



Department
for Education

School and College Panel – March 2022 wave

Research Report

June 2022

Authors: IFF Research



**Government
Social Research**

Contents

List of figures	4
Executive Summary	7
A note on the reporting	7
Workload	7
Staff absence and response measures	8
Unregistered provision	8
Teaching assistants	9
Appropriate Bodies policy	9
Swimming and water safety	9
Pupil mental health	10
Pupil behaviour	10
Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND)	11
Decision making and delivery	11
Remote education	11
Languages	12
Wraparound childcare	13
Breakfast club provision	13
Climate change	14
Summer provision	14
Face coverings	15
Support in Further Education	16
Introduction	17
Methodology	17
Weighting	18
School-level weighting	18
Teachers / individual weighting	18
Panel A/B weighting approach	19
Interpreting the findings	20
Workload	22

Leaders' workload	22
Teachers' workload	23
Staff absence and response measures	26
Unregistered provision	28
Teaching assistants	30
Appropriate Bodies policy	32
Swimming and water safety	34
Pupil mental health	36
Teachers' views on supporting pupil mental health and wellbeing	36
Pupil behaviour	39
Leaders' views on behaviour culture	39
Teachers' views on behaviour culture	39
Overall pupil behaviour	42
Impact of pupil behaviour	46
Confidence managing behaviour	48
Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND)	51
Support for decision making and delivery	55
Remote Education	59
Languages	63
Wraparound childcare	68
Breakfast club provision	72
Climate change	77
Summer Provision	80
Face Coverings	86
Support in Further Education	90
Support DfE can provide	90
Challenges facing colleges in coming months	92

List of figures

Figure 1. Whether leaders are spending more or less time on certain tasks	23
Figure 2. Whether teachers are spending more or less time on certain tasks	24
Figure 3. Whether schools have arranged any unregistered alternative provision within the last academic year.....	28
Figure 4. Factors that determined whether schools recruited teaching assistants.....	30
Figure 5. How much involvement leaders and teachers had in assigning tasks to teacher assistants.....	31
Figure 6. How valuable schools find the Appropriate Bodies verification for statutory teacher induction	32
Figure 7. Types of swimming and water safety lessons provided	34
Figure 8. Reasons why swimming or water safety lessons were not running this term ...	35
Figure 9. Teachers' agreement with statements regarding pupil mental health	37
Figure 10. Frequency of positive behaviour culture experiences as reported by leaders and teachers	41
Figure 11. School leaders' views of pupil behaviour in school during the past week	43
Figure 12. Teachers' views of pupil behaviour in school during the past week.....	44
Figure 13. Frequency of types of misbehaviour	45
Figure 14. Extent to which misbehaviour stopped teaching or learning in the past week	46
Figure 15.. Extent to which pupil misbehaviour has had a negative impact on health and wellbeing.....	48
Figure 16. Levels of confidence managing misbehaviour in their school	49
Figure 17. Levels of confidence supporting pupils to understand how to behave well.....	50
Figure 18. External evidence sources used by schools in the current academic year to support decision making and delivery (Prompted)	55
Figure 19. Which one external evidence source was most useful to support decision making and delivery	57

Figure 20. Which of the following influenced schools' decision to use EEF resources to support decision making and delivery	58
Figure 21. Challenges of delivering livestreamed lessons	60
Figure 22. Benefits of delivering livestreamed lessons	61
Figure 23. Effectiveness of livestreamed lessons	62
Figure 24. Languages currently taught at school	64
Figure 25. Which languages that are not currently taught at their schools, would schools be interested in teaching	66
Figure 26. The proportion of language classes in primary schools delivered by a specialist	67
Figure 27. Whether primary schools offered childcare before or after school, or both	69
Figure 28. Reasons for not providing supervised wraparound childcare	70
Figure 29. Changes in demand for wraparound childcare	71
Figure 30: How schools run their breakfast provision	73
Figure 31. Breakfast provision free to pupils	74
Figure 32. Which groups were provided free breakfasts	76
Figure 33: Degree of confidence to teach content that includes climate change	78
Figure 34. Which primary year group(s) have been taught content about climate change this academic year	79
Figure 35. Whether school plans to offer any form of summer provision to pupils this year	80
Figure 36. Types of summer provision schools are planning to offer	82
Figure 37. Cohorts of pupils that summer provision will be tailored to	83
Figure 38. How many days of summer provision will be provided to a pupil on average ..	84
Figure 39. Whether parents/carers whose child is attending summer provision will be expected to contribute	85

Figure 40. Whether pupils wear face coverings when they should and whether they wear them correctly	87
Figure 41. Extent to which face coverings can affect pupils in different ways.....	88
Figure 42. Extent to which face coverings influence communication, learning and anxiety among SEND pupils who wear masks.....	89

Executive Summary

This report presents findings from the fourth (March 2022) wave of the School and College Panel, a panel run by IFF Research on behalf of the Department for Education.

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 the 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.

Due to the small base size of 24, the results for colleges are reported, but are done so using integer values (i.e., X out of 24) rather than percentages to reflect the small base size and the caution that should be taken with assuming the representation of these results. For the first time, college teachers were invited to take part in the survey. Eighty college teachers took part but due to the small base size, no weighting has been applied. For questions where the base size drops below 30, for example college leaders, integer reporting is used.

Findings from each wave should be interpreted in the context of guidelines in place at that time. Caution should be taken when comparing results from previous surveys as any changes and patterns may be impacted by the guidelines in place at each timepoint.

Workload

Leaders and teachers were asked about time spent on various tasks, compared to the same time last year. Both leaders and teachers reported spending *more* time this year on all tasks, apart from planning and preparation of online lessons and resources, and keeping up to date with current COVID-19 guidelines. For leaders, this included covering additional roles due to staff absence (86% of leaders reported that they spent more time on this), supporting staff mental health (82%), and pastoral support including communication with external organisations (76%). The proportion of teachers reporting that they spent more time on tasks this year was particularly marked for general administrative work (76% of teachers reported that they spent more time on this),

covering additional roles due to staff absence (72%), and dealing with incidents of misbehaviour (71%).

Staff absence and response measures

Leaders and teachers were asked whether anything had prevented them personally from physically attending the school site since schools reopened this (Spring) term (from January 2022). Around half (46%) of leaders and teachers said they had not been prevented from physically attending with a slightly higher proportion of leaders (53%) than teachers (45%) giving this response.

The most frequent reasons for not being able to physically attend their school site were COVID-19 related sickness (29% of all leaders and teachers), non-COVID-19 related sickness (18%), and caring responsibilities (13%).

In December 2021, the DfE issued an urgent call for qualified teachers currently not working in the sector, to return to support schools on a temporary basis. Two percent of schools said that they had some teachers who had returned to the profession following this urgent call.

Of these 13 schools, eight reported that these teachers had helped to reduce pressures in their school caused by staff absence (four saying to some extent, four to a small extent). No school reported these teachers had helped reduce staffing pressures to a great extent and five said it had not helped at all.

Unregistered provision

A small minority (4%) of schools said they had arranged unregistered alternative provision. Secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to report having done so (10% vs. 3%). A further 6% did not know if they used such provision.

The 28 leaders that said they had used an unregistered setting were asked why they had done so. From a prompted list, leaders most commonly said that they had arranged this type of provision because the setting in question addressed the needs of the young people involved in ways which could not be met in a school (24 gave this response).

All but one leader said they used tools when deciding on an unregistered provider, with the most common types being Service Level Agreements or Procurement Contracts (24). The most commonly reported origin of these tools was their own Local Authorities (16). The majority of leaders reported that both national (26) and local (24) government guidance on using an unregistered provider would be something they would find useful.

Teaching assistants

School budget considerations were the most important factor in schools' decisions about whether to recruit teaching assistants, with two thirds (66%) reporting this as important in this decision. Smaller proportions reported that availability of suitable candidates (16%) and the number of pupils with an education, health and care (EHC) plan (13%) were important.

Teachers and leaders were also asked how involved they were in assigning tasks to teaching assistants within their schools. Leaders (84%) were more likely to have some form of involvement compared to teachers (76%). However, teachers were more likely to report that they had 'a lot' of involvement (42% vs 34% of leaders). A quarter of teachers (23%) reported they had no involvement at all in assigning tasks to teaching assistants.

Appropriate Bodies policy

As part of statutory teacher induction, headteachers perform a final formal assessment which is then verified by an Appropriate Body. Just over four-in-ten (42%) thought the Appropriate Bodies verification was valuable (15% very valuable and 27% fairly valuable), though over a third (35%) were unsure or undecided.

Swimming and water safety

Swimming is a vital life skill and that is why pupils are taught to swim and about water safety at primary school. Swimming and water safety are compulsory elements of the PE curriculum at Key Stages 1 and 2. The majority of primary schools (80%) reported providing pupils with swimming and/or water safety lessons, with no variation seen amongst different types of primary schools. Less than a fifth (18%) were not providing these lessons, with 1% not sure.

Amongst schools who provided lessons, swimming lessons were more common than water safety lessons, with 89% teaching swimming at least 25 metres and 78% providing lessons on a range of swimming strokes, compared to only 48% providing lessons on safe self-rescue.

The most common reason why primary schools were not currently delivering swimming or water safety lessons was that lessons were not usually run this term and scheduled for later in the academic year (43%). Lack of pool space (23%) was the most common practical reason why schools were not able to provide these lessons, followed by costs of running lessons and staff capacity (both 16%).

Pupil mental health

Around three-quarters (73%) of teachers knew how to help pupils with mental health issues access support offered by their school, and two-thirds (67%) felt equipped to identify behaviour that may be linked to a mental health issue.

Slightly fewer said they felt equipped to teach children in their class who have mental health needs (51%), had access to mental health professionals if they need specialist advice on pupils' mental health (40%), knew how to help pupils with mental health issues access specialist support outside of school or college (38%), or felt that pupils were able to access specialist support when needed (35%).

Pupil behaviour

Just under nine-in-ten school leaders (86%) reported that their school was a safe environment for pupils every day. In addition, three-quarters (77%) reported that school staff had been respectful to each other every day.

Teachers were less positive than leaders on the same statements, with 65% reporting that school staff had been respectful to each other every day, and 63% saying their school was a safe environment for pupils every day.

Most (95%) leaders and teachers were confident in dealing with misbehaviour, with 48% saying they felt very confident and 48% reporting they felt fairly confident. Leaders were more likely to report feeling very confident than teachers (74% vs. 44%). Leaders and teachers were similarly confident about supporting pupils to understand how to behave well. Overall, half (50%) were very confident, and a similar proportion were fairly confident (46%). Leaders were more likely to report feeling very confident doing this than teachers (76% vs. 46%).

School leaders were asked how pupils' behaviour had been in the past week. Overall, around nine-in-ten (89%) reported that pupils' behaviour was at least good, and around four-in-ten (40%) said it was very good. Four percent reported that behaviour had been poor or very poor.

Teachers views on pupils' behaviour varied, with 64% saying behaviour was either good or very good and 17% saying behaviour was poor. Primary teachers were more likely than secondary teachers to say pupils' behaviour was good (53% for primary vs. 43% for secondary) or very good (21% for primary vs. 11% for secondary).

Two-thirds (65%) of teachers reported that in at least some lessons pupil misbehaviour had stopped teaching or learning. When asked how many minutes they thought were

lost, these teachers reported that, on average, for every 30 minutes of lesson time around 5 minutes were lost.

When asked an open text question about what this misbehaviour involved, teachers said this included pupils talking out of turn, shouting out, arguing or fighting between themselves, fidgeting, throwing things, distracting others, having a lack of focus and arriving to lessons late.

Leaders and teachers were also asked the extent to which pupil misbehaviour has had a negative impact on their health and wellbeing. Overall, around two-thirds (63%) of leaders and teachers reported this to at least a small extent, with one third (27%) reporting to some extent and a similar proportion reporting to a small extent (28%).

Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND)

Leaders and teachers provided a range of definitions to illustrate what they understood the term 'inclusive education' for children with SEND to mean. The most common response centred around the theme of equitable access to a high quality broad, balanced curriculum in a mainstream setting with support as required. Other common responses included the opportunity to learn alongside and/or feel part of their peer group and a supportive environment where children make progress and feel successful.

A separate group of leaders and teachers (Panel B) were asked whether they have any concerns about providing inclusive education for children with SEND. For those that did, some of the most common concerns mirrored the broader concerns within the sector, including recruiting and retaining appropriately skilled staff, funding constraints and workload pressures. In addition, some leaders and teachers raised the difficulty of teaching SEND pupils in mainstream education.

Decision making and delivery

Nine-in-ten schools used the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) to aid their decision making. The EEF is a charity which supports leaders and teachers by summarising the available evidence of what works to improve teaching and learning. Two-thirds of schools (66%) used research or statistics provided by the DfE. Just over three-quarters (78%) of Multi-Academy Trusts (MATs) used resources from their MAT to aid their decision making.

Remote education

Around one-in-seven (14%) teachers had delivered livestreamed lessons since the start of this term in January 2022. Teachers in secondary schools were more likely to have

done so compared to primaries (23% vs. 6%). Amongst colleges, 36% of teachers had delivered livestreamed lessons in the same time frame.

Of school teachers who had delivered lessons using this approach, 80% cited difficulty dividing attention between remote learners and children in the classroom as a challenge. Other challenges reported were the difficulty in planning for these lessons (56%) and problems with technology disrupting the lesson (49%). College teachers identified the same challenges.

Teachers were also asked about the benefits of delivering livestreamed lessons. Just under two-thirds (64%) of school teachers and 25 of the 29 college teachers said that these lessons ensured remote learners could keep up with the curriculum. Around a third of teachers also said that it improved remote learners' experience on their return to school (35%), improved absent pupils' engagement with remote learning (32%) and improved the wellbeing of remote learners (32%).

Overall, teachers were asked how effective livestreamed lessons were for delivering remote education. Six-in-ten school teachers said that they were effective, as did 17 of the 29 college teachers asked. Just over a third (37%) of school teachers and 11 of the 29 college teachers thought livestreamed lessons were not effective.

Languages

Schools and colleges were asked which languages were currently being taught. Three-quarters of schools reported that French was being taught, followed by just under two-fifths (37%) who taught Spanish. Amongst colleges, the same two languages were the most widely taught, with 17 of the 24 colleges teaching French and 15 teaching Spanish.

Schools and colleges were also asked if they would be interested in teaching any languages that they do not currently deliver as part of their curriculum. Half of schools and 12 of the 24 colleges said they would not be interested in this. Amongst schools that selected at least one language that they would be interested in, around a quarter (26%) said Spanish, and one-in-six (16%) said Mandarin. Amongst colleges, Italian and Mandarin were selected by four of the twelve colleges.

Primary schools were asked what proportion of languages classes were taught by a specialist language teacher. This was defined as someone with a relevant post-A level qualification. One-in-five primary schools had all or most of their language classes delivered by a specialist. No classes were being delivered by a specialist in 53% of primary schools. Around a quarter (24%) reported that some of their classes are taught by a specialist.

Wraparound childcare

Four-fifths (80%) of primary schools indicated that they offered supervised wraparound childcare in March 2022. This is an increase from December 2021 (when COVID-19 Plan B measures were in place, including advice to work from home), when 71% offered it.

Of the primary schools offering wraparound childcare, four-fifths (80%) offered both before and after school childcare, 19% offered it only before school and just 1% offered it only after school. Overall, more primary schools were only offering provision before school (15%) than in December 2021 (5%). One-fifth (20%) of primaries offering wraparound childcare reported that it was registered on Ofsted's General Childcare Register, whilst two-thirds (67%) said it was included as part of the school's own Ofsted registration; the remaining 14% did not know.

Amongst those primary schools which did not offer wraparound childcare provision, the top three reasons given were insufficient demand from parents (42%), not being financially viable for the school (41%) or that provision was provided off-site (37%).

Just over half of primary schools that offered wraparound childcare reported that demand for before or after school childcare had stayed stable over the last six weeks (56% of those that offer before school childcare and 54% of those that offer after school childcare). Around a third of primaries that offer such childcare reported that demand had increased recently: 31% for before school childcare, and 34% for after school childcare. Only a minority thought demand had decreased (8% for before school and 6% for after school childcare).

Amongst primary school leaders who were asked whether their school was able to receive Tax Free Childcare (TFC) payments from parents, 45% reported that they did not know and 41% reported that they were able to (made up of 33% who reported their school was able to receive them and 8% who reported that their schools' childcare provider was able to). One-in-seven primary school leaders (14%) reported they were not able to receive TFC payments. The main reason given by schools who said they were not able to receive TFC payments was that they did not understand what is required of the school to receive them (45%).

Breakfast club provision

Three-quarters (75%) of schools ran breakfast club provision for pupils, with primary schools more likely than secondary schools (78% vs. 57%) to run this.

When asked how they funded their breakfast club provision, primary schools were much more likely than secondary schools to use parents/carers payments (80% vs. 13%), making it their most common source by a considerable margin. On the other hand,

secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to use pupil premium funding (44% vs. 29%), other school funding (30% vs. 16%), or the DfE's National School Breakfast Programme (14% vs. 3%).

Almost two-thirds (62%) of schools offering breakfast provision provided this for free to some or all pupils – 50% free to some pupils and 12% free to all pupils. Around a third (35%) said it was not offered free to any pupils, and the remaining 3% said they did not know.

Climate change

Two-fifths (41%) of school teachers had personally taught content that included climate change in the current academic year. A third (33%) of college teachers said they had done the same.

Among school teachers, 92% who had already taught on climate change this academic year felt confident doing so, whereas only 68% of those who had not taught on the subject this year would feel confident (12% very confident and 57% fairly confident). Among college teachers, 24 of the 26 who had taught on the subject this year felt confident doing so, whilst 76% of those who had not taught on it felt confident. 7% of teachers and 8% of college teachers said they had received any training on teaching about climate change.

Primary teachers that had taught about climate change during this academic year, were more likely to have taught it at Key Stage 2 than at Key Stage 1. Over two-thirds (69%) had taught it at KS2 and over a quarter (28%) had taught it at KS1.

Summer provision

School and college leaders were asked whether they were planning to offer any summer provision for pupils this year. Summer provision was defined as extra-curricular activities or additional lessons offered during the summer holidays.

Almost a fifth of schools (18%) were planning to offer summer provision this year, with 1% planning to do so for the first time. All primary schools asked this question said that their provision would focus on sports-based activities. Almost all (94%) secondary schools said that their provision would be focussed on transition.

Almost half (11) of the 24 colleges who responded had no plans for summer provision. Seven planned to offer summer provision, all of which had offered this before. Most commonly, colleges planned on offering academic and transition-focussed activities as part of their summer provision (six for each).

Overwhelmingly, this provision is planned to take place in-person at school (96%), with most (64%) tailoring it towards disadvantaged pupils. Almost a quarter (23%) spontaneously answered that their provision would be catered to all pupils. Of the seven colleges planning to offer summer provision, four said it would be in-person. Two planned to offer a mixture of virtual and in-person provision, with one opting for solely virtual provision. All seven colleges said that pupils previously identified as needing further support would be targeted with summer provision.

On average, amongst those who were planning to offer summer provision, schools intended to provide pupils with ten days of summer provision (13 on average in primaries, six on average in secondaries). Over half of schools (55%) said parents/carers would be expected to make a contribution to cover the cost of this provision, though this was significantly more likely in primary schools (75% vs. 18% for secondary schools). On average, amongst colleges who were planning to offer summer provision, they said they would provide pupils with a median of five days of summer provision.

Face coverings

Secondary and college teachers were asked a series of questions related to face coverings in their school or college. DfE guidance recommending face coverings in classrooms (for secondary-aged pupils, students and adults) was removed on January 20th 2022, following a temporary reintroduction on January 4th 2022. DfE guidance recommending face coverings in communal areas (for secondary-aged pupils, students and adults) was similarly removed on 27th January 2022, having been in place since 28th November 2021. Local Directors of Public Health retained the discretion to recommend the use of face coverings in some circumstances as part of their responsibilities in outbreak management, in both classrooms and communal areas.

Just over one-in-ten (12%) secondary teachers and 16% of college teachers said their school or college had asked students to wear a face covering in class or communal school or college areas in the last two weeks.

In schools that asked pupils to wear face coverings, 76% of secondary teachers said pupils mostly or always wore them when they should and 68% said they mostly or always wore them correctly (i.e. covering the nose and mouth). The proportion of those reporting that students wore face coverings when they should (either always or most of the time) was directionally lower than when this question was asked in April 2021 (76% vs. 88% in April).

Almost three-quarters of secondary teachers (73%) reported that wearing face coverings helped pupils feel safer at school at least to some extent, however two-thirds (66%) said face coverings made it more difficult for pupils to communicate with others to at least

some extent. Around half (49%) of secondary teachers felt that wearing face coverings made it more difficult for pupils to learn to at least some extent. Thirty nine percent said face coverings makes pupil behaviour more disruptive to at least some extent and 32% said it made pupils feel anxious to at least some extent. College teachers had a similar pattern of response to these statements.

Similar questions were also asked of secondary teachers about the effect of wearing face coverings on SEND pupils specifically. Three-quarters (75%) of secondary teachers who teach SEND pupils who wear face coverings, reported that wearing them made it more difficult for SEND pupils to communicate with others to at least some extent. Wearing face coverings also made it more difficult for SEND pupils to learn, with 65% of secondary teachers reporting this to at least some extent. In relation to feelings of anxiety, 59% of secondary teachers thought having to wear face coverings made pupils feel anxious to at least some extent. Again, college teachers' answers were similar to secondary teachers.

Support in Further Education

In March 2022, college leaders were asked two open-text questions about what support would be best for DfE to provide and what were the main challenges anticipated for colleges in the next couple of months. There was a lot of overlap between the two questions with many colleges wanting support for issues they thought were going to be a challenge in the near future.

Additional funding was the most common type of support listed, with some simply responding "more funding" and others providing details of what the funding is needed for. There were calls for both general funding, and funding specifically for employing/retaining more staff (including specialist staff). Colleges also wanted DfE to provide support to deal with rising mental health problems (amongst staff and students) and the on-going effects of COVID-19.

The most mentioned challenge anticipated by college leaders related to exams. This was primarily about the challenge of preparing learners to sit exams, when they have not taken formal assessments in this way recently. The mental health impact of exams was also frequently referenced. The increase in observed mental health problems amongst both staff and students, was raised as both a challenge facing colleges as well as an area they would like DfE to provide more support for.

Introduction

This report presents findings from the March 2022 wave of the School and College Panel, a panel of leaders and teachers designed to provide rapid feedback to the Department for Education on topical educational issues from the provider perspective.

The short survey (taking five to ten minutes to complete) covered a range of topical issues in education including education recovery, teacher wellbeing and wraparound childcare provision. A total of 1,052 school leaders and 1,386 classroom teachers participated in the March wave. In addition to this, 24 college leaders and 80 college teachers participated in the survey.

Methodology

The School and College Panel consists of a group of leaders and teachers that have agreed to participate in short regular research surveys on topical education issues. The panel comprises those from the previous School Snapshot Panel (initially recruited in late 2020/early 2021) who agreed to remain as panellists and new respondents recruited specifically to the new School and College Panel. At the time of the March survey, almost half (49%) of school leaders and teachers on the panel members were 'new recruits' i.e. recruited directly onto the School and College Panel. All college leaders and teachers were recruited at the start of the 2021/22 academic year. This is the first wave of the survey in which college teachers were invited to take part. Moreover, this is also the first wave that sixth-form leaders have taken part, this group of respondents have been included in the 'college leaders' category in the report.

