but their grammar and basic literacy was poor, and when they interviewed them they were embarrassed to put them in front of a classroom of pupils. I don't know if you have got any comments about that—whether this is something that you are looking at in the calibre of people coming through.

Sinead O'Sullivan: It is not currently something we are looking at, but this is one of the reasons why it is so important to have schools involved in recruiting trainees—because they will

filter out the weakest candidates. They have a vested interest in making sure that they have the best candidates trained at the end of the programme in order to employ them.

Q156 Chair: I am not sure that they can necessarily weed them out at that point. How are they going to weed out someone whose grammar is not quite on?

Sinead O'Sullivan: They will ideally either not recruit them or will have developed a programme to assist as part of the training package.

Q157 Chair: Okay. I am not sure how you would necessarily be able to tell, until someone was in the classroom writing badly.

Sinead O'Sullivan: As part of the recruitment exercise, quite often candidates are put before a class and asked to teach.

Caroline Flint: If you have a shortage of teachers, you end up having to accept what you get, don't you? That is part of the problem. If you have a lot of supply, that works, but what if you haven't? Some headteachers in my area say that they get maybe one applicant for certain jobs or they are competing. I think at key stage 2, there are 35 adverts on the Doncaster recruitment site at the moment, and not enough teachers are applying for those jobs.

Q158 Chair: I remember being a school governor in the last teacher recruitment crisis, when you had one applicant if you were lucky for a job, so you just took them with open arms and tried to make it work, but it was very challenging at times. Anyway, that is an issue that we have heard about, so we just want to reflect that back to you, and we may reflect on it further in our Report.

The curriculum has been changing quite rapidly, particularly under the current Secretary of State's predecessor. We heard from previous witnesses, and a number of us have heard from people in our constituencies, that as those changes happen, there will clearly be demand for teachers in those subjects. When you plan curriculum changes, do you look at planning teacher recruitment strategies alongside that? Some of these have been very rapid changes, so I guess that makes it even more challenging.

Sinead O'Sullivan: Each year when we look at the number of teachers we require, we look at what policy changes are coming up, so yes, we take it into account. We don't build it into the TSM—the TSM is a data model—but we layer it in as part of planning the numbers.

Chris Wormald: Yes, and we did this year—so, for the EBacc subjects where the model would have suggested a lower target this year, we held it at the previous target because we know that there is more demand coming.

Sinead O'Sullivan: And we particularly protected the subjects that are EBacc subjects.

Q159 Chair: In terms of policy change, how much notice do you need to start setting a teacher recruitment programme in place to meet the needs of a curriculum change? Is it one year, two years, or three months?

Sinead O'Sullivan: It is about two years. We set the teacher supply model in the summer last year. We are recruiting at the moment. They will be trained next year.

Q160 Chair: So you need two years, but sometimes, I have to say, schools seem to be getting less than that at the moment for some of the curriculum changes.

Sinead O'Sullivan: I think that some of the detail comes later in the process, but in terms of understanding the change—

Q161 Chair: But the two-year figure is very helpful. On agencies, we have also had evidence from people saying that agencies are now increasingly being used by young graduates. Do you see that at the centre? Mr Wormald, is there anything you are doing to tackle this?

Chris Wormald: Yes we do, and as your previous witnesses said, there are occasions when it is perfectly reasonable to use agencies.

Q162 Chair: We are talking particularly about for the recruitment of full-time teachers.

Chris Wormald: We have seen what schools spend on agencies going up. That is an issue that we will be looking at, not really as part of this, but as part of the work we are doing on school efficiency, which we said a bit about as we introduced our consultation on the new national funding formula. So that is something we will be looking at.

Q163 Chair: Will you be monitoring? Something we picked up on in a parallel with your new Department—Health—was a lot of criticism of agency fees, but we uncovered that it is not the fee per hour, but the volume of agency requirement that is causing the biggest problem for NHS budgets. Will you be breaking down what is happening in agencies by the difference between supply cover, or covering when a school has an uncertainty in its budget, compared with actual recruitment of full-time people in permanent roles?

Chris Wormald: Yes, what we are doing around school efficiency—it is not just on agency workers, but across the whole variety of spending—is looking to do a lot more benchmarking of what schools do, so that we get down to exactly those sorts of costs. I do not know whether the situation in education is the same as in health. As I say, we have observed a rise in spending on agency staff over the last couple of years, which we do want to look at.

Q164 Chair: If fees get to a ridiculous level—as you say, agencies have a role and they have to cover their costs, and, I suppose, make a profit—and agencies start ramping up because there is

more demand, will you be looking at that, as a Department, to see if you can try and drive that cost down, as the social services department and the NHS try to do? Have you got a proper strategy for that?

