House of Commons

Public Accounts Committee

Managing colleges' financial sustainability

Thirty-Eighth Report of Session 2019–21

Report, together with formal minutes relating to the report

Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 18 January 2021

HC 692
Published on 27 January 2021
by authority of the House of Commons

The Committee of Public Accounts

The Committee of Public Accounts is appointed by the House of Commons to examine "the accounts showing the appropriation of the sums granted by Parliament to meet the public expenditure, and of such other accounts laid before Parliament as the committee may think fit" (Standing Order No. 148).

Current membership

Meg Hillier MP (*Labour (Co-op), Hackney South and Shoreditch*) (Chair)

Mr Gareth Bacon MP *(Conservative, Orpington)*

Kemi Badenoch MP *(Conservative, Saffron Walden)*

Shaun Bailey MP (*Conservative, West Bromwich West*)

Olivia Blake MP *(Labour, Sheffield, Hallam)*

Sir Geoffrey Clifton-Brown MP (*Conservative, The Cotswolds*)

Barry Gardiner MP (*Labour, Brent North*)

Dame Cheryl Gillan MP *(Conservative, Chesham and Amersham)*

Peter Grant MP *(Scottish National Party, Glenrothes)*

Mr Richard Holden MP *(Conservative, North West Durham)*

Sir Bernard Jenkin MP *(Conservative, Harwich and North Essex)*

Craig Mackinlay MP *(Conservative, Thanet)*

Shabana Mahmood MP (*Labour, Birmingham, Ladywood*)

Sarah Olney MP *(Liberal Democrat, Richmond Park)*

Nick Smith MP *(Labour, Blaenau Gwent)*

James Wild MP *(Conservative, North West Norfolk)*

Powers

Powers of the Committee of Public Accounts are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No. 148. These are available on the Internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publication

Committee reports are published on the Committee's website and in print by Order of the House.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Jessica Bridges-Palmer (Media Officer), Ameet Chudasama (Committee Operations Manager), Richard Cooke (Clerk), Ben Shave (Chair Liaison), Rose Leach (Committee Operations Officer), Damith Rajakaruna (Committee Operations Manager) and Wafia Zia (Second Clerk).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Committee of Public Accounts, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 5776; the Committee's email address is pubaccom@parliament.uk.

You can follow the Committee on Twitter using @CommonsPAC.

Contents

Summary 3

Introduction 4

Conclusions and recommendations 5

1 Financial pressures 8

Impact of financial pressures on provision for students 8

Pension costs 9

Payment of VAT 10

Implementation of T levels 10

2 Government funding and support for colleges 12

Funding arrangements 12

Intervention 12

The Department's strategy for further education 14

Formal minutes 15

Witnesses 16

Published written evidence 16

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament 17

Summary

The financial health of the college sector has been a cause for concern for many years and this continues to be the case. There is clear evidence that the financial health of the sector remains fragile—in 2018/19, 34% of colleges reported an operating deficit—and that financial pressures are having a detrimental impact on aspects of colleges' provision for students. The COVID-19 pandemic will put further strain on the financial health of the sector. There is, however, a disconnect between the picture of improvement that the Department for Education and the Education and Skills Funding Agency painted during our evidence session, and the much less positive situation on the ground.

Colleges' autonomy can hamper the Department's ability to protect learners and safeguard taxpayers' money—for example, colleges are free to borrow sums that they may struggle to repay, and to run with financial deficits year after year. Poor financial management can diminish students' learning experience, and in extreme cases jeopardise colleges' viability. In February 2020, government was intervening in nearly half of colleges for financial health reasons, and in recent years the Department has provided over £250 million in emergency funding, alongside other support, to ensure the continued functioning of colleges.

Colleges play a crucial, if unsung, role in developing the knowledge and skills the country needs. Their importance will grow in the coming years, as they help to address skills gaps that exist in the labour market, and develop the skills of those who need to retrain as a result of the economic impact of COVID-19. These challenges make it essential for the government to finalise the strategy it is developing for the future of further education. This committee has been raising concerns about the lack of strategy for over five years. A proper plan for further education is vital and overdue.

Introduction

At April 2020, there were 242 colleges in England, comprising 192 further education (FE) colleges and 50 sixth-form colleges. Colleges educate and train 1.7 million adults and young people each year, many from disadvantaged groups or deprived areas.

