



House of Commons
Committee of Public Accounts

School Funding

**Twenty-First Report of Session
2021–22**

*Report, together with formal minutes relating
to the report*

*Ordered by the House of Commons
to be printed 23 September 2021*

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

[Dame 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*)

[Dan Carden MP](#) (*Labour, Liverpool, Walton*)

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

[Rt Hon Mark Francois MP](#) (*Conservative, Rayleigh and Wickford*)

[Barry Gardiner MP](#) (*Labour, Brent North*)

[Peter Grant MP](#) (*Scottish National Party, Glenrothes*)

[Antony Higginbotham MP](#) (*Conservative, Burnley*)

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

[Craig Mackinlay MP](#) (*Conservative, Thanet*)

[Sarah Olney MP](#) (*Liberal Democrat, Richmond Park*)

[Kate Osamor MP](#) (*Labour (Co-op), Edmonton*)

[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

© Parliamentary Copyright House of Commons 2021. This publication may be reproduced under the terms of the Open Parliament Licence, which is published at <https://www.parliament.uk/site-information/copyright-parliament/>.

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), Rose Leach (Committee Operations Officer), Ben Rayner (Second Clerk), Ben Shave (Chair Liaison).

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 The school funding system	8
Impact of the national funding formula	8
Transparency over funding levels	10
Funding for sixth forms	11
Impact of falling school rolls	11
2 Progress on departmental initiatives	13
Review of support for children with special educational needs and disabilities	13
Changes to the national funding formula	14
Teachers' starting salaries	14
Education recovery and catch-up learning	15
Formal minutes	16
Witnesses	17
Published written evidence	18
List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament	19

Summary

In making changes to the school funding system, the Department for Education (the Department) has failed to take enough account of the impact of its decisions on individual schools and their pupils. The adverse impacts have fallen disproportionately on deprived local areas and schools. The introduction of the national funding formula in 2018–19 has resulted in a relative re-distribution of funding from more deprived schools to less deprived schools; in the three years to 2020–21, average per-pupil funding fell in real terms by 1.2% for the most deprived fifth of schools, but increased by 2.9% for the least deprived fifth. And the Department's decision in 2021 to change how it calculates pupil premium funding means that schools have lost out on £90 million of funding to support disadvantaged children.

There is a lack of urgency in the Department's approach to making improvements to the school system. Delivery of a number of its initiatives has slipped, and the Department is unwilling or unable to commit to revised timetables. In particular, the further delays in publishing the SEND review, which was announced in September 2019, are unacceptable. While the Department drags its feet, more and more children with special educational needs and disabilities are progressing through the school system without the support they need.

The Department has committed £3.1 billion to help children and young people catch up on learning lost due to the disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. However, funding drops significantly from 2022–23 and the total falls well short of the £15 billion that the Government's own Education Recovery Commissioner recommended. We have previously highlighted our concerns about the tutor programme but whatever aspect of catch-up schools need certainty so they can plan ahead. The Department says it is working through the feasibility of the more costly elements of the Commissioner's proposals, such as extending the school day, and that further funding will be considered as part of the upcoming Spending Review. Given the importance of this issue and the scale of the challenge, we intend to return to the subject of education recovery at a later date.

Introduction

In January 2020, there were more than 20,200 mainstream state schools in England, educating more than 8.1 million pupils aged four to 19. Around 11,700 of these schools (58% of the total), with 3.8 million pupils, were maintained schools, funded and overseen by local authorities. The remaining 8,500 schools (42%) were academies, with 4.4 million pupils. Each academy school is part of an academy trust, directly funded by the Department and independent of the relevant local authority.

The Department is responsible for the school system, and is ultimately accountable for securing value for money from the funding provided for schools. It works with the Education and Skills Funding Agency (the ESFA), which distributes funding for schools and provides assurance about how the money has been used. In 2020–21, the Department provided mainstream schools with core revenue funding of £43.4 billion. The largest component of this funding (£36.3 billion, 84% of the total) was the schools block of the dedicated schools grant. Other funding streams included grants to support disadvantaged pupils and pupils with high needs.