Chris Wormald: Yes, we want schools to remain in charge of their budgets and for them to be buyers. What we want to do through our efficiency programmes is to help them be really good buyers.

Chris Wormald: Yes, we want schools to remain in charge of their budgets and for them to be buyers. What we want to do through our efficiency programmes is to help them be really good buyers.

Q165 Caroline Flint: I just want to come back on something that was said earlier. Teachers are going to agencies because they are not sure where the jobs are, particularly if they are looking outside the area where they live. That seems a bad use of going to an agency, if they are then going to top-slice an amount of money that is going to cost the schools more. Is there a role—or has the Department for Education thought about it—for a national bank or something where teachers can look in to see what is available around the country? I suppose it would be a bit like the UCCA system, so they would not have to resort to agencies in order to find a job.

Chris Wormald: Yes, we are looking at some of those issues. I have not had that particular issue raised with me before. It does sound a little—

Caroline Flint: Sorry, I did not hear that.

Chris Wormald: It sounds like something that we would want to look into. Yes, we are looking at whether we should do more nationally around making it easier to connect people to jobs. That is something we are going to look at.

Q166 Chair: It seems like a bit of a culture clash in the Department. I was puzzling through your last answer to me, which was that you want schools to be autonomous but you want to give them the tools to be better buyers. But for better buyers in agencies, there will be local markets. It will be a different market in Lincolnshire from what it would be in Hackney or Berwick, I suspect. There is not a national picture. Will you have some sort of cap, or encourage a cap on fees?

Chris Wormald: No, and for exactly the reason you say. I was thinking more in terms of identifying where there is good practice in buying and spreading that information around the system.

Q167 Chair: Another directive from the Department. I am sure head teachers are reading them avidly as they land.

Chris Wormald: Normally, you would say that I should do more on that sort of thing. The other thing that people look at is whether you can create local procurement frameworks, so that you have a standard across area. I know a lot of multi-academy trusts look at buying collectively. I think it will be more in that sort of territory than, “Here is a grand national scheme.”

Chair: I think that we may want to look at that more. Caroline wants to say something.

Q168 Caroline Flint: One concern, looking at the data from the NAO Report and our own local experiences, is that good schools just get better but bad schools don’t get better. The Secretary of State—I paraphrase her—said at the weekend that she does not feel, when looking at the education landscape, that it should be like the wild west out there; and that it should not be down to the survival of the fittest. Does that indicate that maybe the Department is going to have a better look at the problems in a more local, regional area, whether it is in training new teachers or retention, and that that would enable the whole school community to benefit from that oversight and see where the problems are? Are we going to see a bit of a change of attitude on that?

Chris Wormald: As you know, we already intervene a lot in schools—

Q169 Caroline Flint: We don’t want them to micro-manage but help to solve the problems. Working with what is happening in reality at a local level might help.

Chris Wormald: Yes. Our main form of intervention is to try to seek to create a circumstance in which those schools get better, rather than deal with some of the individual problems. So it would be the sponsored academies programmes and our other policies around failing schools that would be the main thing. As we said earlier, we are developing the National Teaching Service, which is specifically around how to get great teachers into places where they are needed. We are looking across those sorts of issues.

Sinead O’Sullivan: It is fair to say that we are encouraging our teaching schools alliances and MATs to share good practice and work collaboratively to find solutions to local issues, whether that is being gouged by a supply agency or finding it challenging to get recruits to come to your area.

Q170 Chair: Can I go back to this issue of applicant choice? We found it very confusing. The NAO has a diagram on what page?

Tim Phillips: Figure 2.

Chair: Figure 2 shows the routes in. Some of them you get funding for and some you don’t. If you were starting out now as a graduate looking to go into PGCE or do a BEd, it is a very confusing model. I don’t know how you would find your way through. Have you any comments on that?

Sinead O’Sullivan: We have done some work on that, but it would be fair to say that there is more to do.

Q171 Chair: That is laden comment. What are you going to do then?

Sinead O'Sullivan: One thing we have done for people who express an interest in teaching and want to get on the Get Into Teaching website, we have divided it into two categories: school-led or HE-led. We offer them advice on how to access training depending on their preferences. We spend quite a lot of time working with all of our providers to attract recruits into teaching. We run many regional, and a small number of national, Train to Teach events, where we explain the different routes and we have people from each of the different routes available to talk to.

Q172 Chair: I have to say, it seems like you need a degree in getting into teacher training to get to be a teacher; it is that complicated—or maybe I am just not very clever.