Colleges in England received income totalling £6.5 billion in 2018/19, of which £5.1 billion (78%) was public funding. Most of this public funding was provided via the Education and Skills Funding Agency (the ESFA), an executive agency of the Department for Education (the Department). Colleges are autonomous bodies and make decisions independently of government; for example, government does not have the power to appoint or remove college staff, and colleges may make financial surpluses or deficits. The Department is responsible for the regulatory framework and policy governing post-16 education and training, and is ultimately accountable for securing value for money from the public funding provided to colleges. It gains assurance mainly through the ESFA, which monitors colleges and intervenes where it has serious concerns, and the FE Commissioner, who acts as an independent adviser to the Secretary of State. In addition, Ofsted provides independent assurance about the quality of colleges' education and training provision.

Conclusions and recommendations

1. **For too long, the Department has lacked a proper integrated vision for the college sector.** The Department oversaw a programme of area reviews from late 2015 to early 2017, in an attempt to ensure that post-16 education and training provision met the needs of employers and students in local areas, while also creating a more financially robust college sector. The area reviews were successful to a degree, but significant strategic challenges remain. The Department considers that it has pursued elements of long-term strategy for some time—for example, giving employers more of a voice and reviewing the number of qualifications on offer. It acknowledges, however, that the impact of COVID-19, together with concerns about productivity, mean there is an increased need for a strategy for further education and skills development. The Department is developing a strategy to address fundamental weaknesses in the sector and expects the resulting White Paper to be published before the end of March 2021.

   Recommendation: ***The Department should make clear when it expects to set out funding commitments to support reforms proposed in the forthcoming White Paper.***

2. **Rising pension costs are putting significant pressure on college finances.** Staff costs, including pension contributions, typically account for around two-thirds of colleges' running costs, and have been rising in recent years. Employer contributions to the Teachers' Pension Scheme rose by over 40% in 2019. The government provided colleges with extra funding to cover this increase in 2019/20 and 2020/21, but colleges are worried about the affordability of contributions in future years. In addition, the Local Government Pension Scheme, which college support staff may belong to, has had a deficit in recent years and colleges have had to make payments to help cover the deficit, on top of their standard contributions.

   Recommendation: ***The Department should write to us within three months, setting out what it has done to assess pension cost pressures on colleges, and how it has taken account of these in its funding decisions.***

3. **It is clearly iniquitous that sixth-form colleges have to pay VAT while post-16 academies and schools with sixth forms do not.** As part of the area reviews of post-16 education and training provision, sixth-form colleges were given the option of becoming academies and, by 2018/19, 24 sixth-form colleges had converted. There is a financial incentive for colleges to convert because colleges have to pay VAT while academies (and other schools) do not. The Sixth Form Colleges Association estimates that the requirement to pay VAT means the average sixth-form college diverts around 4% of its funding away from frontline provision. This would equate to around £20 million per year across the remaining sixth-form colleges. The Department believes that, despite regular discussions between the two departments, the issue of inconsistent VAT treatment is not a priority for HM Treasury.

   Recommendation: ***The Department should work with HM Treasury to assess the merits of making the rules on VAT consistent for schools and colleges.***

4. **Successful implementation of the new T level qualifications risks being delayed by a lack of work placements.** In May 2018, the then Permanent Secretary at the Department requested and was given a ministerial direction, as he had concerns about the feasibility of delivering the new T level technical qualifications in 2020. The first three qualifications were launched in September 2020, but we remain concerned about the practicability of implementing the programme. A crucial element of each T level is the 20% of time spent on a work placement at a relevant employer, but colleges tell us of difficulties in securing those placements. COVID-19 has forced many employers to work virtually, and this is likely to reduce the opportunities for work placements even further. The ESFA acknowledges that some people still do not know what T levels are, but says it is working to engage with employers about the programme.

    Recommendation: ***The Department should write to the Committee before the start of the next academic year setting out what up-to-date assurance it has that there will be enough work placements for T levels. This should cover what impact the COVID-19 pandemic has had on the availability of placements, and plans to incorporate virtual placements.***

5. **The Department's funding decisions are based on previous years' student numbers, which risks holding back colleges that are growing.** Funding for students aged 16 to 19, which makes up around half of college income, is based on the previous year's learner numbers; other factors, such as retention rates, are based on data which are two years old. This means that colleges with increasing numbers of learners or improving retention rates are not funded for their full level of provision. This may become a growing problem, as learner numbers are expected to increase over the next few years as the population of young people rises. The ESFA reports that it is reviewing various aspects of the FE funding system – which, it acknowledges, is very complex – including how it uses lagged data.