Conclusions and recommendations

1. **The Department's continued failure to finalise the SEND review means children with SEND are still waiting for much needed improvements in support.** In September 2019, the Department announced a major review of support for children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND). In May 2020, we concluded that many children with SEND were being failed by the support system and recommended that the Department should, as a matter of urgency, complete and publish the review. In March 2021, the Department told us that it would publish a Green Paper with its proposals for change towards the end of June 2021. However, in July 2021, the Department wrote to tell us that it needed more time to develop its plans. It says that it has extended the timetable for the review in order to ensure that its plans take full account of the changes caused by the pandemic, and that it cannot commit to a revised publication date. It is therefore still not clear how the Department plans to improve the SEND system and make it more sustainable, and when practical changes will be made.

Recommendation: *The Department should write to us, within a month of this report being published, with details of the progress it has made towards finalising the SEND review and setting out when it now plans to publish the review.*

2. **Under the national funding formula, schools that are more deprived have fared worse than those that are less deprived.** In 2018–19, the Department introduced a national funding formula with the aim of allocating school funding more transparently, consistently and fairly across the country. The new formula has made allocations more transparent and consistent, but it has also led to a re-balancing of funding away from more deprived schools towards less deprived schools. Between 2017–18 and 2020–21, average per-pupil funding fell in real terms by 1.2% for the most deprived fifth of schools, but increased by 2.9% for the least deprived fifth. The Department highlights that funding allocations have been catching up with changes in patterns of deprivation across the country since the early 2000s. However, the relative re-distribution of funding is also the result of the Department introducing minimum per-pupil funding levels, which have benefited the least deprived schools. In July 2021, the Department began a consultation on moving to a 'hard' national funding formula under which it would set schools' budgets directly.

Recommendation: *Before moving towards a hard national funding formula, the Department should publish an assessment of the likely impact of the proposed changes on individual schools and different types of schools.*

3. **It is not possible to tell whether individual academy schools are receiving the government's guaranteed minimum per-pupil funding levels.** In 2018–19, the Department introduced minimum levels of schools block per-pupil funding for all schools in England. In January 2020, the Prime Minister guaranteed that every school would receive minimum funding of £3,750 per primary pupil and £5,000 per secondary pupil in 2020–21. Local authorities are legally required to ensure that their maintained schools receive the minimum per-pupil funding levels. By contrast, multi-academy trusts are allowed to pool funding centrally, and do not have to provide each of their individual academy schools with the minimum per-pupil funding. We asked how parents would know whether their child's academy school

has received the minimum funding levels. The Department says that the schools financial benchmarking website provides a range of data on income and spending for individual academy schools. However, we note that the website combines funding from a range of sources, and does not show specifically the schools block per-pupil funding that each academy receives.

Recommendation: *The Department should publish each year, starting with the year ending 31 August 2021, details of the schools block per-pupil funding that each academy school has received.*

4. **Schools are having to cross-subsidise their sixth forms with funding intended to support younger pupils.** Between 2014–15 and 2020–21, the balance of funding shifted from secondary schools to primary schools. Secondary school funding per pupil dropped by 3.9% in real terms, while primary school funding increased by 4.2%. Part of the reason for this was that the Department reduced funding per sixth-form student, which fell by 11.4% in real terms. The Department concedes that it chose to prioritise funding for children aged 5 to 16. Local authorities have also protected funding for primary schools. The Department accepts that 16-to-19 education is facing challenges, and that some schools cross-subsidise in order to keep their sixth forms going. It has increased funding for students aged 16 to 19 in the past two years, in order to start redressing the balance.