Sinead O'Sullivan: We don't want anyone to be put off—

Q173 Chair: It is not the first weeding ground, then?

Sinead O'Sullivan: Well, if you are a career changer, we have evidence that suggests you are less likely to want to take a training programme with tuition fees; you are more likely to be attracted to a salary-based route. That sends you towards either School Direct salaried or Teach First. We are trying to provide a range of options for the different types of people who might be attracted to teaching, but I don't think we've got it right yet.

Q174 Chair: But each year you also change the number of allocations per route, so I might think, "My predecessors on my degree course went that way; I think I'll do that," and then you find that actually there aren't as many places and it is full that year. Doesn't that cause some confusion to the applicant, but also for the provider in trying to plan their way forward?

Sinead O'Sullivan: I think for the applicant the issue is to make really clear what programmes are available in your area, and we are increasingly doing that, working with UCAS.

Q175 Chair: You are changing every year. That seems like a big—

Sinead O'Sullivan: We haven't. We have made changes every year over the last few years because we have been growing the School Direct market—the school-led route.

Q176 Caroline Flint: Why can't you extend that to a three-year forward look in terms of what is needed, given that, to be honest, in some of the subjects which have not got enough trainees coming through—I mean it is not new in terms of the STEM subjects. This isn't—I was going to say rocket science.

Sinead O'Sullivan: No indeed, for maths and physics we don't have the places.

Caroline Flint: I am sorry?

Sinead O'Sullivan: For maths and physics we don't have the places.

Chair: I am sorry; what do you mean, you don't have the places?

Sinead O'Sullivan: What I mean is, whether you are in a higher education institution or a school, then you can keep recruiting until—you know, we have never said, over the last three years, "Stop recruiting for maths recruits."

Caroline Flint: I see.

Q177 Chair: We talked earlier about subject knowledge enhancement courses. We were quite staggered, in looking at this, that if you are a PE teacher—say you have a sports science degree—you could train to be a science teacher and teach physics. I have nothing against people who have done a good sports science degree or against PE teachers, but I think most parents and pupils would be a bit worried about somebody who was a PE teacher teaching physics. Do you know how many people are doing that?

Sinead O'Sullivan: I don't know, right now.

Q178 Chair: Is it possible to do that?

Sinead O'Sullivan: We give a degree of—we allow providers to make a judgment call. It depends on the content of the programme and it depends on what A-levels they have.

Q179 Chair: The University of Aberystwyth states on its PGCE Biology page that it has accepted candidates with sports science.

Sinead O'Sullivan: They don't take places from us because they are in Wales.

Chair: Okay, but you get the point. That is one example.

Q180 Stephen Phillips: There are places that do. Paragraph 1.8 of the NAO Report states: "In some subjects, teaching by non-specialists is prevalent: computer science (44%), Spanish (43%), religious education (30%), physics (28%) and German (25%)." One in four kids in this country who are studying German are being taught German by someone who has no qualification beyond German A-level—maybe not even that. Don't you think most parents would be extremely surprised by that, let alone by the fact that for computer science, which is a relatively important subject in school, nearly half the teachers are not qualified to degree level, or possibly even to A-level? It is extraordinary, isn't it, Ms O'Sullivan?

Sinead O'Sullivan: This reflects the mismatch between the demand for teachers and the people coming through the pipeline.

Q181 Stephen Phillips: But why wasn't this picked up years ago, Mr Wormald?

Chris Wormald: Well, as I said, it takes time—

Q182 Stephen Phillips: How long have you been the Permanent Secretary?

Chris Wormald: Just under four years.

Q183 Stephen Phillips: Right. Why wasn't it picked up years ago?

Chris Wormald: As has been said at a number of points during this Committee, a number of these problems are long-standing. We do not have enough modern foreign language graduates in this country to fill all our teaching slots, and that is just a fact.

Chair: Can I just interrupt you. One of the key things is about the data. I know we go on about data in this Committee; it is because we and the NAO and parents want to track what is happening, one way or another. There are no data on the post A-level qualifications of teachers teaching off-subject. So we have the bit from the NAO Report, but generally you do not, I believe, collect data on, for instance, how many history teachers are teaching a completely different subject, how many people with a degree in English are teaching something else, or how many with a degree in PE or sports science are teaching physics.

Chris Wormald: No, we don't do that.

Sinead O'Sullivan: No. We do know the number of hours taught by teachers with a specialism—

Q184 Meg Hillier: Sorry, can you unpack that? What do you mean? Would this be people with a physics degree teaching physics?