    Recommendation: ***The Department should consider a change to the formula for funding colleges which takes account of real time or more recent information about student numbers. It should report back to us by the summer about how funding could be delivered that better reflects colleges' real time position.***

6. **The Department's, the ESFA's and the Further Education Commissioners approach to intervention takes too long, costs too much and is not effective in making colleges more sustainable.** At February 2020, government was intervening in nearly half of colleges for financial health reasons. Some colleges remain in intervention for a long time—for example, seven have been in formal intervention for five years or more—and 75 colleges have been in and out of early intervention more than once. The Department has spent substantial sums of public money on supporting colleges in intervention, including £253 million on emergency funding for 36 colleges with cashflow problems. This emergency funding was originally intended to take the form of repayable loans, but much of the money is now not expected to be repaid. Two colleges in Kent have been in the insolvency regime since mid-2019 and the ESFA expects these cases will end up costing it over £60 million. Payments to the education administrators amount to £6 million (10% of the total) so far, and could increase further. The ESFA acknowledges that intervention often

does not feel supportive to colleges and reports that it is taking action in response to Dame Mary Ney's 2019 report on college financial oversight arrangements, which recommended the ESFA develop a more nurturing relationship with colleges.

Recommendation: ***The Department should set out within three months what actions it plans to take to improve its intervention arrangements, and how it will assess the success of these actions.***

7. **Students are losing out as colleges cut mental health and other support services in response to financial pressures.** The Department's funding for colleges fell by 20% in real terms over the six years from 2013/14 to 2018/19, and the ESFA rated the financial health of 35% of colleges as 'inadequate' or 'requires improvement' in 2018/19. The ESFA emphasises that the sector's financial position did not decline as much as had been feared in 2015, but we consider this detracts from the continuing financial fragility. More colleges will face financial difficulties as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and, when we took evidence, the ESFA had concerns about the cash position of 64 colleges. Many colleges have responded to their increasingly tight financial position by cutting back on enrichment activities designed to improve students' wider learning experience, and on welfare services such as mental health support. The Department believes that colleges are good at prioritising their activities in response to financial pressures, but accepts that this is an area it needs to monitor.

Recommendation: ***The Department should undertake research into the extent to which college support services are meeting students' needs, including canvassing the views of students themselves. In its Treasury Minute response, we expect the Department to give a firm commitment to taking this action, and details of the timetable for the research.***

1 Financial pressures

1. On the basis of a report by the Comptroller and Auditor General, we took evidence from the Department for Education (the Department) and the Education and Skills Funding Agency (the ESFA) on managing the financial sustainability of colleges.[1]

2. At April 2020, there were 242 colleges in England, comprising 192 further education (FE) colleges and 50 sixth-form colleges. Colleges provide a wide range of academic education and vocational and skills training. In total, they educate and train around 1.0 million adults and 660,000 young people aged 18 and under each year, many from disadvantaged groups or deprived areas. Colleges are involved in delivering many of the government's educational and training priorities, such as apprenticeships and the new technical T level qualifications. In the coming years, colleges are expected to help meet the need for a more skilled domestic workforce following the UK's exit from the European Union, and they will be important in developing the skills of people who retrain or change roles as a result of the economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.[2]

3. Colleges are autonomous bodies and make decisions independently of government. The Department is responsible for the regulatory framework and policy governing post-16 education and training, and is ultimately accountable for securing value for money from the public funding provided to colleges. It gains assurance mainly through the ESFA, which monitors colleges and intervenes where it has serious concerns, and the FE Commissioner, who acts as an independent adviser to the Secretary of State. In addition, Ofsted provides independent assurance about the quality of colleges' education and training provision.[3]

4. Colleges in England received income totalling £6.5 billion in 2018/19, of which £5.1 billion (78%) was public funding. Most of this public funding was provided via the ESFA, an executive agency of the Department.[4]