All school leaders and teachers were recruited from School Workforce Census data provided by the Department for Education. A maximum of two leaders from each chosen school were invited to take part in the March wave. In order to reduce the survey length for individual respondents, school leaders and teachers were randomly allocated to either panel A or panel B, with each panel seeing a different set of questions. Where two leaders from the same school appeared to be on the same panel, they were allocated to different panels, ensuring that two leaders from the same school did not answer the same set of questions. Teachers were selected from the full population of teachers, meaning at some schools, multiple teachers were invited to participate in the March wave. Similarly, multiple teachers from the same college were invited to participate this wave.

The survey was administered online, with fieldwork lasting from 9 to 16 March 2022. Respondents received an email invite and two reminder emails.

The following table shows the response rate for the March survey by key group.

Table 1. Response rate by key group

	Primary Leaders	Secondary Leaders	College leaders	Primary Teachers	Secondary Teachers	College teachers
Starting sample	2,391	1,865	78	2,411	2,242	162
Completed responses	629	423	24	748	638	80
Response rate	26%	23%	31%	31%	28%	49%

Weighting

Two types of weighting were applied to the data, depending on whether questions were asking for school-level or individual-level answers from school leaders and school teachers. No weighting was applied to the college data.

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 are 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 school leaders and classroom teachers were combined and weighted together to the overall population of school teachers. The population data for the teachers weighting was taken from the Schools Workforce Census based on November 2020 data (the most current available data).

Panel A/B weighting approach

For the March survey, to minimise the survey length for individual respondents, school leaders and teachers were allocated either to group A or B, with each group receiving a different set of questions. Weights were calculated separately for panel A and panel B respondents to ensure results reported from either panel A or B were representative of the overall population. This resulted in four weights being created:

- Panel A school-level
- Panel B school-level
- Panel A individual
- Panel B individual

Interpreting the findings

Data presented in this report is from a sample of senior leaders and teachers rather than the total population of leaders and teachers. 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 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 (1,191 in panel A and 1,247 in panel B), 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 1,191 or 1,247) lies within a +/- 4.0% range of this figure for panel A (i.e. 46% - 54%) and a +/- 3.9% range of this figure for panel B (i.e. 46.1% - 53.9%). Results based on a sub-set of schools interviewed are subject to a wider margin of error. For example, for results among panel B school leaders (a base of 552), we can be 95% confident that for a survey result of 50% the sampling error is +/- 5.9%.

Due to the small sample size for colleges in this survey (24 college leaders and 80 college teachers), findings are not presented in this report as percentages when the sample size for a question is below 30. Instead, it is reported as "*eight out of 24 colleges said X*". It is reported in this way to reiterate that the findings are based on a small sample size and should be treated with caution.

Differences between sub-groups and between this 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 eligible pupils and schools with the highest proportion of FSM eligible 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 and College Panel, direct comparisons should be treated with caution.

Some survey questions allow for an 'other, please specify' free-text response. At the end of fieldwork, these free-text responses are examined. They are either back-coded into existing codes or new answer codes are created to group together responses for the purpose of reporting. These newly created codes are referred to as 'spontaneous' responses in charts. New codes are only created if they account for 1% or more of answers. Responses that cannot be matched to any existing, or newly created 'spontaneous' code, are reported as 'other'. It should be noted that results on these spontaneous responses are likely to be much lower than if those responses had been presented to respondents (the latter are often referred to as 'prompted' responses).

Workload

Workload reduction is a longstanding priority for the Department for Education. Leaders and teachers were asked whether they were spending more or less time on specific tasks this year compared to the same time last year.

As leaders and teachers engage in different tasks in their day-to-day roles, this section addresses the changes to leaders' and teachers' workload separately. The survey covers leaders' personal workload, rather than their views on the workload of teachers at their school.

Leaders' workload


Leaders were asked if they had spent more or less time on a list of tasks this year (at the time of the current survey) compared to the same time last year. As shown in Figure 1, leaders reported spending more time on most tasks than they were at the same time last year. The exceptions were: planning and preparation of online lessons and resources, and keeping up to date with current COVID-19 guidelines, where 54% and 37% of leaders, respectively, reported that they spent less time overall.

The proportion of leaders reporting that they spent more time on tasks this year was particularly marked for covering additional roles due to staff absence (86% of leaders reported that they spent more time on this), supporting staff mental health (82%), and pastoral support including communication with external organisations (76%). For each of these tasks 4% or less of leaders reported that they spent less time on them than the same time last year.

Leaders were more likely than teachers to report that they spent more time than last year on the following tasks:

- Pastoral support including communication with external organisations (76% of leaders vs. 45% of teachers)
- Supporting staff mental health (82% vs. 41%)
- Covering additional roles due to staff absence (86% vs. 72%)
- Keeping up to date with current COVID-19 guidelines (29% vs. 22%).

Figure 1. Whether leaders are spending more or less time on certain tasks



Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. J1: Panel A leaders (n=500). “Pastoral support including communication with external organisations” has been shortened to “Pastoral support”. “Communication with staff, including staff meetings, appraisal, coaching, mentoring and training” has been shortened to “Communication with staff”. “Recording, inputting, monitoring and analysing data in relation to pupils’ performance” has been shortened to “Analysing pupils’ performance”. “Planning, administering and responding on pupil assessments” has been shortened to “pupil assessments”. “Planning and preparation of online lessons and resources” has been shortened to “Planning and preparation of online lessons”.

Teachers' workload

As shown in Figure 2, teachers reported spending more time on all tasks in March 2022 than the same time last year, excluding planning and preparation of online lessons and resources, and keeping up to date with current COVID-19 guidelines, where 59% and 37% of teachers, respectively, reported that they spent less time overall.


The proportion of teachers reporting that they spent more time on tasks this year was particularly marked for general administrative work (76% of teachers reported that they spent more time on this), covering additional roles due to staff absence (72%), and

dealing with incidents of misbehaviour (71%). For each of these tasks 5% or fewer of teachers reported decreases.

Teachers were more likely than leaders to report that they spent more time on:

- General administrative work (76% of teachers vs. 60% of leaders)
- Recording, inputting, monitoring and analysing data in relation to pupils performance and for other purposes than leaders (67% vs. 52%)
- Planning, administering and responding on pupil assessments (68% vs. 49%)
- Marking pupils work (58% vs. 39%)
- Planning and preparation of online lessons and resources (24% vs. 11%).

Figure 2. Whether teachers are spending more or less time on certain tasks



Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. F1: Panel A teachers (n=691).
Statements shortened as per Figure 1.

Secondary school leaders and teachers were more likely to report that they spent more time compared to last year than primary leaders and teachers on the following tasks:

- Marking pupils work (63% of secondary vs. 49% of primary)
- Planning, administering and responding on pupil assessments (73% of secondary vs. 60% of primary)
- Dealing with incidents of misbehaviour (78% of secondary vs. 65% of primary).

In contrast, primary school leaders and teachers were more likely to report that they spent more time compared to last year than secondary leaders and teachers on:

- Supporting staff mental health (49% of primary vs. 43% of secondary)
- Keeping up to date with current COVID-19 guidelines (25% of primary vs. 19% of secondary)
- Pastoral support including communication with external organisations (53% of primary vs. 44% of secondary).

Other subgroup differences included:

- Respondents in schools based in London were less likely than average to report more time being spent on dealing with incidents of misbehaviour (64% vs. 71% on average)
- Those working in schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely to report more time spent on marking pupils' work than those working in schools with the highest proportion (65% vs. 48%), keeping up to date with current COVID-19 guidelines (29% vs. 18%), and on recording, inputting, monitoring, and analysing data in relation to pupil performance and for other purposes (74% vs. 64%)
- Rural schools were more likely than urban schools to report more time spent on keeping up to date with current COVID-19 guidelines (28% vs. 21%) and on pastoral support (54% vs. 47%).

Staff absence and response measures

The Department's priority is to protect education, and make sure that schools and colleges have the teaching staff they need to safely deliver face-to-face education.

School leaders and staff have worked incredibly hard to make sure pupils have been able to remain in school, while dealing with higher levels of staff absence than normal. The questions covered in this chapter were asked to improve understanding of the extent of challenges that education settings are facing in relation to absence, and to gather data on the impact of the urgent call for supply teachers.

All leaders and teachers were asked whether anything had prevented them from physically attending the school site since schools reopened this term (from January 2022). Around half (46%) of leaders and teachers reported that there had been no reasons stopping them from physically attending, with a slightly higher proportion of leaders (53%) than teachers (45%) giving this response. This is a lower proportion than leaders and teachers in October 2021, when around three-fifths (59%) reported that there had been no reasons stopping them from physically attending. This suggests that there are more barriers in place preventing staff from physically attending in March 2022, than there were in October 2021.

The most frequent reasons selected by those who had not been able to physically attend their school site were COVID-19 related sickness (29% of all leaders and teachers), non-COVID-19 related sickness (18%), and caring responsibilities (13%); all of which were reported more commonly than in October 2021 (15%, 17% and 9% respectively). A range of other reasons were selected less frequently (4% or less in all cases) by leaders and teachers, including attending a COVID-19 vaccination appointment and other personal reasons.

There were some subgroup differences which included the following:

- Teachers were more likely than leaders to report other non-COVID-19 related illness such as flu (19% of teachers vs. 14% of leaders) and caring responsibilities (14% of teachers vs. 10% of leaders) as a reason for absence.
- Secondary school leaders and teachers were more likely than their primary school counterparts to report other non-COVID-19 related illness such as flu (21% of secondary vs. 15% of primary), caring responsibilities (16% of secondary vs. 11% of primary), and mental health reasons (6% of secondary vs. 3% of primary) as a reason for absence.
- Primary school leaders and teachers were more likely to report COVID-19 related sickness than their secondary school equivalents (33% vs. 26%).

- Those who were disabled were more likely than average to report absence due to COVID-19 related sickness (39% vs. 28%), and to caring responsibilities (20% vs. 12%).

In December 2021, the DfE issued an urgent call for qualified teachers currently not working in the sector, to return to support schools on a temporary basis. Two percent of schools said that they had teachers in their school who had responded to this urgent call (one per cent were unsure).

Primary schools were more likely than secondary schools to say no teachers had returned to their schools following the urgent call (97% vs. 93%), and particularly for primary non-academy schools (99%).


Unregistered provision

Schools use alternative provision (AP) to direct pupils off site to improve their behaviour or in order to provide suitable education during a suspension. Some of these settings are too small to meet the requirements to register as a school and are commonly called 'unregistered provision'. The settings vary in nature but mainly offer part time vocational education and practical experiences and are valued by school commissioners. Through asking these questions, and wider data collection changes made to the school census, the DfE is looking to address current evidence gaps. These findings will support reforms to improve outcomes for pupils attending all alternative provision as set out in the SEND and AP Green Paper.

School leaders were asked whether they had arranged any provision of this type for pupils in the last academic year. As of March 2022, 4% of school leaders said they had arranged this type of provision compared to 89% who had not; 6% did not know.

As shown in Figure 3, secondary school leaders were more likely than primary school leaders to report having arranged unregistered alternative provision (10% vs. 3%).

Figure 3. Whether schools have arranged any unregistered alternative provision within the last academic year



Source: School College Panel, March 2022 survey. B1: Panel A leaders (n=500). *Indicates a significantly higher figure between primary and secondary schools.

Schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were also more likely to have arranged this type of provision than average (7% vs. 4%).