Sinead O'Sullivan: Yes, but you would only know the number of hours taught.

Chair: Okay, but you do not know the number of hours taught by someone in a subject they haven't got a degree in.

Sinead O'Sullivan: What we do not know, of that remaining group, is what other training they have done.

Chair: So?

Sinead O'Sullivan: So, whether they have done a diploma outside of school or have had CPD in the meantime. We know what their degree is and we know how many hours are taught—

Q185 Chair: I am not again knocking good teachers who are good at teaching, but I think that if anyone stands up in a classroom who is a good teacher but does not know the subject very well that must, by definition, be a challenge, and children in our schools are not stupid—they would pick that up. If you have someone who is very able and needs the extra input, where do they get that from, if they haven't got specialist teachers in their school?

Sinead O'Sullivan: As I mentioned earlier, we are running a programme to train those teachers in teaching maths and physics. This is the first year of the programme, but we have more than 2,000 people doing the training, and this is training that is delivered by schools but has been designed in partnership with the Institute of Physics.

Q186 Stephen Phillips: Can I teach German to kids, without even a GCSE in German?

Sinead O'Sullivan: It depends on what the school has decided to do—

Q187 Stephen Phillips: Is there any bar on my teaching to children if I do not even have a GCSE in German?

Chris Wormald: No. It is a choice by the school leadership as to who teaches what.

Q188 Caroline Flint: Do you think that that is acceptable?

Chris Wormald: I think that headteachers are the right people to make that choice, rather than—

Chair: Sorry, but headteachers may have to make the choice because there isn't anyone else to choose from. If you advertise for a German teacher and no one applies, what are you going to do? You still have to teach German.

Chris Wormald: On the specific question I was asked, it is common ground to everyone that there are a lot of challenges in these areas—

Q189 Stephen Phillips: So as far as the DFE is concerned, there is no bar on someone who has no qualification in German, physics, computer science, Spanish or any of these other subjects mentioned in the NAO Report, teaching those subjects to A-level standard, even though they have absolutely no qualification themselves.

Chris Wormald: We think that the decisions about who should teach what should be made at school level, not by the DFE—

Q190 Stephen Phillips: So it is not your responsibility?

Sinead O'Sullivan: That is precisely why we incentivise, in the pipeline, people to come through with degrees.

Q191 Caroline Flint: Who does a parent go to if their child has signed up to do an A-level in German and they then find that the teachers teaching the subject haven't got an A-level in it or are not qualified to teach German to a specialist level?

Chris Wormald: Your first point of conversation would be with the school itself—

Q192 Caroline Flint: But where do they go if the school just says, "Sorry, tough"?

Chris Wormald: If a school is failing to provide an adequate level of education for that reason or any other reason, we would expect an inspection to pick that up and then we would expect to intervene in that school. I know that this is not a popular one, but—

Q193 Caroline Flint: I think that you are putting an awful lot of pressure on schools and on these teachers. I think what happens probably in a school is that they want to try to provide this course and then they try to work within the school team, but it is your job for the pipeline to come through and oversee that we are getting enough qualified applicants into the system to train as teachers. Schools can then take their pick from those. It seems to me that that is not working. Is that fair?

Chris Wormald: As we have said throughout this hearing, in a number of subjects we have a challenge. We have set out what we are seeking to do about that challenge but we do not think that rules on who can teach what is the way forward.

Q194 Chair: I am going to bring in the Comptroller and Auditor General, but I want to pursue just one more point. So, yes an inspection can pick it up, and any of us who visit our constituency schools will know that you can look and see easily if there is a problem in teaching in any secondary school because you can see the dip in GCSEs for that subject area. You can see if there is a problem with the maths department or the French department or whatever, because usually you will see the pattern. So it is evident.

Now if you are the parent, as Caroline Flint has said, of a child who is mad keen to do maths, French, German or whatever but is not getting that level of qualification, you might notice it before you apply to the school. You might notice it when they are in the classroom, but at that point it is too late for that child. That is the key point. Children in our schools are being short-changed if they are not having teachers with the right level of qualification in the classroom. I hope you take this seriously, Mr Wormald.

Chris Wormald: We do take it very seriously. As we have set out throughout this hearing, where we identify shortage subjects we take action nationally. What we can't guarantee is that we can always deliver in areas where the country is short of graduates.

Stephen Phillips: The level of incredulity around the table speaks volumes, Mr Wormald.

Chair: I'm going to bring in the Comptroller and Auditor General, because we're all too gobsmacked to speak.