Impact of financial pressures on provision for students

5. The previous Committee reported on overseeing financial sustainability in the FE sector in December 2015, concluding that the declining financial health of many FE colleges had potentially serious consequences for learners and local economies, and that the bodies responsible for funding and oversight had been slow to address the problem.[5] Five years on, the financial health of the college sector remains fragile. The Department's total funding for colleges fell from £5.5 billion in the 2013/14 academic year to £4.8 billion in 2018/19, a drop of 20% in real terms. At the same time, colleges' key costs have been rising. In 2018/19, 34% of colleges reported an operating deficit, compared with 37% in 2013/14.[6]

6. The ESFA's ratings of colleges indicate that the financial health of the sector has changed relatively little in recent years, although the proportion of colleges rated as 'requires improvement' or 'inadequate' decreased from 40% in 2013/14 to 35% in 2018/19. There

1 C&AG's Report, Financial sustainability of colleges in England, Session 2019–2021, HC 728, 16 September 2020
2 C&AG's Report. paras 1–2, 6
3 C&AG's Report, paras 4–5
4 C&AG's Report, para 3
5 Committee of Public Accounts, Overseeing financial sustainability in the further education sector, Thirteenth Report of Session 2015–16, HC 414, 16 December 2015
6 C&AG's Report, paras 10, 23, 2.12, 2.19

were 660,000 students (40% of all students) in the colleges rated as 'requires improvement' or 'inadequate' in 2018/19.[7] In 2015, the then Skills Funding Agency projected that there could be around 70 colleges rated as having inadequate financial health by the end of 2015/16.[8] The ESFA stressed to us that this decline had not happened, and said that the current situation, while not a good news story, was better than it might have been.[9]

7. The ESFA expects that more colleges will face financial difficulties and require emergency funding in future, as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.[10] In written evidence, the Association of Colleges told us that colleges would have lost a substantial amount of income because of the pandemic, particularly during summer 2020, from sources including adult learners, international students, on-site catering and apprenticeships.[11] The ESFA told us that one of the key indicators it was monitoring was the number of cash days that colleges had in hand. Based on forecast information supplied by colleges in July 2020, it had concerns about the cash position of 64 colleges.[12]

8. Financial pressures are affecting provision for students. They have caused some colleges to narrow their curriculum and reduce the length of courses. Some FE colleges have significantly reduced enrichment activities for students, such as careers advice and employability activities, and some are particularly concerned about reduced mental health support for students.[13] The Department told us that colleges had been good at prioritising support, and supporting vulnerable students was important to them. It acknowledged, however, that colleges had had to make difficult choices during challenging times, and that it was important for it to remain alive to these issues. The ESFA said that it was looking at students' experience of being supported and trying to understand their perspectives.[14]

Pension costs

9. Staff costs typically account for around two-thirds of colleges' running costs, and have been rising in recent years. Colleges usually offer the Teachers' Pension Scheme to their academic staff and the Local Government Pension Scheme to their support staff. Employer contributions to the Teachers' Pension Scheme rose from 14.1% to 16.48% in 2015 and to 23.68% in 2019. This means that the current contribution rate is 44% more than in 2015 and 68% more than the rate before 2015. The government is providing extra funding to FE providers to cover increased contributions in 2019/20 and 2020/21, but colleges are worried about the affordability of contributions in future years.[15]

10. The Local Government Pension Scheme has had a deficit in recent years, and colleges have had to make payments to help cover the deficit, in addition to their standard contributions.[16] Committee Members have been told of concerns about the potential impact of the deficit repayments on the balance sheets of otherwise financially healthy

7 C&AG's Report, para 2.5 and Figure 4
8 Committee of Public Accounts, Overseeing financial sustainability in the further education sector, Session 2015–16, HC 414, 16 December 2015
9 Q 50
10 C&AG's Report, para 1.15
11 Association of Colleges, para 2 (MCF00001)
12 Q 54
13 C&AG's Report, para 2.24
14 Qq 57, 59
15 C&AG's Report, paras 2.19–2.20
16 C&AG's Report, para 2.20

colleges. The ESFA told us that the scheme's deficit had grown to more than £3.5 billion and that, although colleges could negotiate, the scheme provider had the power to impose deficit reduction contributions.[17]

Payment of VAT

11. Between September 2015 and March 2017, government oversaw a programme of 37 area reviews of post-16 education and training provision across England. As part of the programme, sixth-form colleges were given the option of becoming academies and, by 2018/19, 24 sixth-form colleges had converted.[18] The Department highlighted that there are a number of reasons why a college may choose to become an academy, but acknowledged that one reason may be that, while colleges pay VAT, post-16 academies and other schools do not.[19]