Leaders who said they had used an unregistered setting (n=28) were asked why they had done so. From a prompted list, 24 said that they had arranged this type of provision

because the setting in question addressed the needs of the young people involved in ways which could not be met in a school. Eighteen said that it was because there were not enough alternative provision school places in their local area.

These leaders were also asked which tools, if any, they used when selecting an unregistered provider. All but one said that they do use some tools, with the most common types being Service Level Agreements or Procurement Contracts (24), or Safeguarding Frameworks or Quality Assurance Guidelines (23). Twelve leaders said that they would use Minimum Education Standards Frameworks or Equivalent Mainstream Curriculum Standards. In addition, three leaders said unprompted that they would use visits to the provider to determine whether they were suitable for their needs.

When asked who created these tools, leaders most commonly said it was their Local Authority (16). Thirteen said that the tools were created by their school. One said another Local Authority created the tools, and four said they were created by another school.

Those leaders that had used an unregistered setting were asked how useful they think it would be to receive local or national government guidance on commissioning unregistered alternative provision settings. The majority of leaders thought that both local government and national government guidance would be useful.


Teaching assistants

This chapter looks at what factors determine whether schools recruit teaching assistants and how involved teachers and leaders are in assigning tasks to teacher assistants within their schools.

As shown in Figure 4, school budget considerations were the most important factor for schools in deciding whether to recruit teaching assistants, with two-thirds (66%) reporting this as important.

School budget considerations were a particularly important factor for primary schools, with the majority (71%) selecting this factor and much smaller proportions selecting any other option. A greater range of factors were selected by secondary schools, with “availability of suitable candidates” and “the number of pupils with an EHC plan” selected as important by greater proportions than leaders from primary schools.

Figure 4. Factors that determined whether schools recruited teaching assistants



Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. I1: Panel B leaders (n=552). *Indicates a higher statistical difference between primary and secondary. Responses under 1% not shown, as well as 'Not sure' responses. For an explanation of 'spontaneous', see the 'Interpreting the findings' chapter


Schools in rural areas were more likely to consider budget considerations the most important factor when recruiting teaching assistances compared to urban schools (76% vs. 63%).

The following significant differences were reported regionally:

- A quarter of schools in London (25%) reported the number of pupils with an education, health and care (EHC) plan was important (compared to 13% of all schools).
- A quarter of schools in the North West (25%) said availability of suitable candidates was important (compared to 16% of all schools).

When asked about the amount of involvement in assigning tasks to teacher assistants, leaders were more likely to have some form of involvement (84%) than teachers (76%). However, as shown in Figure 5, teachers were more likely to report that they had 'a lot' of involvement (42% vs. 34% of leaders). A quarter of teachers (23%) reported they had no involvement at all in assigning tasks to teaching assistants.

Figure 5. How much involvement leaders and teachers had in assigning tasks to teacher assistants




Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. I2: Panel B leaders and teachers (n=1247). *Indicates a higher statistical difference between leaders and teachers. Responses under 2% not shown ('don't know').

Appropriate Bodies policy

As part of statutory teacher induction, headteachers perform a final formal assessment which is then verified by an Appropriate Body. School leaders were asked, based on their experience of these assessments, how valuable they think the Appropriate Bodies verification is for statutory teacher induction.

As shown in Figure 6, just over four-in-ten schools (42%) thought this verification was valuable, though over a third (35%) were unsure or undecided.

Figure 6. How valuable schools find the Appropriate Bodies verification for statutory teacher induction



Source: School College Panel, March 2022 survey. H1: Panel B leaders (n=552).

Schools with an 'Outstanding' Ofsted rating were more likely than those with ratings of 'Good' and 'Requires Improvement' to think this verification was valuable (53% vs. 39% and 35% respectively).

Schools in rural areas were significantly more likely to say they were unsure/undecided (43% vs. 35% overall), with this being the most common answer among this group. East

Midlands schools were more likely to say they thought the Appropriate Bodies verification was not very valuable (24% vs. 15% overall).


Swimming and water safety

Swimming is a vital life skill which is why pupils are taught to swim and about water safety at primary school. Swimming and water safety are compulsory elements of the PE curriculum at Key Stages 1 and 2. This section of the report explores what swimming and/or water safety lessons primary schools were providing pupils, and the barriers to providing such lessons.

The majority of primary schools (80%) were providing pupils with swimming and/or water safety lessons, with no variation seen amongst different types of primary schools. Less than a fifth (18%) were not providing these lessons, with 1% not sure.

Amongst those who provided lessons, swimming lessons were more common than water safety lessons, with swimming at least 25 metres the most common element pupils were taught about (89%), followed by performing a range of swimming strokes (78%), as shown in Figure 7.

Figure 7. Types of swimming and water safety lessons provided




Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. E2: Panel B primary leaders that provide swimming lessons (n=269).

Primary academy schools were less likely than non-academy primary schools to provide lessons on a range of swimming strokes (70% vs. 83%) or lessons on performing safe self-rescue (38% vs. 55%).

Primary schools in the North West were more likely to provide lessons on water safety theory or knowledge (42% compared to 26% of all primary schools).

The most common reason why primary schools were not currently delivering swimming or water safety lessons was that lessons were not usually run this term and scheduled for later in the academic year (43%). Lack of pool space (23%) was the most common practical reason why schools were not able to provide these lessons, following by costs of running lessons (16%) and staff capacity (16%).

Figure 8. Reasons why swimming or water safety lessons were not running this term



Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. E3: Panel B primary schools that are not currently providing swimming lessons (n=62).

Pupil mental health

The questions in this section were asked to help inform the Department's understanding of how well education staff feel able to promote and support the mental wellbeing of children and young people, and the support the department provides.

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. Around three-quarters (73%) of teachers reported knowing how to help pupils with mental health issues access support offered by the school or college and two-thirds (67%) felt equipped to identify behaviour that may be linked to a mental health issue.


Slightly fewer said they felt equipped to teach children in their class who had mental health needs (51%), had access to mental health professionals if they need specialist advice on pupils' mental health (40%), knew how to help pupils with mental health issues access specialist support outside of school or college (38%), or felt that pupils were able to access specialist support when needed (35%).

The findings are compared to those from previous waves in Figure 9. In general, levels of agreement with the statements have fluctuated over time. In comparison to around one year prior to the current survey, in early February 2021, levels of agreement for all statements asked in both waves have significantly decreased. In comparison to December 2021, the most recent wave that this question was asked, there has been a significant reduction in the proportion of teachers agreeing with the following statements:

- 'I feel equipped to identify a behaviour that may be linked to a mental health issue' (67% in March 2022 vs. 72% in December 2021)
- 'I feel equipped to teach children in my class who have mental health needs' (51% in March 2022 vs. 58% in December 2021)
- 'I know how to help pupils with mental health issues access specialist support outside of school/college'. (38% in March 2022 vs. 45% in December 2021)
- Students/pupils are able to access specialist support when needed (35% in March 2022 vs. 41% in December 2021).¹

¹ This statement has only been asked in the December 2021 and March 2022 waves. As such, there is no long-term trend as there are only two data points.

Figure 9. Teachers' agreement with statements regarding pupil mental health



Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. F1: Panel B teachers (n=695). December 2021 survey. K1: All teachers (n=1,720). June 2021 survey. K4: All teachers (n=979). April 2021 survey. H1: All teachers (n=1,130). Early February 2021. B2: All teachers (n=1,266). September 2020. All teachers (n=746). * Indicates a statistically lower significant difference between March 2022 and previous wave. Students/pupils are able to access specialist support when needed was added in the December wave. Please note that the Y axis has been truncated in this chart

Differences between subgroups included the following:

- Primary teachers were more likely than secondary teachers to disagree that:
 - They had access to mental health professionals if they needed specialist advice about pupils/students' mental health (48% vs 40%).
 - Pupils were able to access specialist support when needed (53% vs. 37%).
- Teachers from rural schools were more likely than those from urban schools to disagree that pupils were able to access specialist support when needed (57% vs. 42%).

- Teachers from schools in the East of England were more likely than average to disagree that they know how to help pupils with mental health issues access specialist support outside of school (53% vs. 43% on average).

Pupil behaviour

All schools should be calm, safe, and supportive environments where both pupils and staff can thrive and reach their potential in safety and dignity. Understanding concerns related to pupil behaviour and engagement is a priority for DfE to inform policy development, guidance and/or best practice products for schools.

Leaders' views on behaviour culture

Leaders were asked a series of statements relating to their experience of the school's behaviour culture. The data should be interpreted in terms of leaders providing their own views, rather than answering on behalf of their schools. Just under nine-in-ten leaders (86%) reported that their school was a safe environment for pupils every day, and just under eight-in-ten (77%) leaders reported that school staff had been respectful to each other every day. On every or most days, 94% of leaders reported that pupils had been respectful to each other, 86% reported that their school had been calm and orderly and 78% reported that their headteacher and other school leaders had reminded pupils about the behaviour rules. Figure 10 shows leaders' views on behaviour culture (and also teachers' views).

There were some differences in reported behaviour culture amongst leaders by school type:

- Secondary school leaders were more likely than primary school leaders to report that the headteacher and other school leaders had reminded pupils about the behaviour rules at least most days (86% vs. 73%).
- Leaders in urban schools were more likely than their rural school counterparts to report that the headteacher and other school leaders had reminded pupils about the behaviour rules every day (61% vs. 40%).
- Leaders in the schools with the lowest proportion of FSM pupils were more likely than those with the highest to report that their school had been calm and orderly every day (59% vs. 40%).
- Leaders in schools with the lowest proportion of FSM pupils were more likely than those with the highest to report that pupils had been respectful to each other at least most days (99% vs. 89%).


Teachers' views on behaviour culture

Individual teacher views on the same behaviour culture statements were less positive than overall school views, as shown in Figure 10. For every statement, leaders were

significantly more likely to say that these positive behaviours were happening every day in their school, compared to teachers.

Two-thirds of teachers (65%) reported that school staff had been respectful to each other every day, and a similar proportion said their school was a safe environment for pupils (63%). On at least most days, 74% of teachers reported that pupils had been respectful to each other, 72% reported that their headteacher and other school leaders had reminded pupils about the behaviour rules, and 66% reported that their school had been calm and orderly.

Figure 10. Frequency of positive behaviour culture experiences as reported by leaders and teachers



Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. G1: Panel B leaders (n=552), Panel B teachers (n=695). “The headteacher and other school leaders have reminded pupils about the behaviour rules” shortened to “school leaders have reminded pupils about the behaviour rules”.

*Indicates a significantly higher figure comparing leaders and teachers

Some of the key differences notable by type of teacher were:


- Primary teachers were more likely than secondary teachers to report that their school had been calm and orderly at least most days (74% vs. 57%).
- Teachers at schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely than those with the highest proportion of FSM to report that their school had been calm and orderly every day (41% vs. 16%).
- Primary teachers were more likely than secondary teachers to report that their school had been a safe environment for pupils every day (75% vs. 49%).
- Teachers at schools with pupils on the lowest proportion of FSM were more likely than those on the highest proportion of FSM to report that their school had been a safe environment for pupils at least most days (96% vs. 83%).
- Teachers at schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely than those with the lowest proportion of FSM to report that their school headteacher and other school leaders had reminded pupils about the behaviour rules at least most days (75% vs. 60%).
- Primary teachers were more likely than secondary teachers to report that their pupils had been respectful to each other at least most days (80% vs. 67%).
- Teachers at schools with pupils on the lowest proportion of FSM were more likely than those on the highest proportion of FSM to report that pupils have been respectful to each other at least most days (86% vs. 61%).
- Teachers at rural schools were more likely than teachers at urban schools to report that pupils have been respectful to each other at least most days (85% vs. 71%).

Overall pupil behaviour

School leaders' view

School leaders were asked how pupils' behaviour had been in the past week. Overall, around nine-in-ten (89%) reported that pupils' behaviour was at least good, and around four-in-ten (40%) said it was very good. Four percent reported that behaviour had been poor or very poor.