Sir Amyas Morse: I just want to make sure I understood something. You were talking about an initiative to encourage 1,000 people to do training in maths or physics, yes?

Sinead O'Sullivan: Are you talking about the training that existing teachers can have?

Sir Amyas Morse: Yes.

Sinead O'Sullivan: Yes.

Sir Amyas Morse: How did you decide it is 1,000?

Sinead O'Sullivan: It's 2,000 this year.

Sir Amyas Morse: How did you decide that?

Sinead O'Sullivan: We are hoping to have a pipeline over the five years of about 15,000, and we decided that looking at the proportion of—

Sir Amyas Morse: The reason I ask is that quite a lot of things that the Department undertakes are interesting initiatives and sound, good directions of travel, but they have a continually experimental, "finger in the air" feel to them. I would like to see when that gets replaced by an actual measured understanding of what's going on and what you have learned from your experience. I would include Teach First and some other things in that. In other words, are you learning from them? I'm not criticising you for doing a lot of diverse things. I think that's really interesting, but I would expect you to harvest knowledge that you subsequently apply so you become more and more thoughtful about how you push things forward. Are you saying that you are doing that? Do you think you are doing that sufficiently or not?

Sinead O'Sullivan: This is the first year that we are running this programme.

Sir Amyas Morse: I know, but I'm asking a slightly more general question.

Sinead O'Sullivan: Yes, we have plans to adjust it and review it year on year.

Sir Amyas Morse: So you're going to evaluate how many people you should be bringing through the programme in the future?

Sinead O'Sullivan: Yes.

Sir Amyas Morse: Is that a general good principle for approaching these other initiatives that you are running? You need to understand how effective they are and adjust the effort according to that result over time. Would you say that is right?

Sinead O'Sullivan: Yes, but it is quite early in a range of the things we are doing to establish an evaluation.

Sir Amyas Morse: I accept that, but not everything is quite as early as everything else. I'm just trying to propose to you that we'd like to be able to see a more evidential approach to more of this stuff. It's not always just at the beginning. It's been going on for quite a long time in some cases.

Sinead O'Sullivan: School Direct has been going in significant numbers since 2013. The first cohort was just a few hundred, but the first significant cohort was 6,500. They finished their training in 2014, so they would have been in employment for the first time in '14-15.

Sir Amyas Morse: And bursary spending has been going since 2010-11.

Sinead O'Sullivan: That's right.

Sir Amyas Morse: All I'm saying to you is that I would expect you to know more about the effects of some of these things. I'd like to see that as an embedded behaviour. Sorry, I'll stop now. I've made my point.

Q195 Chair: The other thing is, as Caroline Flint said earlier, that it is not a new phenomenon that we are short, particularly in the STEM subjects. Where is the institutional memory about what happened before? Can I ask a specific question on that? I mentioned the Irish example earlier. I don't know whether that led to more people doing maths, physics and whatever degrees. Have you looked at good international examples? Are there countries that do very well in getting STEM teachers into schools? If so, what is the secret of their success?

Sinead O'Sullivan: We do look at it. I have to confess that—despite the accent—Ireland is not one of the countries that we specifically looked at. We've been looking at countries—

Q196 Chair: More pupils took higher-level maths. I know that worked. Whether it led to anything else—

Sinead O'Sullivan: Yes, you can take two exams at the end of school, so it's a slightly different system.

Q197 Chair: It meant that more pupils got a higher qualification, which meant that they may be more likely to go on to do a maths degree. Forget the Irish example, because neither of us know enough about it. What other examples have you looked at?

Sinead O'Sullivan: We look at what's going on in Singapore, where they have a very centralised approach. It's a small city state, so they can probably afford to, but it's very directed from the centre.

Q198 Chair: So that's not going to quite work then. Ireland we don't know; Singapore we rule out. What else?

Sinead O'Sullivan: There are states in America that are doing very similar things to us: they have quite a school-led approach to training, schools that specialise in CPD—

Q199 Chair: Is that working and getting more STEM graduates into teaching?

Sinead O'Sullivan: It varies. There isn't a silver bullet.

Q200 Stephen Phillips: Which states in the USA?

Sinead O'Sullivan: In Massachusetts, there are really interesting things going. There are interesting things going on in the charter schools across the country.

Q201 Caroline Flint: I used to be on the Education and Employment Committee and we went to America. I have been an MP 18 years now, and I think we visited back in 1998 or 1998, when Margaret Hodge was the Chair. I am intrigued that some of the answers given are so vague about where you have looked and what is the learning applied to the policies you are devising in the Department. I would have thought you would be able to crack how you have looked at this—

Stephen Phillips: And how they are working.