Recommendation: *In making and communicating decisions about school funding, the Department should explicitly consider how different funding streams interact so that schools do not have to cross-subsidise, for example, in order to support sixth-form provision.*

5. **The Department does not seem to have a grip on the impact of falling rolls on schools.** Most school funding follows the pupils—under the national funding formula, the Department allocates nearly three-quarters of schools block funding on the basis of pupil numbers. We know of schools whose rolls are falling due to changes in their local populations. These schools still have to cover their fixed costs, but are seeing their funding fall significantly. The Department highlights that there is a ‘falling rolls fund’ that local authorities can use to help schools in this position, and that the national funding formula provides a lump sum for each school regardless of size. However, the Department does not appear to have a strong understanding of the practical financial impact of falling rolls on individual schools.

Recommendation: *The Department should carry out an evidence-based assessment of whether there is enough support for schools whose rolls are falling, and write to us by the end of March 2022 with an update on the results of its assessment and what it is doing to address any concerns.*

6. **The Department cannot say when it will implement its commitment to a starting salary of £30,000 for new teachers.** In September 2019, the Government set out its intention that salaries for new teachers would rise to £30,000 by September 2022, in order to improve the competitiveness of teacher pay. In February 2021, it told the School Teachers’ Review Body that it had paused planned pay rises for teachers in 2021/22, and that starting salaries would not reach £30,000 by September 2022. The Department says that it will not be able to confirm until after the next Spending

Review when its commitment to a starting salary of £30,000 will be implemented. For several years, the Department provided separate grants to help schools cover increases in teachers' pay costs and higher pension and national insurance costs. However, from 2021–22, it is incorporating most of this funding within the dedicated schools grant, making the funding less transparent.

Recommendation: *The Department should set out a timetable for meeting its commitment to a £30,000 starting salary for teachers, along with details of how this will be funded.*

1 The school funding system

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 school funding in England.¹

2. In January 2020, there were more than 20,200 mainstream (primary and secondary) state schools in England, educating more than 8.1 million pupils aged four to 19. Around 11,700 of these schools (58% of the total), with 3.8 million pupils, were maintained schools, funded and overseen by local authorities. The remaining 8,500 schools (42%) were academies, with 4.4 million pupils. Each academy school is part of an academy trust, directly funded by the Department and independent of the relevant local authority.²

3. The Department is responsible for the school system, and is ultimately accountable for securing value for money from the funding provided for schools. It works with the ESFA, which distributes funding for schools and provides assurance about how the money has been used.³

4. In 2020–21, the Department provided mainstream schools with total core revenue funding of £43.4 billion. The largest component of this funding (£36.3 billion, 84% of the total) was the schools block of the dedicated schools grant. Other funding streams included grants to support disadvantaged pupils and pupils with high needs. The Department’s total core revenue funding for mainstream schools increased by 7.1% in real terms between 2014–15 and 2020–21. However, as pupil numbers rose over the period, funding per pupil increased by just 0.4% in real terms.⁴

Impact of the national funding formula

5. In 2018–19, the Department introduced a national funding formula to allocate funding for schools. Its aims included that the new funding system should: be transparent, simple and predictable; allocate funding consistently across the country; and distribute funding fairly with resources matched to need based on pupils’ and schools’ characteristics. The Department’s funding allocations for schools are more transparent and consistent under the national funding formula—it publishes its methodology and the underlying values for the formula each year.⁵

6. At the same time, the national funding formula has led to a shift in the balance of schools block funding, meaning that some local areas and schools have fared worse than others in relative terms. Most London boroughs and cities with relatively high levels of deprivation, such as Nottingham and Birmingham, experienced real-terms falls in per-pupil funding between 2017–18 and 2020–21, while local authorities with relatively low levels of deprivation in the South West, the East Midlands and the South East saw the largest real-terms growth in per-pupil funding.⁶