Figure 11. School leaders' views of pupil behaviour in school during the past week



Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. G4: Panel B leaders (n=552).
 'Prefer not to say' is not shown on chart (<1%)


Primary school leaders were more likely than secondary to report pupils' behaviour as very good (44% for primary vs. 31% for secondary). There were other differences by subgroup:

- Leaders from schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils (53%) were more likely than those with the highest proportion (34%) to say behaviour was very good;
- Leaders from schools with an Ofsted rating of 'Outstanding' (51%) were more likely to report that pupils' behaviour was very good, compared to leaders from schools with a 'Requires Improvement' rating (19%);
- Rural school leaders (94%) were also more likely than those from urban schools (88%) to report that behaviour was at least good.

Teachers' view

Teachers were asked how pupils' behaviour had been in the past week at their school. Overall, around two-thirds (64%) of teachers reported pupils' behaviour was at least good, while 17% said it was poor. Teachers were more likely than leaders to say that behaviour was poor in the past week (17% vs. 4% of leaders) and less likely to say that it was good (64% vs. 89% of leaders).

Figure 12. Teachers' views of pupil behaviour in school during the past week



Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. G3: Panel B teachers (n=695).
 'Prefer not to say' is not shown on chart (1%)

Primary teachers were more likely than secondary teachers to report pupils' behaviour as good (53% vs. 43% respectively) or very good (21% for primary vs. 11% secondary). Teachers at schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils (81%) were more likely than those with the highest proportion (56%) to say behaviour was at least good. Teachers from rural schools (73%) were also more likely than those from urban schools (62%) to report that behaviour was at least good.

When asked whether a list of disruptive behaviours had occurred, teachers that taught in the past week commonly reported talking (86%) and shouting out (66%) as behaviours


that occurred when they were not supposed to in at least some lessons. Less frequently reported behaviours included arriving to lessons late (46% of teachers reported this in at least some lessons) and answering back or challenging instructions (39% reported this in at least some lessons). The behaviours least likely to be reported in at least some lessons included throwing things non-aggressively (19%) and using mobile devices when not supposed to (12%).

Secondary school teachers were more likely than primary teachers to report the following behaviours occurring when not supposed to in at least some lessons:

- Talking (89% for secondary vs. 84% for primary)
- Throwing things (22% for secondary vs. 15% for primary)
- Answering back or challenging instructions (43% for secondary vs. 35% for primary)
- Using mobile devices (25% for secondary vs. 1% for primary)
- Arriving late to lessons late (72% for secondary vs. 21% for primary).

Shouting out was the only behaviour more commonly reported by primary teachers (71% for primary vs. 60% for secondary).

Figure 13. Frequency of types of misbehaviour




Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. G8: Panel B teachers that had taught in the past week (n=677).

Impact of pupil behaviour

Teachers that had taught lessons in the past week were asked how often misbehaviour stopped teaching or learning. Overall, two-thirds (65%) of teachers reported that in at least some lessons misbehaviour interrupted teaching.

Figure 14. Extent to which misbehaviour stopped teaching or learning in the past week



Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. G5: Panel B teachers that had taught in the past week (n=677).

Teachers from schools with the highest proportion (74%) of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely than those with the lowest proportion (45%) to report that in at least some lessons misbehaviour stopped teaching.

Teachers that had taught lessons in the past week were also asked how many minutes they thought were lost due to misbehaviour. On average, teachers reported for every 30 minutes of lesson time, five minutes were lost. The majority of teachers (73%) reported that between one and ten minutes were lost, with significantly more secondary than primary teachers reporting this (78% of secondary vs. 69% of primary). Seven percent reported that more than ten minutes were lost.

When asked an open-ended question on what this misbehaviour that interrupted lessons involved, teachers reported a range of disruptive behaviours. Pupils talking out of turn, answering back and challenging instructions, shouting out, arguing or fighting between themselves, and using bad language were some of the verbal behaviours reported. Other

physically disruptive behaviours included pupils refusing to stay in their seat, fidgeting, throwing things (in a non-aggressive manner) and physically hitting students or staff. Further disruptive behaviours that were reported included pupils distracting others, having a lack of focus, arriving to lessons late and pupils leaving the classroom.

“Interruption, crying and wailing, standing up so others were unable to see, refusal follow a clear and agreed rule, refusal to join the class, attempting to leave the classroom through any means available, trying to hide under tables. Loss of focus and lying on the floor, trying to get the attention of the class by being funny. There are many SEND children within the class and these are some of the issues dealt with on a regular basis.” - *Primary teacher*


“Constant disruption, shouting out, bickering with each other, unable to focus, very hyperactive.” - *Secondary teacher*

“Punctuality, distracted chatter and defiance (questioning direct instructions about behaviour expectations).” - *Secondary teacher*

Leaders and teachers were also asked the extent to which pupil misbehaviour has had a negative impact on their health and wellbeing. Overall, around two-thirds (63%) reported this to at least a small extent (27% reported it to some extent, 28% to a small extent and 8% to a great extent).

Teachers were more likely than leaders to report that misbehaviour had had any negative impact on their health and wellbeing (64% for teachers vs. 54% for leaders). Leaders and teachers from secondary schools were also more likely to report this than those in primary schools (67% for secondary vs. 60% for primary).

Figure 15. Extent to which pupil misbehaviour has had a negative impact on health and wellbeing



Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. G9: Panel B teachers and leaders (n=1,247). Don't know and 'not applicable' not shown. *indicates significantly higher figure between leaders and teachers


The following leaders and teachers were more likely to report a negative impact on their health and wellbeing:

- Those from schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils (67% vs. 47% among those with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils).
- Those teaching in urban schools (65% vs. 55% among those in rural schools).

Confidence managing behaviour

Leaders and teachers were asked the level of confidence they had personally in managing misbehaviour in their school. Overall, 95% of leaders and teachers felt at least fairly confident, with around half (48%) very confident. This differed between leaders and teachers, with leaders more likely to report being at least fairly confident (99% vs. 95%) and leaders reporting being very confident more commonly than teachers (74% vs. 44%).

Figure 16. Levels of confidence managing misbehaviour in their school




Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. G2: Panel B leaders and teachers (n=1,247). *Indicates significantly higher figure between leaders and teachers

Differences by phase were evident with leaders and teachers from primary schools more likely to report confidence in managing misbehaviour than those from secondary schools (97% vs. 93%).

Leaders and teachers from schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely to report feeling 'very confident' in managing misbehaviour than those from schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils (65% vs. 46%).

Leaders and teachers were also asked the level of confidence they had personally in supporting pupils to understand how to behave well. Overall, half (50%) were very confident, and a similar proportion were fairly confident (46%). Leaders were more likely to feel very confident than teachers (76% vs. 46%), while teachers were more likely to report being fairly confident (50% vs. 23%).

Figure 17. Levels of confidence supporting pupils to understand how to behave well



Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. G3: Panel B leaders and teachers (n=1247). *Indicates significantly higher figure between leaders and teachers

Primary school leaders and teachers were more likely than those from secondary schools to report feeling at least fairly confident in supporting pupils to behave well (99% from primary vs. 94% from secondary). Schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were most likely to report feeling very confident in supporting pupils to behave well (62% vs. 47% of the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils). By role, headteachers, assistant headteachers and deputy headteachers were more likely to report feeling very confident (79% of headteachers and deputy headteachers and 70% of assistant headteachers, vs. 50% average).

Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND)

This section focuses on schools understanding of the term 'inclusive education' for children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) and what concerns, if any, schools have in providing this support.

Under the Children and Families Act 2014, a child or young person has Special Educational Needs (SEND) if they have a learning difficulty or disability which calls for special educational provision to be made for them. A child of compulsory school age or a young person has a learning difficulty or disability if they:

- Have a significantly greater difficulty in learning than the majority of others of the same age, or
- Have a disability which prevents or hinders them from making use of facilities of a kind generally provided for others of the same age in mainstream schools (or mainstream post-16 institutions).

When leaders and teachers were asked as an open question for their understanding of the term 'inclusive education' for children with SEND most answered in terms of an adaptable, high-quality curriculum, equity with peers and the support and resources to enable this.

Equal access to a 'high-quality curriculum' was the most common understanding given.

"An inclusive education is ensuring that all children have the same access to a high, quality education and that the education that SEND pupils receive is responsive to the individual pupil need and diversity of all learners within the school community." - *Primary Leader*

"Accessing high quality lessons, that enable them to succeed." - *Secondary Leader*

"All children are entitled to high quality education alongside their peers irrespective of their need." - *Primary Leader*

A large minority thought 'inclusive education' for children with SEND meant the ability for SEND pupils to learn alongside and/or feel part of their peer group.

"Children with SEND being taught alongside their peers so they are within lessons but with learning differentiated appropriately to allow them to access the learning." - *Primary Teacher*

“Ensuring that all students feel included regardless of their SEND. Not having a SEND pupil off in a corner to seclude them.” - *Secondary Teacher*

“Educating children with SEND alongside and together with children who are not SEND.” - *Primary Teacher*

The existence of a supportive environment or SEND pupils being supported as required was also referenced by many.

“Children with SEND being given the support they need to access the curriculum so as not be at a disadvantage and to ensure their personal trajectory both educationally and socially is met and enables them to make progress from their starting points.” – *Primary Leader*

“Ensuring teaching and learning and pastoral systems meet the needs and support students to be successful, both academically and socially in school.” - *Secondary Leader*

“For children with additional SEND needs to have the support they need to access their learning.” - *Primary Leader*

Some leaders and teachers referenced adaptation or differentiation within, or personalisation of, the mainstream curriculum to enable all children to access learning fully.

“Adapting the curriculum to include SEND children using a equality approach.” - *Primary Leader*

“Ensuring that the curriculum is adapted so that students with SEND are able to access the same information as their peers and feel comfortable doing so.” - *Secondary Teacher*

“Creating an environment that gives all children the opportunity to access learning at their own level.” - *Primary Teacher*

References to the provision of resources, flexibility to teach all abilities, ensuring all children are valued and treated fairly and identifying/removing barriers for learning were also made by leaders and teachers.

Leaders and teachers (from Panel B) were asked whether they had any concerns about providing inclusive education for children with SEND. Many reported that they did not have any concerns, but amongst those who did, difficulties recruiting and retaining appropriately skilled staff were the most common:

“Having the right people (recruitment) is a real challenge at present, more so than it has ever been. The children with significant needs are stripping resources from across the school meaning those with lower level SEN needs are left behind. EHCP children with high level of need are actually requiring more like 1.5 adults to one child rather than 1:1. Notional budget is spent and there is simply no room for any more staff in the budget.” – *Primary leader*

“Not enough staff to support pupils appropriately. The TA team doesn't have enough experience to be left with normal TA jobs they are apprentices.” – *Secondary teacher*

“Lack of appropriate adult support within the school due to budget restraints. I have 2 children with EHCPs in my class and no adult support. We have 2 members of staff off on maternity leave and no budget to replace them.” – *Primary leader*

Leaders and teachers were also concerned about difficulties teaching SEND pupils in mainstream education.

“More and more SEND children are coming through mainstream as they are waiting for placement at specialist unit. In mainstream we try our best but the provision is hard to lend itself to their needs completely and as such the education system is failing them.” – *Primary Leader*

“The level of need sometimes is beyond a mainstream offer.” – *Secondary Leader*

“Not having effective ways to deal with students whose SEND manifest in disruptive behaviours. Finding the balance between supporting students with SEND that presents as a barrier to learning while also providing sufficient stretch and challenge for other students in the same class.” – *Secondary Leader*

Funding / budgetary constraints were mentioned by both leaders and teachers.