Caroline Flint: —and how they are working, yes.

Q202 Chair: We are here to watch the taxpayer's pound. We do understand that money may need to be thrown at this, but it has to get the right outcomes, and we are worried about that at the moment.

We have not got very far on international comparisons. On pay, the public sector pay freeze means that teachers' pay is frozen. Have you analysed whether that has had an impact on retention and recruitment? Especially if you are a STEM graduate, you have better opportunities than in many other subject areas outside the teaching profession. Has that made a difference? Have you looked at the trend over time?

Sinead O'Sullivan: We have not analysed it in NCTL.

Q203 Chair: Has the Department?

Chris Wormald: Future projects of pay and the economy are built into the teacher supply model, so yes.

Q204 Chair: So you are benchmarking against other options for graduates?

Chris Wormald: Yes. We look at the overall state of the economy and what we expect to happen to teaching, and that goes into our projections of how many new teachers we need to recruit.

Chair: But what about their pay? It is no good wanting to recruit teachers if they don't get paid enough.

Q205 Stephen Phillips: Has the retention element of the model got built into its assumptions with regard to future increases in teachers' pay or not, Mr Wormald?

Chris Wormald: Well—

Sinead O'Sullivan: It does not.

Stephen Phillips: It does not. Thank you.

Sinead O'Sullivan: It looks at wastage rates and projects based on historical data.

Q206 Stephen Phillips: Just on that model, paragraph 1.18 of the NAO Report, fourth bullet point, states: "The Department has not yet independently verified the model's accuracy." You said earlier in the hearing that the further out the model goes, the larger the range of potential outcomes. When are you going to independently verify the model you are using?

Sinead O'Sullivan: The model is publicly available and has been for two years—

Stephen Phillips: Yes, I've seen that.

Sinead O'Sullivan: Also, we have established an expert group to work with us—

Stephen Phillips: Now can I have an answer to my question? This hearing has been going on for quite a long time. When are you going to independently verify the model's accuracy?

Sinead O'Sullivan: In what sense?

Q207 Stephen Phillips: Well, you're going to get in some economists who are independent of the Department or the NCTL to tell you that the model is the right model going forward and that it

is likely to be a good predictor of the number of teachers needed, subject by subject, for the next relevant period.

Sinead O'Sullivan: We already make it publicly available and our—

Q208 Stephen Phillips: Right, the answer to my question is you are not going to have it independently verified.

Sinead O'Sullivan: We have no plans to do so in the immediate future.

Q209 Stephen Phillips: Well, can I make a suggestion—it may or may not be a recommendation of this Committee—that you do? Let's move on to another subject—

Chris Wormald: On that point, I would point out that of this model the National Audit Office itself said that it was well thought-through, logical and based on the best data. The NAO made some suggestions for improvement, but it is a validation.

Q210 Stephen Phillips: It might be a very good idea to have that independently verified.

Right, let's get back to bursaries for a moment. Last month, the NCTL, of which you are the accounting officer, Ms O'Sullivan, published the "Initial teaching training bursary guide" for the academic year 2015-2016. Are you familiar with it?

Sinead O'Sullivan: Last month?

Stephen Phillips: February 2016 is the date of publication. It is on the Department's website.

Sinead O'Sullivan: Okay.

Q211 Stephen Phillips: Annex B tells me the degrees that qualify me for a £25,000 bursary in mathematics or in physics. Are those degrees that have to be studied at a UK university, or could they be studied anywhere?

Sinead O'Sullivan: We have an equivalency process, so it does not have to be a UK university.

Q212 Stephen Phillips: I might, for example, have studied for a qualifying degree at the University of Maastricht, and that would enable me to get a bursary of £25,000 to train to be a maths teacher.

Sinead O'Sullivan: It might do, yes. We would have to look at the degree, but yes, it might well do.

Stephen Phillips: Right. Now, I know you don't know the answer to this—that's what you said earlier—but I imagine that it is the position that if I were a citizen of any European Union country, I am eligible for one of these bursaries. Assume that to be the case for the moment. Let's assume that I am Irish and that I studied a degree that qualifies me for one of these £25,000 bursaries, and that the Irish authorities recognise the PGCE as a training qualification in Ireland, which I imagine they do. There is nothing to stop me from qualifying as a teacher, intending to teach in Ireland, at the UK taxpayer's expense, is there?

Sinead O'Sullivan: First of all, I'm not sure that the Irish Government do recognise the range of qualifications we have for teacher training, but yes, as an Irish person you can come over here and train to be a teacher. We have many Irish teachers working in the system here.