1 C&AG’s Report, *School funding in England*, Session 2021–22, HC 300, 2 July 2021

2 C&AG’s Report, para 1

3 C&AG’s Report, para 2

4 C&AG’s Report, paras 3, 7

5 C&AG’s Report, paras 2.6, 2.10

6 C&AG’s Report, paras 2.21–2.22

7. There has also been a relative re-distribution of funding from more deprived schools (those with a higher proportion of pupils eligible for free school meals) to less deprived schools. Between 2017–18 and 2020–21, average per-pupil funding for the most deprived fifth of schools fell in real terms by 1.2% to £5,177, while funding for the least deprived fifth of schools increased by 2.9% to £4,471.⁷

8. The written evidence that we received raised concerns about the impact of the national funding formula. Professor Tanya Ovenden-Hope said that the formula had not delivered the expected significant increases in funding for small schools, including rural schools which have traditionally struggled to remain sustainable.⁸ The NASUWT (The Teachers’ Union) described the formula as “regressive”, and said that it was vital that the 17.9% of schools block funding which was allocated on the basis of pupil need did not reduce over time.⁹

9. The Department said that the national funding formula had fixed a system that had become broken. It explained that, between 2005 and 2017–18, school funding had not been adjusted to reflect changes in patterns of need across the country. For example, while the proportion of pupils eligible for free school meals nationally went up from 16% to 17% between 2005 and 2020, in Inner London, the proportion dropped from 38% to 25%.¹⁰

10. The Department told us that funding allocations were now catching up with changing levels of deprivation—some areas remained very deprived but were not as deprived as they had been in the early 2000s, while other areas remained less deprived but were significantly more deprived than they had been. This situation had created what on the face of it looked like a slightly peculiar pattern of some areas that were less deprived having larger funding uplifts than other areas that were more deprived.¹¹

11. The Department also highlighted the impact of the new minimum per-pupil funding levels on the distribution of funding. The effect of these had been to shift funding in the direction of schools that had very low levels of deprivation.¹² The Department told us that it had always known that the minimum funding levels were likely to benefit the least deprived schools. This was because the national funding formula was weighted towards disadvantage, so the schools with the lowest per-pupil funding were highly likely to be the least deprived schools. It noted that only a small proportion of funding (less than 2% of total schools block funding) was distributed via the minimum funding mechanism.¹³

12. The Department provides pupil premium funding (£2.2 billion in 2020–21) to help schools improve the attainment of disadvantaged pupils.¹⁴ From April 2021, the Department has calculated pupil premium allocations based on the number of eligible pupils recorded by schools in the school census in the preceding October, rather than the more recent January census as was previously the case. As a result, schools received £90 million less in pupil premium funding.¹⁵ We asked the Department why it made this change. The Department said that there were two reasons: firstly, to bring pupil premium

7 C&AG’s Report, paras 2.31, 2.33

8 SCF0001 Professor Tanya Ovenden-Hope, Plymouth Marjon University submission, pages 1–2

9 SCF0002 NASUWT submission, page 2

10 Qq 59–61

11 Qq 59–60

12 Q 59

13 Qq 75, 78

14 C&AG’s Report, Figure 2

15 C&AG’s Report, paras 1.34, 1.37

into line with most other aspects of school funding which were based on the October census; and secondly, because the COVID-19 pandemic had meant there were high levels of uncertainty around the January 2021 census.¹⁶

Transparency over funding levels

13. In 2018–19, as part of the national funding formula, the Department introduced minimum per-pupil funding levels for all schools in England in support of the government’s aim of ‘levelling up education funding’.¹⁷ In January 2020, the Prime Minister guaranteed that every school would receive minimum funding of £3,750 per primary pupil and £5,000 per secondary pupil in 2020–21.¹⁸

14. Local authorities can apply local funding formulae in deciding funding for maintained schools and academy trusts. However, the Department limited the extent of local authorities’ discretion from 2020–21 by requiring them to include the minimum per-pupil funding levels in their local formulae.¹⁹ By contrast, academy trusts are not required to provide their schools with the minimum per-pupil funding levels. The Department allows multi-academy trusts to pool funding centrally, and they can also re-distribute funding between their schools based on their own assessment of need.²⁰