“Insufficient funding to enable additional adult support.” - *Primary Teacher*

“The costs of providing the appropriate support. School finding the first £6k is very challenging in a very small school (under 50 pupils)”. – *Primary Leader*

Some also talked about workload pressures / lack of time to provide support, whilst others spoke about the lack of specialist / alternative provision.

“Having the time needed to support or sometimes just having the time to check in on them to check they are ok”. - *Secondary Teacher*

“Due to work load, very little time able to appropriately differentiate tasks suitable for SEND students.” - *Secondary Teacher*

“The lack of external support from agencies is an issue. This has reduced in recent years and has proved problematic in dealing with complex cases.” - *Secondary Leader*

“Support and assessments from external sources are limited and very hard to access. CAMHS [children and adolescent mental health services] are not offering adequate support for children as they do not have capacity.” - *Primary Leader*

“I’m the schools SENCO and my main concern is waiting times for CAMHS, EHCA [Education Health Care Assessment] reviews and speech and language support.” - *Primary Teacher*


A small proportion raised concerns about the lack of physical resources and ensuring all staff have the proper training to provide inclusive education for children with SEND.

Support for decision making and delivery

This section examines which external evidence sources schools have used in the current academic year to support their decision making and delivery.

Figure 18 summarises the external evidence sources used by schools. The most widely used were the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) (90%), research or statistics provided by the DfE (66%), resources from hubs that their school is involved in (58%) and the National Foundation for Educational Research (56%). Amongst Multi-Academy Trusts (MATs), resources from the MAT had been used by 78% of these schools.

Figure 18. External evidence sources used by schools in the current academic year to support decision making and delivery (Prompted)



Source: School College Panel, March 2022 survey. R1: Panel A leaders (n=500). * Indicates a significantly higher figure between Primary and Secondary schools. Only sources selected by more than 5% are shown.

As shown in Figure 18, there were differences between primary and secondary schools as to which evidence they had used in the current academic year. Primary schools were more likely to have made use of information / evidence from:


- The EEF (91% vs. 85% of secondaries)
- Resources from hubs their school is involved in (60% vs. 46%)
- NSPCC (52% vs. 38%)
- Early Intervention Foundation (11% vs. 5%).

In contrast, secondary schools were more likely to report having used information / evidence from:

- The Chartered College of Teaching (37% vs. 25% of primaries)
- Evidenced-based Education (36% vs. 24%)
- Institute of Education (IoE) at the University of London (20% vs 10%)
- The Teacher Development Trust (17% vs. 8%).

Among schools that used more than one evidence source to support decision making and delivery in the current academic year, 60% felt that the EEF was the most useful, making it by far the most useful source (as shown in Figure 19). One-in-ten reported that resources from hubs that their school was involved in were most useful. Amongst MATs, 24% indicated that resources from their MAT were the most useful that they had used.


Figure 19. Which one external evidence source was most useful to support decision making and delivery



Source: School College Panel, March 2022 survey. R2: Panel A leaders who used more than one evidence source (n=467). * Indicates a significantly higher figure between Primary and Secondary schools. Only sources selected by 1% or more are shown.

Schools that had used the EEF were asked what influenced their decision to use EEF resources to support decision making. The main reasons were that their evidence is clearly communicated (82%), past positive experience of using their resources (67%) and that EEF's website is easy to navigate (53%). Just over a quarter (28%) were signposted to it by DfE, with this far more common among primary than secondary schools (30% vs. 19%). Around a quarter (26%) of MATs were signposted by their trust to the EEF's resources.

Figure 20. Which of the following influenced schools' decision to use EEF resources to support decision making and delivery



Source: School College Panel, March 2022 survey. R3: Panel A leaders who used EEF (n=441).

* Indicates a significantly higher figure between Primary and Secondary schools. Only sources selected by more than 5% are shown. "Other" (5%) and "Not sure" (2%) also not shown.

Remote Education

Partly as a result of the continuing impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, some schools and colleges have continued engaging in various measures to deliver teaching to pupils not attending school in person. In the March survey, school and college teachers were asked about the use of livestreamed lessons since the start of the term in January 2022.

‘Livestreamed lessons’ refers to lessons where the teacher teaches some pupils and students in the classroom, whilst also providing a simultaneous video stream of the lesson to pupils or students learning remotely.

Around one-in-seven (14%) school teachers had delivered livestreamed lessons since the start of this term. Teachers in secondary schools were more likely to have done so compared to those in primaries (23% vs. 6%).² Amongst colleges, 36% of college teachers had delivered livestreamed lessons in the same time timeframe.


Teachers in schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely to have delivered livestreamed lessons compared to schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils (19% vs. 10%).

Of school teachers who had delivered lessons using this mode, 80% cited difficulty dividing attention between remote learners and pupils in the classroom as a challenge. Other challenges reported were the difficulty in planning for these lessons (56%) and problems with technology disrupting the lesson (49%). Figure 21 shows the response to the full list of challenges asked about in the survey.

Amongst the 29 college teachers who had delivered livestreamed lessons, similar challenges were identified. Twenty-five reported difficulty dividing attention between remote learners and students in the classroom as a challenge, followed by 16 who said problems with technology disrupted the lesson. Twelve said planning for these lessons was difficult.

² Only 24 primary schools (6%) had delivered livestreamed lessons since the start of this term which meant comparisons between primary and secondary schools were not possible for subsequent questions due to this low base.


Figure 21. Challenges of delivering livestreamed lessons



Source: School College Panel, March 2022 survey. Q1: Panel A teachers who have delivered livestreamed lessons (n=96). Only answers selected by more than 5% are shown.

School and college teachers were also asked about the benefits of delivering livestreamed lessons. Just under two-thirds (64%) of school teachers and 25 of 29 college teachers said that these lessons ensured remote learners could keep up with the curriculum. Around a third of school teachers also said that it improved remote learners' experience on their return to school (35%), improved absent pupils' engagement with remote learning (32%) and improved the wellbeing of remote learners (32%). The first two benefits were also reported by college teachers, with 12 and 17 of the 29 teachers citing these as benefits respectively. Figure 22 shows the list of potential benefits asked to school teachers.


Figure 22. Benefits of delivering livestreamed lessons



Source: School College Panel, March 2022 survey. Q2: Panel A teachers who have delivered livestreamed lessons (n=96). Only answers selected by more than 5% are shown.

School and college teachers were asked how effective livestreamed lessons were for delivering remote education. Six-in-ten school teachers (60%) felt that they were effective, as did 17 of the 29 college teachers asked. Just over a third (37%) of school teachers and 11 of 29 college teachers thought livestreamed lessons are not effective.

Figure 23. Effectiveness of livestreamed lessons



Source: School College Panel, March 2022 survey. Q3: Panel A teachers who have delivered livestreamed lessons (n=96).

Languages


The DfE remains committed to improving uptake of the EBacc subjects, especially amongst the most disadvantaged children, and is continuing to drive improvements in access to high-quality language teaching to realise this, as reported in the March 2022 Schools White Paper.³ From 2023, the DfE will establish a network of modern foreign language hubs and introduce more effective continuous professional development courses for language teachers in both primary and secondary schools. The March survey asked schools and colleges:

- What languages were currently being taught
- What languages would schools and colleges be interested in teaching as part of their curriculum
- What proportion of language classes were delivered by specialist language teachers in primary schools.

As shown in Figure 24 below, three-quarters of schools reported that French was being taught, followed by just over a third (37%) who taught Spanish. Just under one-in-ten schools (9%) taught German. Amongst colleges, the same three languages were the most widely taught, with 17 of 24 colleges teaching French, 15 teaching Spanish, and 9 teaching German language classes.

³ [Opportunity for all: strong schools with great teachers for your child - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/opportunity-for-all-strong-schools-with-great-teachers-for-your-child)

Figure 24. Languages currently taught at school



Source: School College Panel, March 2022 survey. A1: Panel A leaders (n=500). *Indicates a significantly higher figure between Primary and Secondary schools. Only languages selected by at least 1% are shown.


Secondary schools were more likely to deliver each of the languages shown in Figure 24 compared to primaries, with the exception of Urdu and Japanese which were taught by very few schools. Seven percent of primaries did not teach any languages, compared to 1% of secondary schools. French was more likely to be taught amongst schools with the lowest proportion of pupils eligible for FSM compared to the highest (83% vs. 63%). The reverse is true for Spanish which was taught by 47% of schools with the highest proportion of FSM pupils vs. 25% amongst schools with the lowest proportion.

There were some regional differences as well, with schools in London and the North West less likely to teach French (63% and 60% respectively vs. the overall average of 75%) but more likely to teach Spanish (54% and 55% respectively vs. the overall average of 37%). Schools in London were more likely to teach Latin (14% vs. 4% of schools nationally).

Schools and colleges were also asked if they would be interested in teaching any languages that they do not currently deliver as part of their curriculum. Half of schools and 12 of the 24 colleges said they would not be interested in this. As shown in Figure 25, primary schools were more likely to say that they were not interested compared with secondaries (52% vs. 35% of secondaries).

Spanish was selected by 13% of schools, with 8% selecting Mandarin. In colleges, Italian and Mandarin were selected by four out of the 24 colleges.

Figure 25. Which languages that are not currently taught at their schools, would schools be interested in teaching




Source: School College Panel, March 2022 survey. A2: Panel A leaders (n=500). * Indicates a significantly higher difference between Primary and Secondary schools. Only languages selected by at least 4% are shown.

In terms of subgroup differences, secondary schools were more interested in teaching Italian than primary schools (8% vs. 3%).

Primary schools were asked what proportion of languages classes were taught by a specialist language teacher. This was defined as someone with a relevant post-A level qualification. One-in-five primary schools had all or most of their language classes delivered by a specialist. No classes were being delivered by a specialist in just over half (53%) of primary schools. Around a quarter (24%) reported that some of their classes are taught by a specialist.

Figure 26. The proportion of language classes in primary schools delivered by a specialist



Source: School College Panel, March 2022 survey. A3: Panel A primary leaders (n=294).

A third of primary schools with an Outstanding Ofsted inspection grade reported most or all of their language classes were taught by a specialist, higher than the national average of 20%. Regionally, schools in the North West reported a higher proportion of some or all classes taught by specialists than the national average (40% vs. 20%).

Wraparound childcare


This section looks at the wraparound childcare offer (before and after-school clubs) provided by primary schools including changes in this provision following the lifting of Covid-19 restrictions. The findings from this survey help to support the Government's objective of ensuring schools can deliver face-to-face, high quality childcare options for parents and carers outside of normal school hours. The data reported helps build a national childcare sufficiency picture and an evidence base for policy decisions on how to ensure affordable, flexible, and high-quality childcare for families.

Extent of wraparound provision in primary schools

Four-fifths (80%) of primary schools indicated that they offered supervised wraparound childcare in March 2022. This is an increase from December 2021 (in which Plan B measures were in place, including advice to work from home) when 71% said they offered it, and similar to the 77% who offered wraparound childcare in the autumn term of 2020.

Of the primary schools offering wraparound childcare, 80% offered both before and after school childcare, 19% offered it before school only and just 1% offered it after school only. Figure 27 presents the figures for all primary schools (not just those offering wraparound childcare). This shows that overall, more primary schools are offering provision before school only (15%) than they were in December 2021 (5%).

Figure 27. Whether primary schools offered childcare before or after school, or both



Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey M1: Panel A primary schools (n=294).
 School and College Panel, December 2021 survey M1/M2: Panel A primary schools (n=395).
 School and College Panel, Late January 2021 survey A3/A5: Primary schools (n=453).


Two-thirds (67%) of primary schools offering wraparound childcare said their provision was included as part of the school's own Ofsted registration, whilst one-fifth (20%) said it was registered on Ofsted's General Childcare Register; the remaining 14% did not know.

