



Department
for Education



Government
Social Research

COVID-19 School Snapshot Panel

Findings from the April survey

September 2021

IFF Research Ltd

Contents

List of figures	4
List of tables	6
Executive Summary	7
A note on the reporting	7
Staff absence	7
Safeguarding	8
Pupil behaviour	8
Catch-up	9
Redistributing summer break	9
Rapid Asymptomatic Testing	9
Ventilation	10
Face coverings	10
Early Career Framework (ECF) reforms	10
Leader and Teacher Wellbeing	11
Pupil Mental Health and Wellbeing	11
Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) and post-16 transition	12
Extra-curricular activities	12
Introduction	13
Methodology	13
Weighting	14
Interpreting the findings	14
Staff absence	16
Safeguarding	19
Number of safeguarding incidents schools are actively dealing with	19
Impact of lockdown on the number and severity of safeguarding cases	20
Reasons for the change in number of safeguarding issues	23
Confidence in identifying safeguarding concerns	26
Pupil Behaviour	27
Catch-up	30

Assessing the impact of lost learning	30
Redistributing summer break	31
Rapid Asymptomatic Testing	33
Ventilation	36
How are classrooms being ventilated	36
How difficult have teachers found ensuring classrooms are ventilated	37
Problems teachers have experienced ensuring classrooms are ventilated	38
Face coverings	41
Impact of wearing face coverings on communication between teachers and students	41
Whether students are wearing face coverings when they should and correctly	42
ECF Reforms	44
Leader and Teacher Wellbeing	46
Pupil mental health and wellbeing	54
Teachers' views on supporting pupil mental health and wellbeing	54
Training on pupil mental health	56
Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) and post-16 transition	57
Barriers to supporting pupils with SEND to transition to post-16 provision	57
Extra-curricular activities	59
The cost to schools and parents of extra-curricular activities	59

List of figures

Figure 1 Reasons for teachers and leaders being unable to work from school site	17
Figure 2 Number of safeguarding incidents schools are actively dealing with per 100 pupils	20
Figure 3 Change in number of safeguarding incidents compared with March 2020	21
Figure 4 Change in severity of safeguarding issues compared with March 2020	22
Figure 5 Change in number x Change in severity of cases	23
Figure 6 Confidence in identifying safeguarding issues arising from factors...	26
Figure 7 Actions taken in response to behaviour warranting disciplinary action	27
Figure 8 Change in number of suspensions (compared to typical term)	29
Figure 9 Methods used to assess the impact of lost learning	30
Figure 10 Whether leaders and teachers would prefer to redistribute summer break	31
Figure 11 How important is regular COVID-19 testing of pupils to effective on-site schooling at present	33
Figure 12 How important is regular COVID-19 testing of staff to effective on-site schooling at present	34
Figure 13. How classrooms are being ventilated	36
Figure 14. How easy or difficult have teachers found keeping classrooms ventilated	37
Figure 15. Have face coverings made it easier or more difficult for teachers and students to communicate in the classroom	41
Figure 16. Whether students are wearing face coverings when they should and correctly	42
Figure 17. Whether students are wearing face coverings when they should (comparing leaders and teachers)	43
Figure 18. Whether students are wearing face coverings correctly (comparing leaders and teachers)	43
Figure 19 Whether schools have begun making preparations for changes to induction process	44

Figure 20 How satisfied are you with life nowadays?	47
Figure 21 To what extent do you feel the things you do in your life are worthwhile	48
Figure 22 How happy did you feel yesterday?	49
Figure 23 How anxious did you feel yesterday?	50
Figure 24 Satisfaction with present job	51
Figure 25 Happiness and fulfilment in current job role	52
Figure 26 Burn-out and frustration in current job role	53
Figure 27. Teachers' levels of agreement with five statements concerning pupil mental health and wellbeing	55
Figure 28. Whether teachers had attended training on pupil mental health since September 2020	56
Figure 29. Barriers to supporting pupils with SEND transition to post-16 provision	58
Figure 30. Amounts paid by schools and parents for extra-curricular activities delivered by an external company	60

List of tables

Table 1. Response rate by key group

14

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from the fourth wave of the School Snapshot Panel (run in April 2021), a new panel run by IFF Research on behalf of the Department for Education.

It covers key issues affecting schools during the COVID-19 pandemic including:

- Pupil safeguarding
- Rapid Asymptomatic testing, the wearing of face coverings and classroom ventilation
- Staff mental health and wellbeing

A note on the reporting

The report covers questions asked about the individual experiences of teachers and leaders, and others asked of leaders at the school level. Two types of weighting were applied to the data, depending on whether questions were asking for school-level or individual-level answers from leaders and teachers. Where responses from 'leaders', 'teachers' or 'leaders and teachers' are referred to in the report, individual-level weighting has been applied. Where responses from 'schools' are referred to, leaders have answered the survey question and a school-level weighting has been applied. Further detail on the weighting approach can be found in the methodology section. Findings from each wave should be interpreted in the context of guidelines in place at that time. From 8th March 2021, schools were fully reopened to all children, and the survey explored the experiences of school leaders and teachers since the reopening. Caution should be taken when comparing results between waves as any changes and patterns may be impacted by the guidelines in place at each timepoint.

Staff absence

Following the re-opening of schools on 8th March, the majority (61%) of schools had experienced teachers or leaders being unable to work from the school site. Half (50%) of schools reported they had experienced staff being at home because they were shielding or self-isolating due to potential contact with COVID-19.¹ Just under a quarter (23%) reported staff were at home due to confirmed COVID-19 or illness due to the impacts of long COVID. Absence for COVID-19 vaccination, or due to the side-effects of the

¹ NET shielding or self-isolating due to potential contact with COVID-19 includes; having a suspected case of COVID-19, remaining at home due to potential contact with COVID-19 inside the school setting, potential contact outside the school setting, potential contact setting unknown, worries about vulnerability to COVID-19/self-imposed shielding, teachers working remotely because a pupil bubble is self-isolating.

vaccine, was another leading reason for staff being away from the school (reported by 22% of schools).

Secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to report staff had been absent for a range of reasons including potential contact with a case of coronavirus *outside* the school setting (31% vs. 21%), receiving the COVID-19 vaccination or following side effect (37% vs. 19%) or worries about COVID-19/self-imposed shielding (35% vs. 16%). There was no difference between primary and secondary schools in the percentage with staff self-isolating due to potential contact *within* the school setting (both 20%).

Safeguarding

Leaders were asked how many safeguarding issues their school was actively dealing with at the time of the interview. This included any issue where the school had to take action, however small (including a safeguarding form), as a result of a safeguarding risk to a pupil. Schools reported an average of 4.5 incidents per 100 pupils, with only 7% of schools reporting they were not actively dealing with any safeguarding incidents.

Just over half (55%) of schools reported they were dealing with more safeguarding incidents compared with March 2020, a further 31% said the number had not changed. When asked about the severity of incidents², 44% of schools reported the cases they were dealing with were a bit or a lot more severe compared with March 2020, 47% reported no change in severity. Overall, 36% of schools reported an increase in both number *and* severity of safeguarding cases compared with March 2021.

Leaders who reported a change in the number of safeguarding issues were asked an open-text question about what factors they thought had driven the increase or decrease. The majority cited lockdown conditions causing increased pressure in the home environment such as overcrowding and an increase in domestic violence. Leaders also commonly cited the increased financial pressures in the family and reduced access to support for pupils.

Pupil behaviour

Leaders were asked, since the wider reopening of schools from March 8th, which measures they had used to respond to behaviour which has warranted disciplinary action. The most used measure was engagement with pupils' parents or carers, reported by eight-in-10 schools (81%), a significant increase from the 71% who reported this in

² Examples given of a change severity were 'harm to the pupil, threat to pupil, or quantity/quality of interventions required to safeguard the pupil.

December 2020. In comparison to December 2020, fewer schools reported issuing suspensions (26% vs. 36% in December).

Around half of schools (49%) had engaged with external services, and a similar percentage had referred a pupil to a space within the school such as a nurture or inclusion unit (47%).