15. We asked why multi-academy trusts had more freedom in how they distributed funding. The Department replied that academy trusts and local authorities had different roles: local authorities were responsible for distributing funding between schools, whereas academy trusts had direct responsibility for the provision of education in the schools that they ran. The Department explained that there were some circumstances, particularly where an academy trust had taken on a challenging school, where the trust might pool funding in order to do things across the academy chain that had benefits for all the schools but might, for a period, help one school more than another.²¹

16. We asked how the parent of a child in an academy school could establish whether the school was receiving the minimum per-pupil funding levels that they were promised. The ESFA said that the most accessible source of information was the schools financial benchmarking website, which contains income and expenditure information on every school in the country, along with additional detail on academy accounts.²² We understand, however, that this website combines income figures from a number of different funding streams, and that it is not possible to see whether a school is receiving the minimum per-pupil schools block funding specifically.²³ The Department said that it strongly supported transparency and that it was happy to look at whether there were improvements it could make to the financial benchmarking website to make it more helpful.²⁴

16 Qq 70–73

17 C&AG’s Report, para 13

18 Government press release, [PM guarantees minimum funding levels for all schools](#), 30 January 2020

19 C&AG’s Report, para 2.26

20 C&AG’s Report, para 2.29

21 Qq 81–82

22 Q 79

23 Qq 92–93

24 Q 94

Funding for sixth forms

17. Overall, between 2014–15 and 2020–21, the balance of funding shifted from secondary schools to primary schools. Secondary school funding per pupil fell by 3.9% in real terms, while primary school funding increased by 4.2%. The main cause of this shift was local authorities protecting funding for primary schools in their local funding formulae. In addition, the Department reduced funding per sixth-form student, which fell by 11.4% in real terms.²⁵

18. The Department said that it had looked carefully at the balance between funding for primary and secondary schools when it had designed the national funding formula.²⁶ We asked whether school sixth forms were losing out in an attempt to prop up the rest of the system. The Department disagreed with this suggestion, saying that government had needed to make some hard fiscal choices, and had chosen to prioritise and protect core funding for pupils aged 5 to 16. It also emphasised that funding for 16-to-19 education was now rising—the 2019 Spending Review had provided an extra £400 million (the biggest single year increase in post-16 funding since 2010), while the 2020 Spending Review had provided an extra £291 million.²⁷

19. The Department told us that it was mindful of the challenges facing 16-to-19 education, including significant demographic pressures.²⁸ It recognised that some schools with sixth forms were cross-subsidising their post-16 provision from the rest of their budgets, and said that this was one of the reasons why it had increased funding for 16- to 19-year-olds in the past two years.²⁹

Impact of falling school rolls

20. The funding that schools receive is largely determined by how many pupils they have. Under the national funding formula, the Department allocates 73.5% of schools block funding based on pupil numbers. A further 17.9% of funding relates to the number of pupils with characteristics that indicate additional need, including deprivation and low prior attainment. The remaining 8.6% of funding is linked to school characteristics, and is intended to help cover costs that do not necessarily vary with pupil numbers.³⁰

21. We have heard concerns about the funding of schools, across London and elsewhere, whose rolls are falling. Small schools, such as those with a single-form entry, may face a disproportionate financial impact if their pupil numbers fall. The Department recognised the themes we described including the impact in London, with changes in patterns of living and people moving out of the capital in some circumstances.³¹

22. The Department emphasised that all schools receive a single lump sum regardless of size to cover some of the fixed costs that do not vary with pupil numbers. In addition,

25 C&AG's report, para 1.12

26 Q 32

27 Q 33

28 Q 39

29 Q 40

30 C&AG's Report, para 2.7

31 Q 65

the funding system includes a mechanism called the falling rolls fund, which allows local authorities to support schools where declining pupil numbers are affecting their financial sustainability, but whose provision will still be needed in the longer term.³²