12. The Sixth Form Colleges Association has estimated that the requirement to pay VAT means that the average sixth-form college diverts around 4% of its funding away from frontline provision.[20] Based on funding data in colleges' accounts for 2018/19, this would equate to an average of almost £0.5 million per college, or around £20 million per year across all the remaining sixth-form colleges.[21]

13. The Department explained that VAT treatment was a longstanding issue and that VAT registration had a range of implications not just the payment of VAT. It said that it had regularly raised the situation with HM Treasury, but did not believe that the issue was a priority for HM Treasury.[22]

Implementation of T levels

14. T levels are new technical qualifications which follow GCSEs and are equivalent to three A levels.[23] In May 2018, the then Permanent Secretary at the Department had concerns about the feasibility of delivering T levels by the target date of 2020. He requested, and was given, a ministerial direction to proceed to that timetable.[24] Delivery of the first three T levels – in construction, digital, and education and childcare – started on time in September 2020, with further subjects to be introduced over the following three years.[25]

15. T levels combine classroom learning and 'on-the-job' experience during a work placement of around 45 days (20% of the overall time) over the two-year course.[26] Committee Members have heard from college principals about difficulties in recruiting students, largely because of the challenge of securing enough work placements, and

17 Q 84
18 C&AG's Report, para 11 and Figure 8
19 Q 69; C&AG's Report, para 2.20
20 Sixth Form Colleges Association, Sixth Form Colleges: 2020 Key Facts and Figures, June 2020
21 Q 70; ESFA, College accounts academic year 2018 to 2019, June 2020
22 Q 69
23 Department for Education, Introduction of T Levels, September 2020
24 Q 73; Department for Education, T Levels: ministerial direction, May 2018
25 Qq 60–61; Department for Education, Introduction of T Levels, September 2020
26 Department for Education, Introduction of T Levels, September 2020; https://www.tlevels.gov.uk/students/about

their consequent fears about colleges losing income. This situation had been exacerbated during the COVID-19 pandemic as it was difficult for students to undertake physical work placements and the ESFA would not accept virtual work placements.[27]

16. The Department acknowledged that the move to T levels was challenging, particularly delivering work placements which were an important element of the new qualifications.[28] The ESFA emphasised the additional funding it had given to colleges to create work placements, and said that it had had positive feedback from colleges and students involved in the first T levels. It told us it was working hard to engage with employers, but acknowledged that people did not always know what T levels were.[29] It accepted that work placements had become more difficult as organisations had moved to working virtually. It was working with Ministers to explore options, but had to make sure that the quality of experience for students would be maintained.[30]

27 Qq 37–38, 61, 73–77
28 Q 75
29 Qq 38, 61–62, 75
30 Q 37

2 Government funding and support for colleges

Funding arrangements

17. Most college funding follows the learner, and each college's funding is largely determined by the funding rates per learner and the number of learners it has. Funding for students aged 16 to 19 was by far the largest funding stream in 2018/19, and represented around half of all college income.[31] The formula that the ESFA uses to calculate funding for these students is based on student numbers from the previous year, and data for other parts of the formula, such as student retention rates, are taken from two years previously.[32]

18. While colleges with fewer students than in the previous year, or with worsening retention rates, benefit from the ESFA's approach, colleges who recruit more students during an academic year than the number they were originally funded for may not receive full funding for those additional students during that academic year. This will become an increasing problem for colleges if learner numbers start to rise in line with demographic trends for 16- to 18-year-olds.[33]

19. The ESFA acknowledged that the FE funding system was complicated and said there were a range of reasons for this including the complexity of the college sector itself, with colleges offering very different programmes and catering for very different groups of students. It told us that it was reviewing various aspects of the funding system including how it used lagged data. It expected the forthcoming White Paper on further education would include a commitment to try to make funding as straightforward as possible.[34]

Intervention

20. Colleges' autonomy means that, for example, government does not have the power to appoint or remove college staff. Colleges can borrow commercially, and they may make financial surpluses or deficits.[35] We asked the ESFA whether its intervention powers were adequate. The ESFA said that the combined efforts of its teams and the FE Commissioner ought to be enough, given the funding contracts it had with colleges, so long as they could maintain dialogue. It was, however, theoretically possible for a college to "bury its head in the sand" and to keep the ESFA away until the last minute.[36] The Department stressed the importance of supporting good college leaders to make improvements and of building a sector that could sustain itself as far as possible.[37]