Leaders who had issued suspensions since 8th March were asked how the number of suspensions compared to a typical spring prior to the pandemic. One third of leaders (31%) who had issued suspensions reported an increase while the majority (66%) reported suspensions were about the same, or less than a typical spring term.

Catch-up

Teachers were asked which methods they had used to assess the impact of lost learning since 8th March. The majority (84%) of teachers reported using informal assessments. Around three-fifths (62%) of teachers reported the use of formal assessments, such as mock exams.

Redistributing summer break

Leaders and teachers were also asked whether they would prefer to keep the six-week summer break or reduce it and redistribute the days to other holidays. Two-thirds (63%) reported a preference to keep it the same, while just three in ten (29%) preferred to reduce it and redistribute the days. Amongst those who would redistribute the days, 71% reported they would prefer a 4-week summer break.

Rapid Asymptomatic Testing

The majority (86%) of secondary leaders and teachers reported regular testing of pupils to be *at least* fairly important to effective on-site schooling at present. A similar percentage (89%) of all leaders and teachers reported regular COVID-19 testing of staff was *at least* fairly important.

The small minority of leaders and teachers who rated regular COVID-19 testing of staff and/or pupils as not very or not at all important were asked to indicate in an open-text question why they felt this way. The most common responses included doubts about the accuracy of the tests (typically the risk of a false negative) and the difficulty of 'policing' who took the tests.

Ventilation

When asked about how they were keeping their classrooms ventilated, almost all (97%) teachers said that they have been ventilating them by opening windows and/or external doors. The second most common method of ventilation has been to open internal doors (67%). Less than one-in-ten (7%) of teachers reported using mechanical ventilation³. Primary teachers were less likely to open internal doors (63% vs 71%) or use mechanical ventilation (4% v 11%) compared to secondary teachers.

Approaching two-thirds of teachers (62%) felt that it has been easy to ensure that the classrooms they teach in are well ventilated over the past 12 months, compared to 28% who felt it has been difficult. A further 11% think it has been neither easy nor difficult. Primary teachers were more likely than secondary teachers to have found keeping classrooms ventilated easy (66% vs 57%).

The most common problems teachers have experienced whilst ventilating their classrooms were classrooms being too cold and, in particular, temperatures being a concern from a health and safety perspective and/or impacting pupils' ability to learn.

Face coverings

Almost all secondary leaders (96%) and teachers (94%) thought that wearing face coverings has made communication between teachers and students more difficult, with 59% saying it has made it a lot more difficult.

Nine-in-ten (89%) secondary leaders and teachers said that students wear their face coverings almost all (37%) or most (52%) of the time they should. However, they reported students were less likely to wear their face coverings correctly (covering the nose and mouth) with 14% saying they wore them correctly almost all of the time and 65% saying most of the time. Secondary leaders were more likely than secondary teachers to report that students wear face coverings (97% vs 88%) and wear face coverings correctly (92% vs 78%) almost always or most of the time.

Early Career Framework (ECF) reforms

From September 2021, early career teachers (ECTs) will be expected to complete a two-year induction process as part of the ECF reforms. School leaders were asked about how prepared they were for these changes. Over a third (37%) of schools reported this was not applicable as they were not expecting to have an ECT join their school in September. Amongst those who were expecting an ECT to join, the majority (87%) had already

³ Mechanical ventilation includes systems using ducts or fans to blow clean air into rooms and/or extract the stale air)

begun making preparations, with secondary schools significantly more likely to have done so than primary schools (94% vs. 85%).

Schools who had begun making preparations but were waiting further guidance, or who had not started preparing, were asked what further guidance they needed in order to be able to implement the changes to the induction process. The most common responses were that more information around the set-up process was needed, such as a simple framework for the programme, information regarding training, funding, choosing a provider and examples of best practice.

Leader and Teacher Wellbeing

ONS measures of life satisfaction, worthwhileness and happiness for leaders and teachers remained low compared to pre-pandemic measures, however some improvement was seen from the late February survey. In April, 58% of leaders and teachers reported they were satisfied with their life (a rating of 7-10), compared to 43% in late February. The proportion reporting they were anxious (a rating of 6-10) fell slightly from 54% in late February when schools were closed to most pupils to 47% in April.

Leaders and teachers were asked how satisfied they were with their job. Leaders were more likely to report satisfaction with their job (68%) than teachers (61%). Overall, leaders' and teachers' job satisfaction levels have significantly increased since late February when schools were closed to most pupils (62% vs. 56%).

Leaders and teachers were also asked the extent to which they feel fulfilled, happy, frustrated and burnt-out in their current job role. Almost two-fifths (39%) of leaders and teachers reported feeling fulfilled in their job to a high or very high degree and a similar percentage (37%) reported feeling happy. Nearly half (48%) of leaders and teachers reported feeling a high or very high degree of burn out in their job role, with significantly more teachers (49%) than leaders (40%) reporting this.

Pupil Mental Health and Wellbeing

Teachers were asked whether they agreed with a range of statements regarding children and young people's mental health at their school. Most teachers felt equipped to identify behaviour that may be linked to a mental health issue (75%) and knew how to help pupils with mental health issues access support offered by the school or college (75%). There has been a significant decrease since early February 2021 in levels of agreement with three out of the five statements asked; 'I know how to help pupils with mental health issues access support offered by my school/college' (75% in April vs. 82% in early February), 'I feel equipped to teach children in my class who have mental health needs'

(58% vs. 67%) and 'I have access to mental health professionals if I need specialist advice on pupils' mental health' (53% vs. 57%).

Two-fifths (40%) of teachers reported that they had undertaken new or additional training on pupil mental health since September 2020. There has been a gradual increase over time in the proportion of teachers doing so (up from 29% in December 2020 and 35% in late February 2021). However, around half (53%) had not attended any training on pupil mental health, despite 41% saying they would have liked to.

Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) and post-16 transition

Teachers involved with supporting pupils with SEND to transition to post-16 provision were asked what barriers they faced.⁴ The most common barrier identified by these teachers was the impact of COVID-19 restrictions limiting opportunities for transition visits (reported by 82%). They also commonly reported that some young people are too uncertain what they want to do in September causing delays to the transition process (58%), and additionally that there is a lack of capacity in the school workforce to deliver transition activities (45%). Only 5% reported no barriers.

Extra-curricular activities

More than half (55%) of all schools paid for extra-curricular activities delivered by an external company; this was significantly more common amongst primary school than secondary schools (62% vs. 21%). Three in ten schools (28%) paid between £2.01 and £4 per pupil per hour, with more than half (53%) paying up to £6 for extra-curricular activities delivered externally. While 10% of schools paid upwards of £8, a relatively high proportion (34%) of leaders did not know how much their school was paying.

Of the schools that paid for extra-curricular activities, 29% said parents did not contribute anything towards them and two-fifths (39%) reported that parents paid up to £4.

⁴ Please note this question was only asked to secondary teachers involved with supporting SEND pupils transition to post-16 provision, and has a relatively small base size (n=76), so caution is needed.

Introduction

This report details findings from the April 2021 wave of the School Snapshot Panel, a panel of leaders and teachers sampled from the Schools Workforce Census to provide rapid feedback to the Department for Education.

The five-minute survey covered a range of topical issues in education following the reopening of schools to all pupils from the 8th March. This involved all pupils returning to school and education being delivered in the classroom.

In this report there is occasional reference to findings from previous School Snapshot Surveys (including the COVID-19 School Snapshot Survey run in May 2020). Due to differences in methodology between the School Snapshot Survey and the School Snapshot Panel, direct comparisons should be treated with caution.⁵

Methodology

The School Snapshot Panel consists of a group of teachers and leaders that have agreed to participate in short regular research surveys on topical issues in education. Teachers and leaders agreed to be part of the panel in late 2020 and early 2021. They were recruited from school workforce census data provided by the Department for Education. One leader from each chosen school was invited to take part. Teachers were selected from the full population of teachers, meaning at some schools multiple teachers were invited to participate.