Q213 Stephen Phillips: Yes, but you don't have to work here. The point I am putting to you, which I want you to write to the Committee to deal with specifically, is that I could intend to teach in Lithuania if I were Lithuanian, or in France if I were French, or in Holland if I were Dutch. I have a qualifying degree. I come here and the UK taxpayer pays me the bursary of £25,000 or £30,000. I study for the qualification, the PGCE, which is recognised in my home country. I then go back to teach in my home country. We run the risk of training physics and maths teachers, in particular, for the rest of Europe. Do you not see that?

Sinead O'Sullivan: I do see it as a possibility, but there is no evidence that it is a sign—

Q214 Stephen Phillips: This is the first time I have looked at this. Has it not occurred either to the NCTL or to the DFE before?

Sinead O'Sullivan: We're not seeing any evidence that it is the case.

Q215 Stephen Phillips: You just accepted that it is a risk, if the assumptions are correct. Has nobody in the NCTL or the DFE considered this risk and whether it might eventuate?

Sinead O'Sullivan: Well, in actual fact we want to encourage all sorts of people to train with us and then go on to teach in our schools. If you train to become a teacher in this country, you will have had placements in several UK schools and you will have learned all about the UK curriculum and how the UK education system works. In relative terms, teachers here are well paid, particularly in comparison with some of the countries you have mentioned.

Chair: If I could just add something. In London, I can think of schools I have visited in recent weeks where the Irish were very highly represented, and the Polish. In London schools that is quite normal.

Q216 Stephen Phillips: I am not criticising European Union teachers in British schools for one moment. I am asking whether we are essentially paying to educate the maths and physics teachers of the rest of Europe, or whether that is a risk.

Sinead O'Sullivan: We're not seeing that happen.

Chair: I have to say, Mr Phillips, that in my experience of the Irish system they are much better qualified and trained.

Q217 Stephen Phillips: That is a separate point, and it is not the point I am on, Chair. Let's move away from that, because you can write to us on it, all right, Ms O'Sullivan?

Mr Wormald, I have one very specific question for you. As I understand it, a quota was imposed for history graduates doing PGCEs who were going on to teach history last year. Is that right?

Chris Wormald: That's—

Sinead O'Sullivan: Do you mean the number of training places we offer?

Stephen Phillips: Yes, for history graduates.

Sinead O'Sullivan: Yes, we do that every year.

Q218 Stephen Phillips: Right. I am told by someone who teaches on the University of Cambridge PGCE course that one effect of that is that at Cambridge the places for 2014 were cut by a third and the places for 2015 by a quarter. The reason for that is that rather than imposing the quota institution by institution, you did it across the board, so that those that recruit late, like Cambridge, which might be thought to be a very prestigious PGCE, based in schools, could not fill up their quotas because the quota had been imposed across the board. Is that right?

Sinead O'Sullivan: So, we used to—*[Interruption.]*

Stephen Phillips: The number of people nodding behind you is quite extraordinary.

Sinead O'Sullivan: It's slightly more complicated than that. We used to give out a certain number of places to every institution, so you might have 20 history places, or you might have 35 places—

Q219 Stephen Phillips: But you don't do that now; you impose a quota per subject.

Sinead O'Sullivan: This year, because people didn't like the fact that they were turning good candidates away, we basically said to all the providers, "Recruit until"—

Q220 Stephen Phillips: Which means that the ones that recruit early fill up their places and the ones like Cambridge that don't recruit early—obviously Cambridge is an incredibly prestigious institution—cannot fill up their places.

Sinead O'Sullivan: They weren't particularly enthusiastic about this, but that is why we set a threshold that they could continue to recruit to, so we gave them some protection even though they were slower to recruit.

Q221 Stephen Phillips: Perhaps this question is for Mr Wormald, but are you going to relook at this policy next year as it seems to have an unintended consequence that is deleterious to training good history teachers?

Sinead O'Sullivan: Yes. The approach this year has had some positive outcomes, but it has also created some noise in the system and we are planning to look at that as part of—

Stephen Phillips: Again, I do find it extraordinary that this wasn't thought about when you went down this route.

Q222 Caroline Flint: Given that in answer to Mr Phillips' question you are having to relook at this, doesn't it suggest that you should have more forward planning rather than these yearly stops and starts in the system? Perhaps you could have a better view over three years, which would enable you to see how things lie. Would you accept that you can still have within a three-year forward plan some assessments on a yearly basis of how it is going, to allow you some flexibility? At least that is a pace at which things can develop and problems can be looked at and maybe resolved, with less of a knee-jerk reaction.