21. The intervention regime for colleges incorporates a number of phases, from prevention work, through early intervention and formal intervention to, in the most serious cases,

31 C&AG's Report, paras 1.7–1.8 and Figure 1
32 Q 43; C&AG's Report, para 2.10
33 Qq 43–45; C&AG's Report, para 2.10
34 Q 64
35 C&AG's Report, para 4
36 Qq 107, 112
37 Q 109

insolvency.[38] At February 2020, the ESFA was intervening in nearly half of all colleges for financial health reasons—84 colleges (35% of open colleges) were in early intervention, while 31 (13%) were subject to formal intervention.[39]

22. At February 2020, seven colleges in early intervention had entered it when the policy was introduced in November 2015; 75 colleges had been in early intervention for two or more separate periods; and seven colleges in formal intervention had been there for more than five years, with two of these having been there for more than seven years.[40] The ESFA accepted that some colleges stayed in intervention for a long time and said that, sometimes, new issues emerged after a college had entered intervention.[41]

23. Between November 2014 and March 2019, the ESFA paid £253 million to 36 colleges which had serious cashflow problems. The purpose of this emergency funding was to help the colleges maintain their teaching and other services for learners. At the beginning of this period, government's intention was that all the emergency funding would be repayable. However, at March 2020, the ESFA had categorised 39% of the total (£100 million) as non-repayable.[42]

24. The ESFA told us that some amounts that were originally given as loans then had to be converted to grants because not enough work had been done at the outset to assess whether there was a realistic expectation of repayment. It explained, however, that if a college did not have the capacity to repay debts, emergency funding had to be given as a grant in order for the college to continue to provide for learners.[43] It also said that emergency funding was now subject to stronger governance arrangements, involving HM Treasury, which included an assessment of value for money.[44]

25. In January 2019, the Department introduced an insolvency regime for colleges, which applies aspects of corporate insolvency law and involves a special administration regime known as 'education administration'. The overriding priority while a college is in education administration is to protect the students. Two colleges in Kent entered education administration in 2019—Hadlow College, and West Kent and Ashford College.[45]

26. The ESFA confirmed that the administration processes for the two colleges were largely complete, although some statutory duties and administrative tasks remained to be done.[46] It estimated that it would have spent more than £60 million on the two cases by the time they were completed. It said that a large proportion of this related to the costs of bringing the colleges' estates up to a reasonable standard, before other providers took them on. It had also provided a significant amount of emergency funding to pay the colleges' creditors.[47] The ESFA estimated that the cost of the administrators

38 Q 97
39 C&AG's Report, para 19
40 C&AG's Report, paras 19, 3.21, Figure 9
41 Qq 99, 104
42 C&AG's Report, para 20
43 Q 108
44 Q 110
45 C&AG's Report, paras 3.31, 3.33
46 Qq 102–103
47 Q 92–93

was £6 million – 10% of the total cost – and was likely to rise further as the process was finalised.[48] The Department asserted that, without the insolvency regime, it would have cost over £20 million more to resolve the problems at the two colleges.[49]

27. In July 2020, the government published an independent review of college financial oversight by Dame Mary Ney. The review made a number of recommendations with a view to improving the support individual colleges and the sector received, and enhancing oversight and intervention arrangements. Dame Mary proposed a new, more nurturing relationship between government and colleges.[50] In written evidence, the Association of Colleges described the existing intervention regime as "very negative".[51] The ESFA acknowledged that intervention—including the use of the word—jarred with the sector. It told us that it was taking action in response to Dame Mary's report, including moving the FE Commissioner into the ESFA, to present a more joined-up approach to intervention.[52]

The Department's strategy for further education

28. As mentioned above, between September 2015 and March 2017, government oversaw a programme of 37 area reviews of post-16 education and training provision across England. The area reviews aimed to ensure that there was the right capacity to meet the needs of students and employers in each area, provided by institutions that were financially stable and able to deliver high-quality provision.[53] The Department told us that the programme had helped to limit the financial deterioration of the college sector.[54] However, we note that the sector still faces strategic challenges including sustainability; relevance to local labour markets; accessibility and equity of provision across the country; and clarity of the message about what colleges offer.[55]