The survey was administered online, and the fieldwork period was one week long, from 21st April to 28th April 2021. Leaders and teachers received an email invite and two reminder emails.

The table below show the response rate for the survey for leaders and teachers by school phase, for the April survey.

⁵ The School Snapshot Survey was administered to one leader and three teachers at each school sampled, whereas the School Snapshot Panel is a randomised sample of leaders and teachers taken from the schools workforce census data. Therefore, teachers are invited from schools that may not have been sampled for a leader survey.

Table 1. Response rate by key group

	Primary Leaders	Secondary Leaders	Primary Teachers	Secondary Teachers
Starting sample	1,396	829	1,133	1,088
Complete surveys	685	344	563	567
Response rate	49%	41%	50%	52%

Weighting

Two types of weighting were applied to the data, depending on whether questions were asking for school-level or individual-level answers from leaders and teachers.

School-level weighting

At the analysis stage, the school-level/leaders' data was grossed up to the overall population of schools. This process corrects for the over-sampling of secondary schools (relative to the proportion of the population that they represent) so that the findings can be interpreted as being representative of all (in scope) state-funded schools.

The population data for weighting was drawn from Get Information about Schools (GIAS).

Teachers / individual weighting

For the analysis on a teacher rather than a school base, the responses from leaders and classroom teachers were combined and weighted together to the overall population of teachers. The population data for the teachers weighting was taken from the Schools Workforce Census based on November 2019 data (the most current available data).

Interpreting the findings

Data presented in this report is from a sample of teachers and senior leaders rather than the total population of teachers and leaders. Although the leader sample and the teacher sample have been weighted to be nationally representative (by school type and by teacher demographics), the data is still subject to sampling error. The extent of sampling error depends on a number of factors, including the sampling approach (the closer it is to a random sample the less the sampling error), the sample size (the larger the sample the

lower the likely sampling error) and the survey result (the closer to 50% the less confident statistically we are in the finding).

Given the sample size in this survey (2,159), statistically we can be 95% confident that for a survey finding of 50% based on all respondents, the 'true' value (if all leaders and teachers had answered rather than a sample of 2,159) lies within a +/- 2.1% range of this figure (i.e. 47.9% - 52.1%). Results based on a sub-set of schools interviewed are subject to a wider margin of error due to a smaller sample size. For example, for results among school leaders, we can be 95% confident that for a survey result of 50% the sampling error is +/- 3.1%.

Differences between sub-groups and previous waves are only commented on in the text if they are statistically significant at the 95% confidence level, unless otherwise stated, i.e. statistically we can be 95% confident that the differences are 'real' differences and not a result of the fact that the findings are based on a sample of schools rather than a census of all schools

Free School Meal (FSM) entitlement is used as a proxy for deprivation levels at the school. All schools in England were listed in ascending order of the proportion of their pupils that are entitled to FSM. This ordered list was then split into five equal groups (or quintiles). Quintile 1, which is referred to as the 'lowest proportion' throughout the report represents the schools with the lowest proportion of pupils entitled to FSM. This group thus equates to the schools with the least disadvantaged/deprived pupil population. The proportion of pupils entitled to FSM increases progressively as the quintiles increase. In the report, significant differences tend to be tested between schools with the lowest proportion of FSM pupils and schools with the highest proportion of FSM pupils.

Due to rounding to the nearest whole number, percentages may not total to exactly 100% or precisely reflect statistics provided in the data tables.

In this report there is occasional reference to findings from previous School Snapshot Surveys (including the COVID-19 School Snapshot Survey run in May 2020). **It should be noted that due to differences in methodology between the School Snapshot Survey and the School Snapshot Panel, direct comparisons should be treated with caution.**

Staff absence


Staff absence has been an ongoing concern for leaders throughout the Autumn term in 2020 and into the Spring term in 2021. Although concern has decreased slightly since Autumn, it remains high.

Leaders were asked if any of their teachers or school leaders had been unable to work from the school site since the re-opening of schools on 8th March. The majority (61%) of schools had experienced teachers or leaders being unable to work from the school site. As shown in figure 1, half (50%) of schools reported they had staff remaining at home because they were shielding or self-isolating due to potential contact with COVID-19⁶. Just under a quarter (23%) reported staff were at home due to confirmed COVID-19 or illness due to the impacts of long COVID. Absence for COVID-19 vaccination, or due to the side-effects of the vaccine, was another leading reason for staff being away from the school, reported by 22% of schools⁷.

⁶ NET shielding or self-isolating due to potential contact with COVID-19 includes; having a suspected case of COVID-19, remaining at home due to potential contact with COVID-19 inside the school setting, potential contact outside the school setting, potential contact setting unknown, worries about vulnerability to COVID-19/self-imposed shielding, teachers working remotely because a pupil bubble is self-isolating.

⁷ **Please note that this was a multicode question (schools could select more than one reason for staff absence), therefore percentages will not sum to 100%.**

Figure 1 Reasons for teachers and leaders being unable to work from school site



School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. A1 & A2: All leaders (n=1,029)

Secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to report staff being unable to work from the school site due to potential contact with a case of coronavirus *outside* the school setting (31% vs. 21%). While there was no difference between primary and secondary schools in the percentage with staff self-isolating due to potential contact *within* the school setting (both 20%), secondary schools were more likely to report staff not being able to work from school site due to worries about COVID-19 or self-imposed shielding (35% vs. 16%).

Secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to report staff had been absent for a range of other reasons including:

- Receiving the COVID-19 vaccination or following side effects (37% vs. 19%).
- Non-COVID-19 related illness, such as flu (32% vs. 15%)
- Other non-work related absence, such as compassionate leave (31% vs. 12%)
- Caring for children / others (20% vs. 10%)
- Stress-related illness (20% vs. 8%).

Schools with the highest proportion of FSM pupils were the most likely to have had staff with a confirmed case of COVID-19 (25% vs. 13% of schools with the lowest proportion of FSM pupils) and were also most likely to have staff remaining at home because of potential contact with a case of coronavirus within the school setting (24% vs. 15% of schools with the lowest proportion of FSM pupils).

Regional differences could also be seen, with Yorkshire and the Humber and the North West being more likely to report teachers and leaders had not been able to work from the school site for any reason (72% and 70% respectively vs. 61% overall). Schools in the Yorkshire and the Humber were most likely to have staff with confirmed cases of COVID-19 (30% vs. 17% overall) and schools in this area were twice as likely to report staff self-isolating because of potential contact within the school setting (41% vs. 20% overall).

Safeguarding

The pandemic is believed to have heightened existing harms such as domestic violence, abuse, neglect, and online and criminal exploitation. In order to provide the appropriate support, it is important to understand the scale and type of risks children and young people are facing.


In the statutory safeguarding guidance for schools and colleges, safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children is defined as: protecting children from maltreatment; preventing impairment of children's mental and physical health or development; ensuring that children grow up in circumstances consistent with the provision of safe and effective care; and taking action to enable all children to have the best outcomes⁸.

Number of safeguarding incidents schools are actively dealing with

All leaders were asked how many safeguarding issues their school was actively dealing with at the moment. This included any issue where the school had to take action, however small (including a safeguarding form), as a result of safeguarding risk to a pupil. Figure 2 shows the rate of safeguarding incidents reported by schools per hundred pupils. Only 7% of schools reported they were not actively dealing with any safeguarding incidents, and 17% reported they were dealing with fewer than 1 incident per 100 pupils. The majority of schools (57%) were dealing with somewhere between 1 and 5 safeguarding incidents per hundred pupils, with an overall average of 4.5 incidents per 100 pupils.

⁸ [Keeping children safe in education \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://www.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/81212/keeping-children-safe-in-education.pdf)

Figure 2 Number of safeguarding incidents schools are actively dealing with per 100 pupils



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. D1: All leaders who were able to provide the number of safeguarding incidents their school was dealing with (n=771)

Secondary schools reported a higher rate of safeguarding incidents compared with primary schools (6.2 per 100 pupils vs. 4.3 per 100 pupils). Primary schools were more likely than secondary to say they were not dealing with any safeguarding issues at present (8% vs. 3%).