23. We asked whether the Department was confident that the falling rolls fund had sufficient resources to help all the schools that might need support. The Department replied that there were mechanisms for the funding to vary according to local need and the context in a particular area.³³ It also highlighted that it collected data every year from local authorities, at local planning area level across the country and forecasting years into the future, for the basic need and capital funding systems. It had a regular dialogue with the local authorities that were experiencing the biggest demographic changes and funding pressures.³⁴

32 Q 62

33 Q 63

34 Qq 64–66

2 Progress on departmental initiatives

Review of support for children with special educational needs and disabilities

24. In September 2019, the Department announced a review of the support system for children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND). The review aimed to improve services for families who needed support, equip staff to respond effectively to children's additional needs, and end the 'postcode lottery' that families often faced. In May 2020, we concluded that many children with SEND were being failed by the support system, and recommended that the Department should, as a matter of urgency, complete and publish its SEND review.³⁵

25. In March 2021, the Department told us that it planned to publish a Green Paper towards the end of June 2021 with its proposals for improving SEND support.³⁶ Consulting on proposals for change will be only the first step towards providing children and families with better services. Supporting the growing proportion of pupils with education, health and care plans is a significant cost pressure on mainstream schools.³⁷ In its written evidence, the National Association of Head Teachers emphasised that the factors underpinning the growing demand on SEND funding, including a shortfall in funding of the health and social care sectors, were likely to continue for the foreseeable future, and that this situation required more than a review of how existing funding is distributed.³⁸

26. In July 2021, the Department wrote to tell us that it had decided it should take more time to ensure its reform plans could deliver the systemic change needed, noting that the COVID-19 pandemic had materially altered the context for reform. It said that it would use the additional time to make certain its plans complemented the wider work being done on recovery and school reform, and that they had the longevity needed to offer stability to the sector.³⁹

27. The Department recognised that the review process was taking much longer than it had wanted, but explained that, as it had started to test its emerging proposals, the risk had become clear that the review would not be as effective as intended, because the early stages of the work had taken place before the impacts of the pandemic were clear. The Department had therefore decided that it would be appropriate to spend longer on the work to make sure that its conclusions and proposals were robust.⁴⁰

28. The Department highlighted three key things that it was doing while it worked on the SEND review. First, it had increased high-needs funding by about £1.5 billion in two years and made available £300 million of capital funding in 2021 for school places for children with SEND. Second, it was offering targeted intervention for the local authorities that had the most challenging situations. And third, it was focusing on children with SEND in its thinking about catch-up learning and recovery.⁴¹

35 HC Committee of Public Accounts, *Support for children with special educational needs and disabilities*, First Report of Session 2019–21, HC 85, May 2020

36 HC Committee of Public Accounts, *Oral evidence: COVID-19: Education*, HC 944, 25 March 2021, Q 80

37 C&AG's Report, para 9

38 SCF0005 National Association of Head Teachers submission, page 3

39 Letter from Department for Education, 6 July 2021

40 Qq 4, 6–8

41 Qq 4–5

29. We pressed the Department on the projected timeframe for the review to be completed, asking if it might be autumn 2021, the end of the calendar year, or the end of the 2021–22 financial year. The Department would not commit to a date, saying only that it would finalise the review as soon as it could.⁴²

Changes to the national funding formula

30. The school funding system currently involves local discretion in that local authorities and academy trusts are free to vary the allocations that the Department calculates using the national funding formula. The government has said that it intends to move to a ‘hard’ national funding formula, where the Department would set schools’ budgets directly.⁴³

31. The Department explained that it had begun a consultation process about moving to a hard funding formula on 8 July 2021. Ultimately, its goal was to allocate funding consistently across the system as whole, so that schools with the same characteristics and pupil needs would be funded at the same level wherever in the country they were located.⁴⁴ The Department said that it had not committed to a specific timetable for implementing the hard formula, because this was a complex reform that would take time to get right. The consultation proposed progressively bringing local authorities closer towards the national funding formula and evaluating the impact at each step. The Department told us that 73 local authorities were already mirroring the national funding formula almost exactly.⁴⁵