Non-academy primary schools were significantly more likely to say the childcare was registered on Ofsted's General Childcare Register (24%) than academy primary schools (13%). There were variations according to the proportion of FSM-eligible pupils. Among schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils 57% reported the childcare was included as part of the school's registration and 34% said the childcare was registered on Ofsted's General Childcare Register. Schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were much more likely to report that the childcare included in the school's registration (83%) and only 9% said the childcare was registered with Ofsted separately.

Reasons for non-provision

As shown in Figure 28, among the 57 primary schools that did not offer supervised childcare, the top three reasons were reported to be insufficient demand from parents (42%), not being financially viable for the school (41%) or that provision was provided off-site (37%).

Figure 28. Reasons for not providing supervised wraparound childcare




Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey M2: Panel A primary schools that do not offer wraparound childcare (n=57). For an explanation of 'spontaneous', see the 'Interpreting the findings' chapter

Changes in demand

Just over half of primary schools that offered wraparound provision reported that demand for before or after school childcare had stayed stable over the last six weeks (56% for before school and 54% for after school). Around a third reported that demand had increased recently: 31% for before school childcare, and 34% for after school childcare. Only a minority thought demand had decreased (8% for before school and 6% for after school childcare).

Figure 29 also presents the findings from December 2021 when over a quarter said demand for childcare before or after school had increased – compared to the situation before the COVID-19 pandemic.

Figure 29. Changes in demand for wraparound childcare



Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey M3/M4: Panel A primary schools that offer wraparound childcare before school (n=234) and after school (n=193).

School and College Panel, December 2021 survey M3/M4: Panel A primary schools that offer wraparound childcare before school (n=276) and after school (n=260).

Tax Free Childcare payments

Tax Free Childcare (TFC) is a Government scheme that pays 20% of childcare costs (up to a maximum of £2,000 each year) for working parents who are not receiving support through Universal Credit or Tax Credits. Amongst primary school leaders who were asked whether their school was able to receive Tax Free Childcare payments from parents, 45% reported that they did not know and 41% reported that they were able to receive them (made up of 33% who reported their school was able to receive them and 8% who reported that their schools' childcare provider was able to). One-in-seven primary school leaders (14%) reported they were not able to receive TFC payments.

Schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were significantly less likely to say they or their provider could receive TFC payments (20% said so, as compared with 50% of schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils).

The schools who said they were not able to receive TFC payments were asked why. These results should be treated as indicative only as they are based on only 33 respondents. The main reason given was that they did not understand what is required of the school to receive TFC payments (15 schools). Fewer gave other reasons: three said the school's Ofsted registration means that they are not able to receive TFC payments, three said the childcare they provide is free, one said the school's online payment service is not compatible with TFC payments, and one said they had never heard of TFC before. Eight said they did not know.

Breakfast club provision

It is important for pupils to start the day with a nutritious breakfast as evidence shows that providing healthy school breakfast at the start of the school day can contribute to improved readiness to learn, increased concentration, and improved wellbeing and behaviour. Through its contractor, Family Action, DfE enables eligible schools to apply for support for breakfast provision, with support targeted towards schools in disadvantaged areas. This section explores the current landscape of school breakfast provision.


Three-quarters (75%) of schools ran breakfast club provision for pupils, with primary schools more likely than secondary schools (78% vs. 57%) to run this.

Breakfast providers

Schools were also asked how they funded their breakfast provision. As shown in Figure 30, approaches varied between primary and secondary schools that were running breakfast provision. Primary schools were much more likely than secondary schools to use parents/carers payments (80% vs. 13%), making it the most commonly used source of funding by a considerable margin. On the other hand, secondary schools were more

likely than primary schools to use pupil premium funding (44% vs. 29%), other school funding (30% vs. 16%), or the DfE's National School Breakfast Programme (14% vs. 3%).

Figure 30: How schools run their breakfast provision



Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey D1a: Panel B primary and secondary leaders that offer breakfast club (n=381). *Indicates significantly higher figure between primary and secondary schools. For an explanation of 'spontaneous', see the 'Interpreting the findings' chapter

There was some variation in funding sources by the proportion of FSM-eligible pupils. Schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were significantly more likely than schools with the lowest proportion to use pupil premium funding (41% vs. 7%), or Magic Breakfast (12% vs. 0%), and less likely to use parents/carers payments (58% vs. 81%).


Breakfast provision free to pupils

As shown in Figure 31, almost two-thirds (62%) of schools offering breakfast provision provided this for free to some or all pupils – 50% free to some pupils and 12% free to all pupils. Around a third (35%) said it was not offered free to any pupils, and the remaining 3% said they did not know.

Secondary schools that were offering a breakfast club were much more likely to offer the provision to all pupils for free than in primary schools providing a breakfast club (46% vs. 8%). Conversely, primary schools with provision were more likely to say it was not free to any pupils (39%) than were secondary schools with provision (6%).

Secondary MATs were more likely to offer breakfast provision free to all pupils (54%) than secondary non-MATs (24%).

Figure 31. Breakfast provision free to pupils




Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey D3: Panel B primary and secondary leaders that offer breakfast club (n=381). *Indicates significantly higher figure between primary and secondary schools.

Schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were significantly more likely than those with the lowest proportion, to offer free breakfast provision to some or all pupils (77% compared to 34%) or to all pupils (25% compared to 1%).

Schools which provided free breakfasts to some, but not all, pupils, were asked to which groups these were provided. The top answer was to pupils identified as vulnerable (74%), followed by those pupils who meet the pupil premium eligibility criteria (58%) and FSM-eligible pupils (47%). As Figure 32 shows, primary schools were most likely to say free breakfasts were offered to pupils they had identified as vulnerable (77%), whilst secondary schools were most likely to say free breakfasts were offered to pupils identified as FSM-eligible (66%).

Figure 32. Which groups were provided free breakfasts



Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey D4: Panel B primary and secondary leaders that offer breakfast club, and provide free breakfasts to some (but not all) pupils (n=187).

*Indicates significantly higher figure between primary and secondary schools.

Climate change


Primary and secondary school teachers, as well as college teachers, were asked about teaching on climate change within the current academic year.

Two-fifths (41%) of school teachers had personally taught content that included climate change in the current academic year; 58% said they had not and 1% did not know. A third (33%) of college teachers said they had personally taught on climate change this academic year.

Among school teachers, 92% who had already taught on climate change this academic year felt confident doing so (40% very confident and 52% fairly confident), whereas only 68% of those who had not taught on the subject this year would feel confident (12% very confident and 57% fairly confident). Among college teachers, 24 of the 26 who had taught on the subject this year felt confident, whilst 76% of those who had not taught on it would feel confident.

There were differences between primary and secondary teachers as to the degree of confidence in the subject. Among those with experience of teaching on climate change, secondary teachers were significantly more likely than primary teachers to say they felt 'very confident' (56% compared to 25%) whereas among those who had not taught on climate change recently, primary teachers were more likely to state that they were confident in doing so (74%) than secondary teachers (62%).

Figure 33: Degree of confidence to teach content that includes climate change




Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey N2: Panel A primary teachers taught on climate change (n=154), secondary teachers taught on climate change (n=131), primary teachers NOT taught on climate change (n=227), secondary teachers NOT taught on climate change (n=179), *Indicates significantly higher figure between primary and secondary teachers. “Not sure” figures are not shown.

Only 7% of school teachers and 8% of college teachers said they had received any training on teaching about climate change. The proportion was significantly higher among secondary teachers (9%) than among primary teachers (4%).

Climate change teaching in primary schools

The primary teachers that had taught about climate change during this academic year were more likely to have taught it at Key Stage 2 than at Key Stage 1, as Figure 34 shows. Over two-thirds (69%) had taught it at KS2 and 28% had taught it at KS1. The subject was most commonly taught in Year 4 (29%), Year 5 (27%) and Year 6 (27%).

Figure 34. Which primary year group(s) have been taught content about climate change this academic year




Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey N4: Panel A primary teachers that have taught climate change, in this academic year (n=154)

Summer Provision

School and college leaders were asked whether they were planning to offer any summer provision for pupils in 2022. Summer provision was defined as extra-curricular activities or additional lessons offered during the summer holidays.

Almost a fifth of schools (18%) said that they were planning to offer summer provision this year, with 1% planning to do so for the first time. 62% of all schools said they had no plans to offer summer provision. Almost a fifth (19%) were unsure at the time of asking. Almost half (11) of the 24 colleges interviewed had no plans for summer provision. A quarter (six) colleges were not sure yet, with seven planning to offer summer provision. Of these seven, all said that they had offered this before.

Figure 35. Whether school plans to offer any form of summer provision to pupils this year



Source: School College Panel, March 2022 survey. P1: Panel B Leaders (n=552). *indicates significant statistical difference between primary and secondary schools.

As shown in Figure 35, secondary schools were significantly more likely to be planning to offer summer provision to their pupils (39% compared to 14% of primaries). A significant portion of secondary schools (31%) also said they were unsure.


Schools in the North West were significantly more likely to be planning to offer summer provision and had done so before (28% vs. 17% of all schools).

Schools that said they were planning to offer summer provision were asked whether it would be virtual, or in-person. None of those surveyed planned to offer solely virtual provision. The vast majority planned to offer in-person provision (96%).

Of the seven colleges planning to offer summer provision, four said it would be in-person. Two planned to offer a mixture of virtual and in-person provision, with one opting for solely virtual provision.

Schools planning to offer summer provision were also asked the types of provision they were planning on offering, from a prompted list. Schools were able to select more than one type of provision. As shown in Figure 36, the majority of schools said that their provision would focus on sports-based activities (86%), with all primary schools offering summer provision planning to offer this type of activity and six-in-ten (59%) of secondaries doing the same. Most commonly, colleges planned on offering academic and transition-focussed activities as part of their summer provision (6 for each). Three colleges each said they planned to offer vocational-focussed activities, wellbeing / enrichment activities, and sports-based activities.

Figure 36. Types of summer provision schools are planning to offer



Source: School College Panel, March 2022 survey. P3: Panel B Leaders planning to offer summer provision (n=134). *indicates significant statistical difference between primary and secondary schools. For an explanation of 'spontaneous', see the 'Interpreting the findings' chapter


When answering about transition-focussed activities, leaders were prompted to think about Year 7 and sixth form inductions. Secondary schools were significantly more likely than primary schools to plan to offer this type of provision (94% vs. 2%). Secondaries were also more likely to be offering academic-focussed activities (41% vs. 13%).

Spontaneously, 3% of schools said they were planning to offer the Holiday Activity and Food (HAF) programme – which provides funding for the 152 upper tier local authorities to coordinate and provide free holiday provision including healthy food and enriching activities - as part of their summer provision.⁴

⁴ [Holiday activities and food programme 2022 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/holiday-activities-and-food-programme-2022)

Schools were also asked what cohort or cohorts of pupils, if any, their summer provision plans were tailored towards, with 'tailored' provision described as provision that is specifically aimed at a cohort. As shown in Figure 37, most (64%) said their plans were tailored towards disadvantaged pupils, though almost a quarter (23%) spontaneously said they did not plan to tailor it to any specific cohort. All seven colleges said that pupils previously identified as needing further support would be targeted, with six tailoring it towards transition years and five for examination years.

Figure 37. Cohorts of pupils that summer provision will be tailored to




Source: School College Panel, March 2022 survey. P4: Panel B Leaders planning to offer summer provision (n=134). *indicates significant statistical difference between primary and secondary schools.

Schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were significantly more likely to tailor their provision to disadvantaged pupils (84% vs. 64% overall).

Nearly a third of schools planning to offer summer provision (29%) said pupils would be provided with between 1 and 5 days. A similar proportion (30%) said they did not know the number of days that would be provided. On average, colleges said they would

provide pupils with a median of five days of summer provision. Two colleges answered that they were unsure how many days would be provided.