Schools with the highest proportion of FSM pupils reported the highest rate of safeguarding incidents; an average of 7.2 incidents per 100 pupils compared with an average of 3.3 incidents per 100 pupils in schools with the lowest proportion of FSM pupils.


Impact of lockdown on the number and severity of safeguarding cases

Leaders were asked if the number of safeguarding issues their school was actively dealing with was more or less than before the first lockdown in March 2020. As shown in figure 3, over half (55%) of schools reported they were dealing with more⁹ safeguarding incidents now compared with March 2020, and just under a third (31%) said the number had not changed. Secondary schools were more likely than primary to report an increase

⁹ 'More' defined as either 'a lot more' or 'a bit more'.

in the number of safeguarding incidents (64% vs 53%), with a quarter (25%) of secondary schools reporting they were currently dealing with 'a lot more' incidents.

Figure 3 Change in number of safeguarding incidents compared with March 2020




Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. D2: All leaders (n=1,029)

Schools with the highest proportion of FSM pupils were the most likely to report an increase in the number of cases (62% vs. 49% of those with the lowest proportion of FSM). Schools in urban areas were more likely than those in rural areas to report an increase in the number of cases (57% vs 49%).

Leaders were also asked whether the issues they are dealing with were any more or less severe than the issues they were dealing with before the first lockdown in March 2020. Examples given of a change in severity were 'harm to the pupil, threat to pupil, or quantity/quality of interventions required to safeguard the pupil'. As shown in figure 4, secondary schools were more likely than primary to report the cases they were now dealing with were a bit or a lot more severe (51% vs. 43%). Half (50%) of primary schools and 30% of secondary schools reported issues were at a similar level of severity. Very few (2% of all schools) reported that the severity safeguarding issues had reduced.

Figure 4 Change in severity of safeguarding issues compared with March 2020




Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. D3: All leaders (n=1,029)

Again, differences could be seen by FSM status. Schools with the lowest proportion of FSM pupils were the least likely to report an increase in severity of cases (36% vs 44% overall).

Figure 5 shows the interaction between change in number and change in severity of cases reported by schools. Overall, 36% of schools reported an increase in both number *and* severity of safeguarding cases compared with March 2021. This was more common amongst secondary than primary schools (44% vs. 35%).

Figure 5 Change in number x Change in severity of cases



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. D2/D3: All leaders (n=1,029)

Reasons for the change in number of safeguarding issues

Leaders who reported a change in the number of safeguarding issues were asked an open-text question about what factors they think have driven the increase or decrease. As previously discussed, the majority of schools reporting a change said the number of safeguarding issues they were dealing with had increased.

Increased pressure in the home environment

The most common reason cited by leaders was that lockdown conditions had caused increased pressure in the home environment. In particular, leaders mentioned an increase in stress, anxiety and mental health problems both amongst the pupils themselves, and amongst family members. Leaders spoke about overcrowding in the home, with all family members spending extended periods of time at home, including

parents working from home. A small number also reported lockdown had led to an increase in alcohol and drug dependency in families.

“Pressure on families having to remain at home all the time especially when living in cramped conditions and increased alcohol use.”

Primary Leader

“Having the children at home has highlighted that some people that normally have coped have not. Some ... parents now abusing alcohol, or their parenting skills have suffered as their mental health has suffered.”

Primary Leader

Commonly, leaders reported that increased financial pressures due to job losses and furlough in the family had exacerbated the stress of lockdown living conditions, and lead to safeguarding risks such as homelessness.

“We have noticed a rise in domestic abuse and financial hardship meaning that some families are at risk of homelessness.”

Secondary Leader

Leaders often reported a combination of the above factors had driven an increase in domestic violence and abuse, and also raised the risk of self-harming behaviour amongst pupils.

Lack of access to support

Another common theme was the reduction in support for pupils from outside their household due to lockdown restrictions. Leaders spoke about a breakdown of existing key support networks for pupils such as their friends and other family members, as well as difficulty for pupils being able to access any kind of specialist support. The impact of this was reported to be twofold; firstly, pupils lose existing support networks, becoming more isolated and not able to spend time away from the house, therefore increasing their risk. Secondly, not having face to face contact with other family members, school staff or other external support services makes it more difficult for emerging issues to be spotted early.

“Lack of schooling / monitoring within the school setting...Social Care not being able to home visit or get intel from school.”

Primary Leader

Changes to routine and increased time spent online

Less commonly mentioned drivers included the loss of routine and structure and increase in time spent online, which increased the risk of online abuse as well as increased social media reliance.

“Students being constantly on social media whilst at home, causing issues in school including increased risk of sexual exploitation.”

Secondary Leader

Some leaders also discussed safeguarding issues arising due to lockdown restrictions easing, in particular the mental health issues for pupils and parents who are struggling to adjust to the return to ‘normal’.

“Anxieties around coming back to school...Having to mix in a large environment.”

Secondary Leader

Leaders reporting a reduction in cases

Amongst leaders who reported a decrease in the number of cases, the majority of these felt this was because of poor access to necessary support and increase difficulty to spot emerging issues. It should therefore be noted that a current reduction in number of safeguarding issues schools are actively dealing with at the moment does not necessarily mean there are fewer issues.

“The children haven’t had the opportunity to be in school to disclose things.”

Primary Leader

More positively, a number of leaders who reported a decrease in safeguarding issues felt this was because the school was better able to communicate with and support pupils and families and identify issues sooner, typically due to increased staff training and improved awareness of potential safeguarding issues.


“Greater awareness among staff that students may be suffering. Greater awareness among students that support is available particularly around mental health and substance misuse.”

Secondary Leader

Confidence in identifying safeguarding concerns

All leaders and teachers were asked how confident, if at all, they felt identifying safeguarding concerns that originate from factors within the pupil's home environment, and from outside the pupil's home environment. As shown in figure 6, the majority of leaders and teachers felt very or fairly confident identifying issues that arise from both within and outside the pupils' home environment (84% and 87% respectively).

Figure 6 Confidence in identifying safeguarding issues arising from factors...



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. D5: All leaders and teachers (n=2,159)

Across both primary and secondary schools, leaders were more likely than teachers to report feeling 'very or fairly' confident in identifying concerns from within the pupils home environment (93% vs. 82%) and from outside the pupil's home environment (95% vs. 85%).


Overall, 16% of teachers reported feeling not very or not at all confident in identifying issues from within the home environment, and 13% reported being not at all or not very confident identifying issues outside the home environment. Secondary teachers were more likely than primary teachers to report not feeling confident identifying safeguarding issues both within (23% vs 9%) and outside the pupil's home environment (17% vs. 9%).

Pupil Behaviour

When pupils returned to school in September 2020, after the first long lockdown, anecdotal evidence from local areas suggested there might be an increase in both suspensions and permanent exclusions as pupils struggled to settle back into school routines and perhaps breached measures put in place to control the spread of Covid. Therefore, it was important to ask questions regarding the use of suspensions and permanent exclusions and also explore what other actions schools were taking to deal with behaviour issues. Leaders were asked which measures they had used since the wider reopening of schools on March 8th to respond to behaviour which has warranted disciplinary action. The most commonly used measure was engagement with pupils' parents or carers, reported by 81% of schools. Around half of schools (49%) had engaged with external services, and a similar percentage had referred a pupil to a space within the school such as a nurture or inclusion unit (47%). Lower proportions of schools had issued suspensions (26%) and referred to alternative provisions for short term placements (11%).

In comparison to December 2020, in April significantly more schools reported engagement with pupils' parents or carers (81% vs. 71% in December), while fewer schools reported issuing suspensions (26% vs. 34% in December).

Figure 7 Actions taken in response to behaviour warranting disciplinary action



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021/Teacher Leader Panel December 2020: All

Leaders (n=1,029/393) *Indicates statistically significant higher difference between December 2020 and April 2021.