Teachers’ starting salaries

32. In September 2019, the Government set out its intention that salaries for new teachers would rise to £30,000 nationally by September 2022. It stated that this increase would make teacher pay among the most competitive in the graduate labour market.⁴⁶ However, at the 2020 Spending Review, the Government announced that pay rises in the public sector would be restrained and targeted in 2021–22. The Department said, in evidence to the School Teachers’ Review Body, that it had paused planned pay rises for teachers in 2021/22, and that the move to increase teachers’ starting salaries to £30,000 would no longer be achieved by 2022/23.⁴⁷

33. In its written evidence, the National Association of Head Teachers emphasised the need to improve salaries for teachers and school leaders as a critical element of any strategy to resolve the “longstanding recruitment and retention crisis”. It said that schools did not have the fiscal headroom to reverse the real-terms decline in the salaries of teachers and leaders, and that all future employer costs, including salary, National Insurance and pension contributions, should be fully funded by government.⁴⁸

34. In the three years from 2018–19, the Department gave grants towards teacher pay increases, and to meet the full cost of increased pension contributions. From 2021–22, the Department will incorporate most of this additional funding within the dedicated schools grant instead of giving it as separate grants, which will make the funding less

42 Qq 9–10

43 C&AG’s Report, paras 2.24–2.25

44 Q 18

45 Qq 18–20, 88

46 [Letter from the Secretary of State for Education to the School Teachers’ Review Body](#), 18 September 2019

47 C&AG’s Report, para 1.18

48 SCF0005 National Association of Head Teachers submission, page 4

transparent.⁴⁹ The Department told us that the extra money for pay and pensions would be maintained in the short term, but could not give this assurance for future spending review periods.⁵⁰

35. The Department said that it remained committed to the £30,000 starting salary for teachers. It explained that it had had to adjust the rate of progress towards this based on conversations with HM Treasury and on the wider context. It stated that pay increases in September would represent an average rise of 3.1%, but this would be significantly weighted towards starting salaries, with 5.5% going on salaries for new teachers.⁵¹ The Department said that the question of when it might implement its commitment on starting salaries could only be answered after the next Spending Review.⁵²

Education recovery and catch-up learning

36. The Department plans to provide funding of £3.1 billion between 2020–21 and 2024–25 to help children and young people catch up on learning lost during the period of disrupted schooling caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.⁵³ Most of the money is expected to be spent by the end of 2022–23, and funding is projected to fall significantly after that.⁵⁴ In addition, the funding that the Government has committed falls well short of the proposals totalling around £15 billion that were recommended by its Education Recovery Commissioner, Sir Kevan Collins.⁵⁵

37. Sir Kevan resigned as the Education Recovery Commissioner in June 2021. In his resignation letter, he said that he did “not believe it is credible that a successful recovery can be achieved with a programme of support this size”.⁵⁶ The Department said that it was very grateful to Sir Kevan, who had made a number of propositions across a wide range of areas. Collectively with HM Treasury and Number 10, it was taking forward much of what Sir Kevan had recommended around investment in tutoring and teaching quality. The Department said that there was a strong evidence base around both of these areas and, in response to feedback from the sector, it was introducing a new programme that would allow schools themselves to train tutors.⁵⁷

38. The Department noted that a large part of the additional funding that Sir Kevan had recommended had related to suggested changes to the timing of the school day, which had met with a mixed reception among schools and teachers. It had therefore decided to take more time, ahead of the Spending Review, to consider the evidence base for such a large investment. It was looking at exactly how extra time in school might be spent and what happened already within the sector.⁵⁸