Sinead O'Sullivan: The issue with the last few years is that we have been growing School Direct, and that has created more volatility in the system. We have unfortunately been learning as we go, just as the providers have. I would like to be able to give longer-term commitments to providers in the future, and we are certainly looking at whether we can do that.

Q223 Chair: I have to say, we have heard from witnesses that people want teachers, so there is not a shortage of opportunities for teachers. To finish, I want to quote the survey published this month by the Association of School and College Leaders. This goes back to the issue of teachers teaching subjects in which they are not specialists. In that survey, 73% of school and college leaders said that they asked teachers to take subjects in which they are not specialists. Looking at the figures in the NAO Report, that is a staggering number of headteachers, principals and school leaders looking at using people who they've got, rather than using people who are ideal to teach our children and getting more good maths graduates, physics graduates and so on coming through.

Sinead O'Sullivan: It would be really interesting to know whether that is an hour a week, five hours a week or more.

Q224 Stephen Phillips: And you don't know. It is not for us to go and get the data; you don't know.

Sinead O'Sullivan: No, but I'm just saying that 73% of headteachers may ask people who are not specialists to teach a subject, but—

Q225 Chair: Our worry, to re-emphasise it, is not—we are here to look at the tax pound, but on this one it is about whether there is value for money for the pupil. If the pupil is not being taught well, even a half term of supply by a covering teacher is really detrimental to their future career in that subject and can make a huge difference when they are choosing their options. I think the NAO want to come in—this may be the last word.

Tim Phillips: In terms of the data behind the 28% of physics classes taught by a teacher without a relevant post-A-level qualification, that 28% equates to 12,600 hours of teaching in 2014. So we do have an idea across the board about what this relates to.

Chair: You have heard some of our concerns. We all, I hope, acknowledge that we need good teachers who are knowledgeable in their subject areas, where that is relevant in the classroom. We will be putting out our report after the Easter recess, and our transcript will be up on the website. Did you have one last point, Caroline? You are so shocked.

Q226 Caroline Flint: The Department for Education has, for some years now, championed good subject and discipline teaching. In the Ofsted reports I have read for schools that are inadequate in my area and others, it is often the quality of the subject teaching that is the issue. You have missed your targets for four years now. My worry is that you are not concerned enough—I don't think you have demonstrated that concern today—about a creeping use of teachers to teach subjects in which they are not qualified. The trend is rising on that front, as you keep missing your targets. Are you concerned about that?

Chris Wormald: Yes. As I said, we accept that there will be challenges in these areas.

Q227 Caroline Flint: No, are you concerned about the fact that you are missing your targets year on year in 14 out of the 17 subject areas? We are hearing about a trend of a rise in the use of non-specialist teachers. They may be put in a difficult position within schools; I am not blaming them, but parents cannot in good faith be certain that their children are being taught to the standard they should expect. Is that a worry for you?

Chris Wormald: We are certainly concerned about hitting our targets and the effects of that. As we have described throughout this hearing, just the initial teacher training component, given that we are very short of graduates nationally on those subjects, is not the entire answer. We think that what we have described around re-training existing teachers and some of the other things we have been talking about are an important part of what we will be doing about that. But yes, of course we are concerned.

Q228 Chair: Well, I hope so. Let's just run through it. As Caroline Flint just emphasised, you missed your recruitment targets for four years running. There are clear signs, as you acknowledge, of

teacher shortages, particularly in certain parts of the country. Sinead O’Sullivan, you highlighted some of those issues in your evidence.

On the bursary funding, which is potentially a real opportunity to get the right quality of teachers in schools, you have heard some of our concerns about how its impact is measured, and then the applicant getting into the system is complicated. There are a number of areas of concern.

We will be producing our report, as I said, in due course, but we are very clear that we will be returning to this subject. Mr Wormald, I think it will probably be your successor who has to come to answer, but we want to watch this because it matters so much, not just to the individual pupils but to the future productivity of this country, that we get highly qualified young people coming out of our schools—

Chris Wormald: Yes, and we would agree with that.

Chair: And if they do not get the right teachers that is a pipe dream really, isn’t it? We know that there is a lot of good teaching going on—I should emphasise that. We have heard from individuals in our constituencies about some excellent teachers who do excellent jobs day in, day out, in front of classrooms of children. It is a hard, demanding job and we applaud them. It is not fair on them, as Caroline Flint said, when they are asked to do things they are not qualified to do—it puts extra pressure on them.

I am glad that you take this seriously, but we will be coming back to look at it again. Thank you very much for coming along.