In April 2020, differences by school phase were marked. Secondary schools were significantly more likely than primary to have used the following measures (in part reflecting their larger average number of pupils):

- Engaged with pupils' parents or carers (96% vs. 78%).
- Engaged with external services (79% vs. 43%).
- Referred pupils to a space within the school (79% vs. 40%).
- Issued a suspension (fixed period exclusion) (74% vs. 16%).
- Referred to alternative provision in the short term (37% vs. 6%).
- Issued a permanent exclusion (17% vs. 1%).


Only 9% of schools with the highest proportion of FSM pupils reported that no behaviour in this time had warranted disciplinary action, compared with 29% of schools with the lowest proportion of FSM. In response to this, schools with the highest proportion of FSM pupils were significantly more likely than those with the lowest proportion of FSM pupils to have done the following:

- Engaged with pupils' parents or carers (89% vs. 69%).
- Engaged with external services (59% vs. 36%).
- Referred pupils to an internal space within the school (53% vs. 37%).
- Issued a suspension (fixed period exclusion) (33% vs. 16%).
- Referred to Alternative Provision in the short-term (13% vs. 6%).

Leaders who had issued suspensions since 8th March were asked how the number of suspensions compared to a typical spring prior to the pandemic. One third of leaders (31%) who had issued suspensions reported an increase, while a small proportion (15%) reported a decrease. Secondary schools were more likely to report a decrease in the number of suspensions than primary schools (22% vs. 8%). Around half (51%) reported no change.

This reflects a change from December 2020, in which a greater percentage of leaders reported an increase in suspensions¹⁰ (44% vs. 31% in April). In April, leaders were more likely to report no change in the number of suspensions (51% vs. 36% in December).

Figure 8 Change in number of suspensions (compared to typical term)



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021/Teacher Leader Panel December 2020: Leaders who have issued suspensions (n=371/240) *Indicates statistically significant higher difference between December 2020 and April 2021.


¹⁰ In the December survey, leaders were asked how the number of fixed-period exclusions compared to “the same time last year.”

Catch-up

Assessing the impact of lost learning

Teachers were asked which methods they had used to assess the impact of lost learning since 8th March. The majority (84%) of teachers reported using informal assessments. Around three-fifths (62%) of teachers reported the use of formal assessments, and over half (54%) reported having targeted conversations with parents or pupils. Lower proportions of teachers reported having pupil self-appraisals (24%), and a portfolio review (16%).

Figure 9 Methods used to assess the impact of lost learning




Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. G3: All Teachers (n=1,130). *Indicates statistically significant difference between primary and secondary schools. Responses under 2% not included.

There were some differences by phase with more secondary than primary teachers reporting use of formal assessments (69% vs. 55%), pupil self-appraisals (30% vs. 18%) and portfolio reviews (23% vs. 10%). On the other hand, more use of targeted conversations with parents or pupils was reported by primary teachers than secondary teachers (58% vs. 51%).

Redistributing summer break

Most schools currently have a summer break of around six weeks. Every year there are discussions about whether to shorten this and redistribute the days elsewhere in the year (e.g. by adding extra days to the October break). Leaders and teachers were asked whether they would prefer to keep the six-week summer break or reduce it and redistribute the days to other holidays. Two-thirds (63%) reported a preference to keep it the same, while just under one third (29%) preferred to reduce it and redistribute the days.

Figure 10 Whether leaders and teachers would prefer to redistribute summer break



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. G1: All Leaders and Teachers (n=2,159).

*Indicates statistically significant difference between leaders and teachers.

As shown in figure 10, teachers were slightly more likely than leaders to express a preference for retaining the 6-week summer holiday (64% vs 59%), while more leaders preferred to reduce it and redistribute the days (33% vs. 28%).

Leaders and teachers who would prefer to redistribute the days elsewhere in the year were asked how long they think the summer break should be instead. The majority (71%) reported they would prefer a 4-week break, and around a quarter (25%) would prefer a 5-


week break. Leaders and teachers in secondary schools were slightly more likely to prefer a 5-week break than primary schools (29% vs. 22%).

Rapid Asymptomatic Testing

As part of the return to face-to-face education on 8th March, schools were asked to facilitate testing three times for each secondary pupil at an on-site Asymptomatic Testing Site before transitioning to twice-weekly testing at home.

Secondary leaders and teachers were asked how important they felt regular COVID-19 testing of pupils was to effective on-site schooling at present. Overall, two-thirds (60%) of secondary leaders and teachers said testing was very important, and 86% said it was *at least* fairly important. There was a slight difference of opinion by role, with significantly more teachers saying testing was at least fairly important than leaders (88% vs. 73%).


Figure 11 How important is regular COVID-19 testing of pupils to effective on-site schooling at present



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. I1: All Secondary Leaders and Teachers (n=911). *Indicates statistically significant difference between leaders and teachers.

Staff in primary and secondary schools were asked to take twice-weekly tests using a home Lateral Flow Device test kit provided by their school. All leaders and teachers were also asked how important they felt COVID-19 testing of *staff* was to effective schooling at present. Two-thirds said it was very important (61%) and around nine-in-ten said it was at least fairly important (89%). Secondary schools were slightly more likely than primary schools to say testing of staff was very important (64% vs. 59%).

Figure 12 How important is regular COVID-19 testing of staff to effective on-site schooling at present



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. I2: All Leaders and Teachers (n=2,159).

*Indicates statistically significant difference between primary and secondary schools.

The small minority of leaders and teachers who rated regular COVID-19 testing of staff and/or pupils as not very or not at all important were asked to indicate in an open-text question why they felt this way.

Doubts about the accuracy of tests

The most common responses included doubts about the accuracy of the tests. As well as the risk of false positives, a substantial proportion also discussed the risk of a false negative, in some cases caused by disbelief that so few pupils and staff in their school have received a positive test result to date.

“I’m not sure how accurate the lateral flow tests are. I work in a school where we haven’t had a single case of COVID.”

Leader, primary school

Difficult to monitor who is taking them

Leaders also discussed that it was hard to ‘police’ who took the tests. Some secondary leaders reported that only a minority of pupils take them, and that they struggled to monitor which pupils are testing and whether the tests are being carried out correctly.

“It’s impossible to do en masse in the building and impossible to monitor who is doing it at home. Our internal surveys suggest not many pupils/ parents are self testing.”

Leader, secondary school

Doubts about the overall value of testing

Other leaders and teachers felt that COVID-19 testing was not as important anymore because infections were already low in the community and that an increasing number of staff and vulnerable pupils were vaccinated.

“We have only detected 2 cases through the lateral flow testing. Infections in the community are far lower than they were, and the priority groups of staff based on the government’s priority groupings have now had at least their first dose of the vaccine.”

Leader, secondary school

Others felt that testing does not actually help to protect against COVID-19, and that testing did not ease their concerns over transmission of COVID-19 in the school setting.

“I work in early years and don’t feel like it protects us teaching staff or the children as we are all in such close contact with each other anyway.”

Teacher, primary school


Ventilation

DfE has advised all schools that they need to keep occupied spaces well ventilated, and this section of the report looks at the ways in which teachers have ensured this in the classrooms they teach in. It also looks at how easy or difficult this has been for teachers and what specific problems have arisen from keeping the classrooms they teach in ventilated.

How are classrooms being ventilated

Only 1% of teachers said their classrooms had no ventilation, although this was concentrated amongst secondary teachers (2%, compared to <0.5% of primary teachers). Almost all (97%) teachers said that the classrooms they teach in have been ventilated by opening windows and/or external doors. The second most common method of ventilation has been to open internal doors (67%), followed by mechanical ventilation, which has been used by less than one-in-ten teachers (7%)¹¹. As shown in Figure 13, primary teachers were more likely than secondary teachers to open windows or external doors (99% vs 94%), but less likely to open internal doors (63% vs 71%) or use mechanical ventilation (4% v 11%).

Figure 13. How classrooms are being ventilated



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. K1: All teachers (n= 1,130).


¹¹ Mechanical ventilation includes systems using ducts or fans to blow clean air into rooms and/or extract the stale air)

Teachers at schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils (74%) were more likely to ventilate their classrooms by opening internal doors, than those at schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils (63%).