29. The Department has not had a clear long-term strategy covering the college sector's role, structure and funding in an integrated way.[56] The Department said that there had been individual elements of long-term strategy, such as giving employers more of a voice about skills and reviewing the number of qualifications on offer. It also highlighted that the impact of COVID-19, together with concerns about productivity, meant there was now a huge amount of focus on setting a strategy for further education and skills development.[57] The ESFA told us that it hoped the White Paper resulting from this work would be published before the end of March 2021. It said that the White Paper would articulate the role of FE in the education landscape, the importance it must have, and the things it needed to deliver for the future success of the country.[58]

48 Qq 94–95, 100–103
49 Qq 96–97
50 C&AG's Report, para 3.14
51 Association of Colleges, para 4 (MCF00001)
52 Qq 97, 104, 111
53 C&AG's Report, Figure 8
54 Q 114
55 Qq 83, 90, 106, 108–109, 113; C&AG's Report, para 3.11
56 C&AG's Report, para 3.10
57 Qq 64, 80
58 Qq 65–66, 89

Formal minutes

Monday 18 January 2021

Virtual meeting

Members present:

Meg Hillier, in the Chair

Olivia Blake	Sarah Olney
Barry Gardiner	Nick Smith
Peter Grant	James Wild
Mr Richard Holden	

Draft Report (*Managing colleges' financial sustainability*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 29 read and agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Introduction agreed to.

Conclusions and recommendations agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Thirty-eighth of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 134.

[Adjourned till Thursday 21 January at 9:15am

Witnesses

The following witnesses gave evidence. Transcripts can be viewed on the inquiry publications page of the Committee's website.

Thursday 26 November 2020

Eileen Milner, Chief Executive, Education and Skills Funding Agency; **Matthew Atkinson**, Director of Provider Market Oversight, Education and Skills Funding Agency; **Susan Acland-Hood**, Permanent Secretary, Department for Education Q1–114

Published written evidence

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the inquiry publications page of the Committee's website.

MCF numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

1 Association of Colleges (MCF0001)

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the publications page of the Committee's website.

Session 2019–21

Number	Title	Reference
1st	Support for children with special educational needs and disabilities	HC 85
2nd	Defence Nuclear Infrastructure	HC 86
3rd	High Speed 2: Spring 2020 Update	HC 84
4th	EU Exit: Get ready for Brexit Campaign	HC 131
5th	University technical colleges	HC 87
6th	Excess votes 2018–19	HC 243
7th	Gambling regulation: problem gambling and protecting vulnerable people	HC 134
8th	NHS capital expenditure and financial management	HC 344
9th	Water supply and demand management	HC 378
10th	Defence capability and the Equipment Plan	HC 247
11th	Local authority investment in commercial property	HC 312
12th	Management of tax reliefs	HC 379
13th	Whole of Government Response to COVID-19	HC 404
14th	Readying the NHS and social care for the COVID-19 peak	HC 405
15th	Improving the prison estate	HC 244
16th	Progress in remediating dangerous cladding	HC 406
17th	Immigration enforcement	HC 407
18th	NHS nursing workforce	HC 408
19th	Restoration and renewal of the Palace of Westminster	HC 549
20th	Tackling the tax gap	HC 650
21st	Government support for UK exporters	HC 679
22nd	Digital transformation in the NHS	HC 680
23rd	Delivering carrier strike	HC 684
24th	Selecting towns for the Towns Fund	HC 651
25th	Asylum accommodation and support transformation programme	HC 683
26th	Department of Work and Pensions Accounts 2019–20	HC 681
27th	Covid-19: Supply of ventilators	HC 685

Number	Title	Reference
28th	The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority's management of the Magnox contract	HC 653
29th	Whitehall preparations for EU Exit	HC 682
30th	The production and distribution of cash	HC 654
31st	Starter Homes	HC 88
32nd	Specialist Skills in the civil service	HC 686
33rd	Covid-19: Bounce Back Loan Scheme	HC 687
34th	Covid-19: Support for jobs	HC 920
35th	Improving Broadband	HC 688
36th	HMRC performance 2019–20	HC 690
37th	Whole of Government Accounts 2018–19	HC 655