49 C&AG’s Report, para 1.17

50 Q 47

51 Qq 23–24

52 Qq 25, 29

53 C&AG’s Report, para 10

54 C&AG’s Report, Figure 5

55 HC Education Committee, *Oral evidence: Education Recovery*, HC 452, 29 June 2021, Q 10

56 Letter from Sir Kevan Collins to the Prime Minister, 2 June 2021

57 Qq 103–104

58 Qq 103–104

Formal minutes

Thursday 23 September 2021

Members present

Dame Meg Hillier, in the Chair

Dan Carden

Sir Geoffrey Clifton-Brown

Peter Grant

School Funding

Draft Report (*School Funding*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

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

Paragraphs 1 to 38 read and agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Introduction agreed to.

Conclusions and recommendations agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Twenty-first 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.

Adjournment

[Adjourned till Monday 18 October at 3:30pm]

Witnesses

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

Thursday 15 July 2021

Susan Acland-Hood, Permanent Secretary, Department for Education; **Tony Foot**, Strategic Finance Director, Department for Education; **Julia Kinniburgh**, Director General Covid Response and Schools Recovery, Department for Education; **Warwick Sharp**, Director, Education and Skills Funding Agency

[Q1–120](#)

Published written evidence

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

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

- 1 Anonymous submitter ([SCF0003](#))
- 2 NAHT ([SCF0005](#))
- 3 Ovenden-Hope, Professor Tanya (Provost and Professor of Education, Plymouth Marjon University) ([SCF0001](#))
- 4 Roach, Dr Patrick (General Secretary, National Negotiating Official) ([SCF0002](#))

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 2021–22

Number	Title	Reference
1st	Low emission cars	HC 186
2nd	BBC strategic financial management	HC 187
3rd	COVID-19: Support for children's education	HC 240
4th	COVID-19: Local government finance	HC 239
5th	COVID-19: Government Support for Charities	HC 250
6th	Public Sector Pensions	HC 289
7th	Adult Social Care Markets	HC 252
8th	COVID 19: Culture Recovery Fund	HC 340
9th	Fraud and Error	HC 253
10th	Overview of the English rail system	HC 170
11th	Local auditor reporting on local government in England	HC 171
12th	COVID 19: Cost Tracker Update	HC 173
13th	Initial lessons from the government's response to the COVID-19 pandemic	HC 175
14th	Windrush Compensation Scheme	HC 174
15th	DWP Employment support	HC 177
16th	Principles of effective regulation	HC 176
17th	High Speed 2: Progress at Summer 2021	HC 329
18th	Government's delivery through arm's-length bodies	HC 181
19th	Protecting consumers from unsafe products	HC 180
20th	Optimising the defence estate	HC 179
1st Special Report	Fifth Annual Report of the Chair of the Committee of Public Accounts	HC 222

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

Number	Title	Reference
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
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

Number	Title	Reference
38th	Managing colleges' financial sustainability	HC 692
39th	Lessons from major projects and programmes	HC 694
40th	Achieving government's long-term environmental goals	HC 927
41st	COVID 19: the free school meals voucher scheme	HC 689
42nd	COVID-19: Government procurement and supply of Personal Protective Equipment	HC 928
43rd	COVID-19: Planning for a vaccine Part 1	HC 930
44th	Excess Votes 2019–20	HC 1205
45th	Managing flood risk	HC 931
46th	Achieving Net Zero	HC 935
47th	COVID-19: Test, track and trace (part 1)	HC 932
48th	Digital Services at the Border	HC 936
49th	COVID-19: housing people sleeping rough	HC 934
50th	Defence Equipment Plan 2020–2030	HC 693
51st	Managing the expiry of PFI contracts	HC 1114
52nd	Key challenges facing the Ministry of Justice	HC 1190
53rd	Covid 19: supporting the vulnerable during lockdown	HC 938
54th	Improving single living accommodation for service personnel	HC 940
55th	Environmental tax measures	HC 937
56th	Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund	HC 941