How difficult have teachers found ensuring classrooms are ventilated

Teachers were also asked how easy or difficult they have found it to ensure that classrooms they teach in are well ventilated over the past 12 months. As shown in Figure 14, two-thirds of teachers (62%) felt that this has been easy compared to 28% who felt it has been difficult. A further 11% said it has been neither easy nor difficult. Primary teachers were more likely than secondary teachers to have found keeping classrooms ventilated easy (66% vs 57%), with three-in-ten (29%) finding it very easy, compared to a 19% of secondary teachers.

Figure 14. How easy or difficult have teachers found keeping classrooms ventilated



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. K2: All teachers (n=1.130), Primary teachers (n= 563), Secondary teachers (n= 567). *Indicates a statistically significant difference between primary and secondary parents.

Teachers at schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils (30%) were more likely to have found keeping classrooms ventilated very easy than teachers overall (24%), and those with the second highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely to report it being difficult (24% compared to 19% of all teachers).

Teachers at schools in rural areas were more likely than those in urban areas to have found ventilating classrooms in the past year easy (30% vs 23%).

Problems teachers have experienced ensuring classrooms are ventilated

Teachers, regardless of how easy or difficult they have found ventilating their classrooms, were asked an open-ended question asking what problems they had had ensuring classrooms are ventilated. Whilst 43% stated there were no problems, many teachers had experienced a variety of challenges. The most common responses related to classrooms sometimes being too cold.

“It has been freezing cold up until recently so keeping windows/doors open has been torturous at times.”

Secondary teacher

“Freezing cold. Children and staff have hot water bottles, fingerless gloves and blankets.”

Primary teacher

Some teachers referenced the cold temperatures being a concern from a health and safety perspective.

“No problem ensuring ventilation but health and safety issue regarding extreme cold temperatures.”

Primary teacher

“We have taught with open windows but staff and pupils when cold need to wear coats which results in difficulty of movement to write and use resources. The issue is warmth over safety.”

Primary teacher

Whilst others said that the cold temperatures have been impacting pupils' ability to learn.

“I can always ensure my classroom is well ventilated but this has had an impact when weather and temperature outside is poor and when children who are being taught outside cause a disruption to learning in the classroom. On these occasions the decision to have a room well ventilated actually impacted learning.”

Primary teacher

"It's too cold and the children can't concentrate."

Secondary teacher

In addition to the colder temperatures, some teachers referenced other weather types impacting their ability to keep classrooms ventilated.

"When it is windy the windows blow shut. If it is windy we can't have the door open because it blows papers all over the place."

Primary Teacher

"The wind blows and the windows close. The blinds have to be down because the sunlight hurts the children's eyes, rendering open windows ineffective."

Primary Teacher

"Some rooms have only roof windows which cannot be open when raining."

Secondary Teacher

Issues relating to no / very few windows / doors or windows being very small / not opening (often as a result of health and safety) were a common problem reported by teachers.

"One classroom I teach in has no external windows or doors. There is one door out to the corridor and this is a fire door so can close easily if not held open".

Secondary Teacher

"Windows can only be open a small amount. Some classrooms only have a small amount of windows. This does not feel enough with 34 students in one classroom".

Secondary Teacher

"Windows have safety catches and so do not open fully".

Secondary Teacher

"Windows that are in classrooms not on the ground floor do not open fully (health and safety reasons) so you do not get much air flow at all".

Secondary Teacher

The final theme commonly referenced by teachers was around classrooms being noisy as a result of having windows and doors open for ventilation. This included noise from

within and outside of school grounds, corridors and other classrooms. Many teachers mentioned this impacting learning as pupils were more likely to be distracted.

“Yes, my classroom is right next to the playground so when the windows are open we can hear the children shouting outside. This has an effect on the children in my classroom as they struggle to hear me and become very distracted”.

Primary Teacher

“Keeping internal doors open into corridors is sometimes challenging as our classrooms are very close to one another, so noise travels easily from one to another, which can be distracting”.

Primary Teacher

“But at times noise in the corridors impacts with teaching in the classroom when doors are open - but we just leave doors open and continue teaching as best as we can”.

Secondary Teacher

Face coverings

After fully reopening on March 8th 2021, including at the time of this survey, DfE recommended that in those settings where pupils and students in year 7 and above are educated, face coverings should be worn by staff, pupils and students in classrooms and during activities unless social distancing can be maintained. This was in addition to previous guidance recommending face coverings should be worn when moving around the premises and outside of classrooms when social distancing could not be easily maintained.


From May 17th 2021, in line with Step 3 of the roadmap, face coverings are no longer recommended for pupils and students in classrooms or communal areas, in all schools and FE providers. Face coverings will also no longer be recommended for staff in classrooms.

Secondary leaders and teachers were asked about the impact of face coverings on communication in the classroom, how often students wear face coverings and whether they wear them correctly. These findings are reported in the rest of this chapter.

Impact of wearing face coverings on communication between teachers and students

As shown in Figure 15, almost all secondary leaders and teachers (94%) thought that wearing face coverings has made communication between teachers and students more difficult, with 59% saying it has made it a lot more difficult. This view was shared by leaders and teachers alike, with 96% of leaders and 94% of teachers saying communication has been more difficult. No leaders, and only 2% of teachers thought communication has been easier. Three percent of leaders and teachers thought there had been no change in communication as a result of students and teachers wearing face coverings.

Figure 15. Have face coverings made it easier or more difficult for teachers and students to communicate in the classroom




Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. L1: All secondary leaders and teachers (n= 911).

Whether students are wearing face coverings when they should and correctly

As shown in Figure 16, nine-in-ten (89%) secondary leaders and teachers said that students wear their face coverings almost all (37%) or most (52%) of the time they should. Eight-in-ten (79%) reported students wearing their face covering correctly almost all (14%) or most (65%) of the time.

Figure 16. Whether students are wearing face coverings when they should and correctly




Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. L2_1 and L2_2: All secondary leaders and teachers (n= 911).

Leaders and teachers from schools rated 'outstanding' by Ofsted were more likely to report students wearing face coverings (98% vs 89%) and wearing them correctly (91% vs 79%) most of or all of the time, compared to schools overall.


Secondary leaders were more likely than secondary teachers to report that students wear face coverings (97% vs 88%) and wear face coverings correctly (92% vs 78%) almost always or most of the time, as shown in Figures 17 and 18.

Figure 17. Whether students are wearing face coverings when they should (comparing leaders and teachers)



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. L2_1: All secondary leaders (n=344) and secondary teachers (n= 567). *Indicates a statistically significant difference between secondary leaders and teachers.

Figure 18. Whether students are wearing face coverings correctly (comparing leaders and teachers)




Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. L2_2: All secondary leaders (n=344) and secondary teachers (n= 567). *Indicates a statistically significant difference between secondary leaders and teachers.

Secondary leaders and teachers at schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely to say pupils were wearing face coverings when they should ‘almost always’ or ‘most of the time’ (96%), than leaders and teachers at schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils (79%). The same pattern was seen regarding whether students wear face coverings correctly almost all of the time or most of the time (88% vs. 60%).

ECF Reforms

From September 2021, early career teachers (ECT) will be expected to complete a two-year induction process as part of the ECF reforms. Over a third (37%) of schools reported this was not applicable as they were not expecting to have an ECT join their school in September. Amongst those who were expecting an ECT to join, the majority (87%) had already begun making preparations, with secondary schools significantly more likely to have done so than primary schools (94% vs. 85%). Since the March 2021 survey the proportion of schools expecting an ECT who had not started making preparations had almost halved, from 16% to 9% in April. Primary schools were more likely to report that they had not started making preparations (11% vs. 3%).

Figure 19 Whether schools have begun making preparations for changes to induction process



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. B1: All leaders expecting an ECT to join in September (n=713)

Schools who had *not yet* started making preparations, or had started but needed further guidance (a total of 39% of all schools)¹² were asked what further guidance they needed in order to be able to implement the changes to the induction process. The most common responses were that more information around the set-up process was needed, such as a simple framework for the programme, information regarding training, funding, choosing a provider and examples of best practice. Leaders discussed the need for clarity around certain details of how the process should be run including what paperwork was needed, who was eligible, who can be a mentor, as well as expectations from the school such as time commitment.