Figure 38. How many days of summer provision will be provided to a pupil on average




Source: School College Panel, March 2022 survey. P5: Panel B Leaders planning to offer summer provision (n=134). *indicates significantly higher figure between primary and secondary schools.

As shown in Figure 38, the median number of summer provision days primary schools planned to offer (10 days) was twice that of secondary schools (5 days) and was often over 15 days (20% among primary schools; no secondaries planned summer provision of this duration). Quite a large proportion of primary schools did not yet know the number of days they would be offering (35% vs. 19% among secondaries).

Schools were asked whether parents/carers would be expected to make any contribution towards the cost of their summer provision. As shown in Figure 39, over half of schools (55%) expected a parental contribution, with this far more common among primary schools (75% vs. 18% for secondary schools). None of the seven colleges said that parents and carers would be expected to make any contribution towards the cost of their summer provision, with one of these saying they were unsure.

Figure 39. Whether parents/carers whose child is attending summer provision will be expected to contribute



Source: School College Panel, March 2022 survey. P6: Panel B Leaders planning to offer summer provision (n=134). *indicates significant statistical difference between primary and secondary schools.

Schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were significantly more likely to say that they would not expect contributions from parents and carers (53% vs. 36% overall).

Face Coverings

DfE guidance recommending face coverings be worn in classrooms where pupils and learners of secondary age and above are educated was removed on January 20th 2022, and in communal areas a week later, following a temporary reintroduction. Local Directors of Public Health were still able to recommend their use in communal areas.

Just over one-in-ten (12%) secondary teachers said their school had asked pupils to wear a mask, either in class or communal school areas, in the past two weeks. Sixteen per cent of college teachers said students had been asked to wear a face covering in class or communal college areas in the same time period.


Secondary and college teachers who reported that pupils / students had been asked to wear face coverings, were asked how often pupils / students were wearing them when they should, and how often they were wearing them correctly (i.e. covering the nose and mouth).

As shown in Figure 40, three-quarters (76%) of secondary teachers said that students wore their face coverings almost all (24%) or most (51%) of the time when they should. The proportion of those reporting that pupils wore face coverings at least most of the time was lower than when this question was asked in April 2021 (76% vs. 88% in April)⁵. Seven-in-ten (68%) said pupils were wearing face coverings correctly almost all (16%) or most (51%) of the time.

Of the 13 college teachers that said students had been asked to wear face coverings, one reported they had worn face coverings when they should almost always and five reported they had worn them most of the time when they should. The remaining seven college teachers reported that students had worn them occasionally. One reported that students almost always wore their face coverings correctly. Five reported they wore them correctly most of the time and seven reported that students wore them correctly occasionally.

⁵ This is directionally rather than significantly lower than in April 2021.

Figure 40. Whether pupils wear face coverings when they should and whether they wear them correctly




Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. U2: Panel A secondary teachers whose school asked pupils to wear a mask (n=37). * Indicates a significantly higher figure between the April 2021 wave and the current survey.

Secondary teachers were asked the extent to which face coverings can affect pupils in different ways. As shown in Figure 41, almost three-quarters of secondary teachers (73%) reported that masks helped pupils feel safer at school at least to some extent. However, two-thirds (66%) said face coverings made it more difficult for pupils to communicate with each other to some extent and around half (49%) felt that wearing face coverings made it more difficult for pupils to learn to at least some extent. In comparison, fewer secondary teachers reported that masks made pupils' behaviour in class more disruptive (39% reported they did to some extent) or made pupils feel more anxious (32% reported they did to some extent).

For colleges, around two-thirds (65%) said face coverings helped students to feel safer at school to some extent. Three-quarters (75%) said wearing face coverings made it difficult for students to communicate with others to at least some extent and 60% felt it made it more difficult for students to learn to at least some extent. Around four-in-ten (38%) said it made students feel anxious and around a third (34%) reported that it made behaviour more disruptive.

Figure 41. Extent to which face coverings can affect pupils in different ways



Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. U3: Panel A secondary teachers (n=310).

Secondary teachers from urban schools were more likely than those from rural schools to report that wearing face coverings did not make learning difficult (26% vs. 13% of rural schools). Those with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were also more likely to report this compared to those with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils (26% vs. 5%).


Secondary teachers from schools with a 'Requires Improvement' Ofsted rating were more likely than those with an 'Outstanding' rating to report that face coverings made pupils' behaviour more disruptive to at least some extent (48% vs. 24% of 'Outstanding' schools).

Similar questions were also asked of secondary and college teachers but specifically about SEND pupils. Three-quarters (75%) of secondary teachers who teach SEND pupils who wear masks reported that wearing face coverings made it more difficult for SEND pupils to communicate with others to at least some extent. Teachers also reported that

wearing face coverings made it more difficult for SEND pupils to learn (65%) and made them feel anxious (59%) at least to at least some extent.

Over three-quarters (78%) of college teachers who taught SEND students that wore masks, reported that wearing face coverings made it more difficult for them to communicate with others to at least some extent. Around two-thirds (64%) of college teachers said it made it more difficult for SEND students to learn and 56% said it made SEND students anxious to at least some extent.

Figure 42. Extent to which face coverings influence communication, learning and anxiety among SEND pupils who wear masks



Source: School and College Panel, March 2022 survey. U4: Panel A secondary teachers who teach SEND pupils who wear masks (n=278).

Support in Further Education

In March 2022, college leaders were asked two open-text questions asking what support would be best for DfE to provide at the moment and what the main challenges facing colleges in the next couple of months are anticipated to be. There was a lot of overlap between the two questions, with many colleges wanting support now for issues they thought were going to be a challenge in the near future.

Support DfE can provide

More or increased funding was the most common type of support listed, with some simply responding “more funding” and others providing details of what the funding is needed for. There were calls for both general funding, and funding specifically for employing/retaining more staff (including specialist staff).

“By funding staff pay increases and additional NI costs. Staff shortages are a real problem.” - *College leader*

“Pay rates for FE staff are at an all-time low. We need to attract more staff to teach in FE. DfE can help by lobbying for funding and by promoting teaching in FE as a career.” - *College leader*

“Providing adequate funding to colleges for the increased heating bills currently being faced alongside the other increased costs being faced.” - *College leader*

Some colleges wanted more to be done to allow more flexibility in the use of funding / change funding structure, or to remove / reduce rules and restrictions regarding eligibility for funding.

“Allow us to spend the money as we see fit - trust that we make good choices for our students. Stop putting ridiculous checks in place and criteria to meet. It makes a challenging job far more difficult.” - *College leader*

“Make the tuition fund flexible, so that we can best decide how to support students, not based on GCSE outcomes, which in some, or indeed many cases do not reflect the ability of the students.” - *College leader*

“More joined work from different teams within the DfE. Capital funding is a good example of this. We have secured funding for a

number of projects via different competitive/bidding rounds. Each has its own rules, different reporting teams, paperwork, reporting requirements. Whilst we are very grateful for the funding there has to be a better way of monitoring and managing capital projects by the DfE rather than each have its individual systems and processes.” - *College leader*

Colleges also wanted DfE to provide support to deal with rising mental health problems amongst staff, as well as students.

“Provide more funding to employ specialist trained staff for long term support. My college has rolled out mental health first aid training to a high number of staff but this is only a first line defence and there needs to be more money put into where those students go next. We have an excellent “well-being” department but their resources are maxed out currently despite their best efforts to support as many students as possible.” - *College leader*

“Ensure staff wellbeing is put at the forefront. If staff are not in a great place then how can they support the learners. Staff are very stressed due to the goings on in the world, the prospect of yet another year with no pay rise, the increased demands due to Ofsted and staff absences.” - *College leader*

“Since the pandemic there has definitely been an increase in mental health concerns within this age group and an increase in anxiety amongst learners. Further support and training in this area could be beneficial.” - *College leader*

Some colleges spoke about the support needed to help deal with the past, present and future effects of COVID-19. A handful mentioned practical measures such as testing, whilst others talked about the additional support some learners need.

“By ensuring that the policy on covid remains fluid, i.e. as cases increase, policies can be reactive and include face coverings being mandatory plus provide free testing to staff and students.” - *College leader*

“By investing more in supporting this cohort of students who have been affected by Covid now. I think this cohort will need support not only in FE or HE or even apprenticeships but also when they get full

time jobs. There has to be some strategy in place to support them for when they move on.” - *College leader*

“Find strategies to help support learners who have been affected by the Covid teaching period. They have gaps in knowledge.” - *College leader*

Challenges facing colleges in coming months

The most mentioned challenge amongst colleges was exams. This was primarily about the challenge of preparing learners, who have not done formal assessments recently, to sit exams. The mental health impact of exams was also frequently referenced.

“Learners sitting formal examinations for the first time in 2 years and the impact this may have on their achievement, but more importantly, their mental health and well-being.” - *College leader*

“Preparing students for exams as many seem to be anxious as they have not sat formal exams before.” - *College leader*

“Students who have never sat formal exams are about to sit A levels, they are extremely anxious. Mental health issues now affect a significant minority of students in every class, anxiety, depression especially. We have many students who work far too many hours, pressure from their parents/ employers make it extremely difficult.” - *College leader*

Outside of exams, colleges spoke of challenges relating to the overall mental health of their students and staff. These concerns were often described in relation to pressures around exams and staff workload and burnout.

“We have had three staff leave (from a team of twelve) since September and have only managed to recruit one replacement (with industry experience but no teaching qualification) since then. The others workload has been distributed across the staff further increasing the likelihood of mental health issues and burning them out too.” - *College leader*

“Mental health among students and teachers. Staff dealing with a great amount of stress regarding all the extra tasks related with admin work or mentoring required by management when there is with

not enough time to do it and be able to keep an outstanding delivery.”
- *College leader*

Many colleges were worried about recruitment and retention of suitable staff.

“Finding enough staff to be able to deliver the required curriculum. Retaining staff, with our inability to meet rising living costs and keep up with the salaries in industry sectors we serve.” - *College leader*

“Recruitment of teaching staff in technical roles is the number one risk on our risk register.” - *College leader*

“Recruitment of high-quality staff, into roles where the wages are poor, hours long and work load is high.” - *College leader*

Colleges still felt that Covid-19 was having an impact and would inform the challenges they faced in coming months. These primarily focused around the discrepancy between achieved grades and students’ abilities, as well as practical challenges regarding isolation and rising case numbers.

“Recovery of lost learning and also the effects of predicted grades for entry on to course where maths and English are major factors. The results given to the students do not correctly reflect their true ability and therefore they are struggling with the core content through ability and prior knowledge. In addition the behaviour and attitude of students returning to full time face-to-face teaching has dramatically declined, so we are finding we are spending more time dealing with a lot more issues than during 'normal' times.” - *College leader*

“With the financial pressure of Covid and having to ensure that staff and students had IT equipment at home. The college has not been able to update and increase the amount of equipment on the college site itself. This has had an impact on the quality of education we can provide as often rooms do not have enough IT equipment for learners to work. This has a big impact on the support that students can be given.” - *College leader*

“Uncertainty for teachers and learners as the rules change further on self-isolation with covid and the continual spread of the disease, specifically in contained spaces where ventilation is not always easy.”
- *College leader*

“The increase in cases of COVID-19 is having an impact on classes. Mask wearing proved to have a positive impact on numbers removing these numbers are on the rise again. Testing should be kept in schools and colleges as should the isolation periods for positive cases.” - *College leader*

Other challenges highlighted by a smaller proportion of colleges included behavioural issues, student attendance and staff workloads.



© Department for Education 2022

Reference: RR1240

ISBN: 978-1-83870-389-9

For any enquiries regarding this publication, contact us at:

omnibus.surveys@education.gov.uk or www.education.gov.uk/contactus

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