“A simplified version of the changes and what we need to do. More clarity over the three options for support programmes and their costs. More info on how this affects our budget and what money we may receive.”

Leader, primary school

A number of schools mentioned they were already in the process of getting the additional support they need, with some waiting to hear back from local authorities and others having information, briefing or training sessions already booked in.

“We are planning to talk more with our Local Authority regarding practical changes to the processes.”

Leader, secondary school

Less common responses specifically mentioned wanting more support from the local authority, and more information on all support available. A few responses included needing more time to look into the changes, and some would welcome the opportunity for discussion.

“Training session and ideas on how to implement and manage this. I knew it was happening but haven’t had time to look at it and didn’t expect I may need to know about it this year.”

Leader, primary school

¹² This figure **does not** include those who are not expecting an ECT to join in September

Leader and Teacher Wellbeing

The Department made a public commitment in the Education Staff Wellbeing Charter, published 10 May, to measure staff wellbeing at regular intervals which enables us to track trends over time and build this evidence into policy making.

Leaders and teachers were asked a series of ONS-validated questions about personal wellbeing, including: their life satisfaction, the extent to which they feel the things they do in life are worthwhile, how happy they felt yesterday and their anxiety levels¹³. They were also asked questions around their job satisfaction and the extent to which they feel fulfilled, happy, burnt out and frustrated.

Life satisfaction


Leaders and teachers were asked to give a rating for the question ‘overall, how satisfied are you with your life?’ using a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all and 10 is ‘completely’.

Almost two-thirds of leaders and teachers were satisfied with their life, with 58% giving a positive score (between 7-10). Leaders were significantly more satisfied than teachers (66% vs. 56%), while teachers were significantly more dissatisfied than leaders (16% vs. 10%).

As shown in figure 20, satisfaction levels have significantly increased since late February 2021 (43%) when schools were closed to most pupils and December 2020 (43%) to 58%. However, they are significantly lower than when leaders and teachers were asked in the COVID-19 School Snapshot Survey (May 2020) and Winter 2019 School Snapshot Survey (November – December 2019), when levels were at 67% and 72% respectively.

¹³ Given the change in people’s circumstances during the COVID-19 pandemic, and the timing of the April survey (April 2021) and the Annual Population Survey (March – June 2020), comparisons between the April survey results and the general population are not explored.

Figure 20 How satisfied are you with life nowadays?



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. C1_1: All Leaders and Teachers (n=2,159). Late Feb 2021 survey (n=2,580). December 2020 survey(n=1,012). COVID-19 School Snapshot (n=1,784). Winter 2019 School Snapshot (n=1,815). *Indicates statistical differences between Late Feb 2021 survey and April 2021 survey. ^Indicates statistical differences between December 2020 survey and April 2021 survey. ~Indicates difference between COVID-19 survey and April 2021 survey. `Indicates difference between Winter 2019 survey and April 2021 survey.

Worthwhileness of daily tasks


Using the same 0 to 10 scale as life satisfaction, leaders and teachers were asked ‘overall, to what extent do you feel that the things you do in your life are worthwhile?’.

Seven-in-10 (68%) leaders and teachers felt that the things they did in their life were worthwhile (giving a positive score between 7-10). Leaders were significantly more likely to have positive scores than teachers (79% vs. 67%).

As shown in figure 21, feelings of worthwhileness have significantly increased since late February 2021 (61%) when schools were closed to most pupils and December 2020 (64%) to 68%. However, they are significantly lower than when leaders and teachers

were asked in May 2020 and November – December 2019, when levels were at 80% and 78% respectively.

Figure 21 To what extent do you feel the things you do in your life are worthwhile



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. C1_2: All Leaders and Teachers (n=2,159). Late Feb 2021 survey (n=2,580). December 2020 survey (n=1,012). COVID-19 School Snapshot (n=1,784). Winter 2019 School Snapshot (n=1,815). *Indicates statistical differences between Late Feb 2021 survey and April 2021 survey. ^Indicates statistical differences between December 2020 survey and April 2021 survey. ~Indicates difference between COVID-19 survey and April 2021 survey. `Indicates difference between Winter 2019 survey and April 2021 survey.


Happiness

Using the same scale, leaders and teachers were asked ‘overall, how happy did you feel yesterday?’.

Over half of leaders and teachers (57%) reported that they were happy yesterday. Leaders were significantly more likely to give a positive response (between 7-10) than teachers (64% vs. 56%). Less than one-in-five were not happy.

As shown in figure 22, feelings of happiness have significantly increased since late February 2021 (44%) when schools were closed to most pupils and December 2020 (47%) to 57%. However, they are significantly lower than when leaders and teachers were asked in May 2020 and November – December 2019, when levels were at 65%.

Figure 22 How happy did you feel yesterday?



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. C1_3: All Leaders and Teachers (n=2,159). Late Feb 2021 survey (n=2,580). December 2020 survey(n=1,012). COVID-19 School Snapshot (n=1,784). Winter 2019 School Snapshot (n=1,815). *Indicates statistical differences between Late Feb 2021 survey and April 2021 survey. ^Indicates statistical differences between December 2020 survey and April 2021 survey. ~Indicates difference between COVID-19 survey and April 2021 survey. `Indicates difference between Winter 2019 survey and April 2021 survey.


Anxiety

Using the same scale, leaders and teachers were asked ‘overall, how anxious did you feel yesterday?’. It is important to note that for anxiety a low score (between 0-3) is a positive score as it represents not being anxious.

Less than half of leaders and teachers reported that they were not anxious (giving a score of 0-3). There were significantly more leaders (39%) reporting this than teachers (29%).

As shown in figure 23, feelings of anxiety have significantly decreased from 54% to 47% since the late February 2021 survey when schools were closed to most pupils. However, they are significantly higher than when leaders and teachers were asked in May 2020 and November – December 2019, when levels were at 38% and 26% respectively.

Figure 23 How anxious did you feel yesterday?




Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. C2: All Leaders and Teachers (n=2,159). Late Feb 2021 survey (n=2,580). December 2020 survey (n=1,012). COVID-19 School Snapshot (n=1,784). Winter 2019 School Snapshot (n=1,815). *Indicates statistical differences between Late Feb 2021 survey and April 2021 survey. ^Indicates statistical differences between December 2020 survey and April 2021 survey. ~Indicates difference between COVID-19 survey and April 2021 survey. `Indicates difference between Winter 2019 survey and April 2021 survey.

Job satisfaction

Teachers and leaders were asked how satisfied they were with their present job. Overall, two-thirds (62%) of leaders and teachers were satisfied with their job. As shown in figure 24, leaders were significantly more satisfied with their job than teachers (68% vs 61%).

Overall, leaders' and teachers' job satisfaction levels have significantly increased since the late February survey (62% vs. 56%), however levels were not as high as the November- December Winter 2019 School Snapshot survey when 73% of leaders and teachers reported they were satisfied with their job.

Figure 24 Satisfaction with present job



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. C3: All Leaders and Teachers (n=2,159). Late Feb 2021 survey (n=2,580). *Indicates statistical difference between leaders and teachers. ^Indicates statistical differences between Late Feb 2021 survey and April 2021 survey.

Fulfilment and Happiness in job role


Leaders and teachers were also asked, the extent to which they feel fulfilled and happy in their current job role.

Over a third (39%)¹⁴ of leaders and teachers reported feeling fulfilled in their job to high or very high degree, with a further 41% reporting they were ‘somewhat’ fulfilled. As shown in figure 25, leaders were significantly more likely to feel fulfilled to a high or very high degree than teachers (51% vs. 38%).

A similar proportion (37%) of leaders and teachers reported feeling happy in their job role to a high or very high degree, with 41% reporting they were somewhat happy. Again, leaders were significantly more likely to report feeling happy to a high or very high degree than teachers (44% vs 36%).

¹⁴ Please note that the individual percentages shown in charts may not sum to ‘net’ figures due to rounding.

Figure 25 Happiness and fulfilment in current job role




Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. C4_1 & C4_2: All Leaders and Teachers (n=2,159). Late Feb 2021 survey (n=2,580). *Indicates statistical difference between leaders and teachers.

Feelings of Burn out and Frustration in job role

Leaders and teachers were asked the extent to which they feel burnt out and frustrated in their current job role. Overall, nearly half (48%) of leaders and teachers reported feeling a high or very high degree of burn out in their job role, with significantly more teachers (49%) than leaders (40%) reporting this. A further 27% (31% of leaders and 27% of teachers) said they were 'somewhat' burnt out.

Around four-in-ten (42%) leaders and teachers reported feeling a high or very high level of frustration in their current job role, with significantly more teachers (43%) than leaders (37%) reporting this. Around a third (34% of leaders and 30% of teachers) said they were 'somewhat' frustrated.

Figure 26 Burn-out and frustration in current job role



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. C4_3 & C4_4: All Leaders and Teachers (n=2,159). Late Feb 2021 survey (n=2,580). *Indicates statistical difference between leaders and teachers.

Pupil mental health and wellbeing

Pupil mental health and wellbeing remains a priority for the Department for Education. The pandemic is affecting children and young people's mental health and wellbeing in a variety of ways. Since children have returned to school and lockdown measures have been eased, it is important to assess whether schools and school staff are able to identify potential issues and provide the sorts of help that pupils may need, as well as whether they are aware of the support and training that is available to them to do this.

The April survey covered key issues around pupil mental health and wellbeing, including teachers' opinions on supporting pupil mental health and the availability and uptake of mental health training, findings of which are reported in this chapter.


Teachers' views on supporting pupil mental health and wellbeing

Teachers were asked whether they agreed with a range of statements regarding children and young people's mental health at their school. Three-quarters (75%) of all teachers felt equipped to identify behaviour that may be linked to a mental health issue and the same proportion (75%) knew how to help pupils with mental health issues access support offered by the school or college.

Slightly fewer said they felt equipped to teach children in their class who have mental health needs (58%), had access to mental health professionals if they need specialist advice on pupils' mental health (53%) and knew how to help pupils with mental health issues access specialist support outside of school or college (50%).

The findings are compared to those from previous waves in Figure 27. In general, levels of agreement with the statements have fluctuated over time. However, since early February 2021, there has been a significant reduction in the proportion of teachers agreeing with three of the statements; 'I know how to help pupils with mental health issues access support offered by my school/college', 'I feel equipped to teach children in my class who have mental health needs' and 'I have access to mental health professionals if I need specialist advice on pupils' mental health'.

Figure 27. Teachers' levels of agreement with five statements concerning pupil mental health and wellbeing



School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. H1: All teachers (n=1,130). Early February 2021 survey. B2: All teachers (n=1,266). * Indicates a statistically higher percentage when comparing April 2021 and Early February 2021.

The main subgroup differences related to academy status. Teachers at secondary academies were significantly more likely than those at secondary non-academies to agree that:

- They felt equipped to identify behaviour that may be linked to a mental health issue (77% vs. 65%);
- They felt equipped to teach children in their class who have mental health needs (60% vs. 50%); and
- They have access to mental health professionals if they need specialist advice on pupils' mental health (61% vs. 49%).


Agreement with the statement around access to mental health professionals for specialist advice was also significantly higher for secondary in comparison to primary teachers (58% vs. 48%).

Training on pupil mental health

Teachers were also asked if they had undertaken any new or additional training on pupil mental health since September 2020. Two-fifths (40%) of teachers reported that they had undertaken this type of training since September. Comparisons with previous waves shows a gradual increase in the proportion of teachers undertaking training since December 2020, as shown by Figure 28.

Around half (53%) of teachers had not attended any pupil mental health training since September. However, the majority of these (41% of all teachers) would have welcomed new or additional training if they had been offered it. The remainder felt they did not need additional training (6%) or were simply unable to take it up for a particular reason (6%).

Figure 28. Whether teachers had attended training on pupil mental health since September 2020



School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. H2: All teachers (n=1,130). Late February 2021 survey. G2: All teachers (n=1,402). * Indicates a statistically significant difference between April 2021 and Late February 2021.

The proportion of teachers that felt additional training was not required varied according to school phase and FSM status. Specifically, secondary teachers were slightly more likely to feel it wasn't needed compared to primary teachers (8% vs. 4%), as were teachers at schools with the lowest proportions of pupils eligible for FSMs versus those with the highest (9% vs. 3%).

Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) and post-16 transition


The late February wave of the survey revealed a notable difference in the reported ability of secondary teachers to support pupils with SEND to transition to post-16 provision, in comparison to pupils without SEND. In late February, 34% of secondary leaders agreed they could support transition pupils with SEND 'fairly' or 'very' well, compared to 60% who said they could support the transitions of pupils without SEND 'fairly' or 'very' well. This wave examined the barriers that exist to effectively supporting the transition for pupils with SEND.

Barriers to supporting pupils with SEND to transition to post-16 provision

Secondary teachers involved in supporting pupils with SEND to transition to post-16 provision (13% of all secondary teachers surveyed), were asked about the barriers they had experienced in doing so.

By far the most commonly cited barrier, experienced by four-fifths (82%) of teachers, was the impact of COVID-19 restrictions on opportunities for transition visits. Following this, around three-fifths (58%) felt that some young people were unsure what they want to do in September, making it difficult to progress the transition, while 45% reported a lack of capacity in the school workforce to deliver transition activities.

Figure 29. Barriers to supporting pupils with SEND transition to post-16 provision



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. E2: Secondary teachers involved with supporting SEND pupils' transition to post-16 provision (n=76).

There were no notable subgroup differences for this question.

Extra-curricular activities

The Department for Education needed to gather evidence on the cost of enrichment and extra-curricular activities to inform an understanding of how these activities are funded and who pays for them.

This chapter explores whether schools were currently paying for activities delivered by an external company, and if so, whether parents were contributing to this cost, and also how much they were paying per pupil per hour.

Firstly, schools were asked whether they would normally (before the pandemic) pay for extra-curricular activities delivered by an external company, such as sports or arts clubs. Overall, more than half (55%) of schools did so, and seven in ten (70%) of those reported that parents contributed to the cost of extra-curricular activities too.


The cost to schools and parents of extra-curricular activities

The amounts paid per pupil per hour for both schools and parents are shown in Figure 30. Over a quarter (28%) of schools paid between £2.01 and £4, with more than half (53%) of schools paying up to £6 for extra-curricular activities delivered by an external company. One in ten schools (10%) paid upwards of £8.

Of the schools that paid for extra-curricular activities, 29% said parents did not contribute anything towards the cost. A further two-fifths (39%) reported that parents paid up to £4.

A relatively high proportion of leaders were unsure how much was paid by the school (34%) or parents (19%).

Figure 30. Amounts paid by schools and parents for extra-curricular activities delivered by an external company



Source: School Snapshot Panel, April 2021 survey. J2/J3/J5/J6: Leaders at schools that pay for extra-curricular activities delivered by an external company (n=499).

Subgroups differences by phase were marked. Primary schools were significantly more likely than secondary schools to pay for extra-curricular activities (62% vs. 21%).

Furthermore, significantly more parents paid a contribution to these costs at:

- Primary schools (71% vs. 45% of secondary schools);
- Primary non-academies (75% vs. 66% of primary academies); and
- Schools with the lowest proportions of pupils receiving FSMs (89% vs. 36% of those with the highest).

Despite being less likely to pay for extra-curricular activities, secondary schools tended to pay more if they did so; nearly two-fifths (18%) spent more than £8 compared to 10% of primary schools. The same trend was observed for costs to parents. However, this may in part be a reflection of limited awareness amongst secondary leaders in comparison to primary, as a significantly greater proportion were unsure how much was paid by the school (56% vs. 32%) or parents (52% vs. 24%).



Department
for Education

© Department for Education 2021

Reference: DFE- RR1159

ISBN: 978-1-83870-301-1

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

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