



# **School and College Panel – June 2022**

**Research report**

**November 2022**

**Authors: IFF Research**



**Government  
Social Research**

# Contents

List of figures	4
Executive Summary	7
A note on the reporting	7
Summer childcare provision	7
Extra-curricular activities	8
Remote education	8
Relationship, Sex and Health Education (RSHE)	8
Money management	9
Physical Education (PE)	9
Music education	9
Film and music streaming licences	10
School Food Standards (SFS)	10
Parent Pledge	11
Pupil mental health	12
Post-16 programmes	12
Careers information and advice	13
National Centre for Computing Education (NCCE)	13
Levelling Up Premium (LUP)	14
Teaching School Hubs (TSH)	14
Workload	15
Staff absence and vaccinations	15
Introduction	16
Methodology	16
Weighting	17
School-level weighting	17
Individual-level weighting	17
Panel A/B weighting approach	18
Interpreting the findings	19
Summer childcare provision	21

Extra-curricular activities	24
Remote education	26
Reasons for not offering remote education	27
Forms of remote education teachers find to be most effective	28
Barriers to remote education working effectively	30
Relationship, Sex and Health Education (RSHE)	32
Money management	35
Physical Education (PE)	37
Music education	40
Film and music streaming licences	45
School Food Standards	48
Parent Pledge	52
Assessments in English and maths	52
Targeted academic support	54
Informing parents and carers of progress	58
Pupil mental health	62
Post-16 programmes	65
Careers information and advice	69
National Centre for Computing Education (NCCE)	72
Levelling Up Premium	75
Teaching School Hubs	78
Programmes and services accessed through locals TSHs	80
Reasons for not accessing programmes and services on offer	81
Workload	83
Staff absence and vaccinations	88
Staff absence	88
Vaccines	89

## List of figures

Figure 1. Activities/childcare offered at primary schools over the summer .....	21
Figure 2. Who leaders anticipate will run majority of summer provision .....	22
Figure 3. Types of activities schools have been able to offer this academic year .....	24
Figure 4. Proportion of schools planning to use remote education next year.....	26
Figure 5. Situations in which schools would use remote education .....	27
Figure 6. Reasons schools are not planning to offer remote education .....	28
Figure 7. Effectiveness of different forms of remote learning.....	29
Figure 8. Barriers to remote education working effectively (prompted list).....	30
Figure 9. Whether personally teaches Relationships, Sex and Health Education.....	32
Figure 10. Methods used to differentiate RSHE teaching for pupils with SEND .....	34
Figure 11. Reasons for not teaching money management in schools .....	36
Figure 12. Primary teachers' confidence in teaching aspects of PE lessons to KS1 .....	38
Figure 13. Primary teachers' confidence in teaching aspects of PE lessons to KS2 .....	39
Figure 14. Activities related to music education offered in the past year .....	40
Figure 15. Format singing lessons are offered in, by phase .....	42
Figure 16. Format musical instrument lessons are offered in, by phase .....	43
Figure 17. Whether schools provide musical choirs/bands/orchestras .....	44
Figure 18. How leaders rate their confidence in their knowledge of what copyrighted materials schools are currently permitted to use.....	45
Figure 19. How interested would schools be in being able to stream and record/share films and music digitally .....	46
Figure 20. How schools would prefer film and music licences to be purchased .....	47
Figure 21. Whether school has a School Food Policy .....	48
Figure 22. Providers of lunchtime catering.....	49

Figure 23. Providers of catering outside of lunchtimes .....	50
Figure 24. School approach to ensuring it complies with School Food Standards.....	51
Figure 25. Awareness of the ‘Parent Pledge’ .....	52
Figure 26. How often pupils are assessed in English and maths.....	53
Figure 27. Methods used to assess pupil attainment in English/math.....	54
Figure 28. What proportion of pupils who need targeted academic support receive it (as reported by schools) .....	55
Figure 29. What proportion of pupils who need targeted academic support receive it (as reported by teachers).....	56
Figure 30. Support provided for pupils behind in English (as reported by schools) .....	57
Figure 31. Support provided for pupils who are behind in English and maths (as reported by teachers).....	58
Figure 32. How schools keep parents/carers informed of progress in English.....	60
Figure 33. How schools keep parents/carers informed of progress in maths.....	61
Figure 34. Teachers’ agreement with statements regarding pupil mental health .....	63
Figure 35. Proportion of KS4/5 teachers aware of post-16 programmes .....	66
Figure 36. Teachers’ awareness and knowledge of post-16 programmes.....	67
Figure 37. Proportion of pupils that teachers would encourage to do post-16 programmes .....	68
Figure 38. Who schools have invited to speak to pupils about the qualifications or training they offer.....	70
Figure 39. How much leaders know about the NCCE.....	72
Figure 40. Whether schools have used any resources, training or support provided by the NCCE.....	73
Figure 41. Reasons why schools have not used any resources, training or support provided by NCCE .....	74
Figure 42. How familiar teachers and leaders are with the Levelling Up Premium .....	75

Figure 43. How leaders and teachers found out about the Levelling Up Premium .....	76
Figure 44. Programmes and services used by local Teaching School Hub, as reported by leaders and teachers (prompted list) .....	79
Figure 45. Proportion of leaders and teachers accessing services offered by local TSH	80
Figure 46. Reasons for not accessing programmes offered by local TSH .....	81
Figure 47. Actions taken by schools to reduce workload in the last 12 months (reported by school leaders).....	84
Figure 48. Actions taken by schools to reduce workload in the last 12 months (reported by teachers).....	86
Figure 49. Staff absence levels compared to before the pandemic .....	88

# Executive Summary

This report presents findings from the June 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.

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.

## Summer childcare provision

Over half (56%) of primary schools did not have plans to offer childcare provision over the summer. Over a third (36%) said they had plans, and the remaining 8% were unsure at the time of the survey in June.

Schools planning to offer childcare provision were asked who they anticipated would run the majority of this provision. Just over a third (34%) of these schools planned to use school staff to run the provision. The majority (59%) planned to use a private provider. Among schools using private provision, around three-fifths (61%) said that the provider is Ofsted-registered. Just over one-in-ten (11%) said they are not, with just under three-in-ten (28%) unsure.

Four-in-ten (40%) schools offering provision said they would accept government funded support for childcare costs, though a further 40% were unsure if they would.

## Extra-curricular activities

Schools were asked to indicate, from a pre-set list, which extra-curricular activities their school had been able to offer this academic year. From the 40 activities listed, schools reported offering a median of 10 activities, a large increase since June 2021 (3 activities) when this question was last asked. The vast majority of schools had offered sports and physical activities (98% vs 72% in June 2021) and nine-in-ten had offered performing arts (90% vs. 39% in June 2021). Three-quarters of schools had offered hobby and interest clubs (75% vs. 31% in June 2021), with around two-thirds (67%) having offered creative arts. A minority (5%) had been able to offer uniform groups, such as Scouts or Brownies. Only 1% had been unable to offer any activities this academic year, a considerable decrease from in June 2021 (22%).

## Remote education

Around half (49%) of schools were planning to use remote education next year. Among these schools, the most common reason they would use remote education next year would be if the whole school needed to close to all or most pupils (94%). A quarter (25%) of schools were not planning to use remote education next year, by far the most common reason for this was a perceived lack of demand for remote education (69%).

In terms of the effectiveness of different types of remote education, live lessons were the most highly rated, with three-quarters (75%) of teachers who used them rating them as either fairly or very effective. Secondary teachers were more likely to rate live lessons as effective (78% vs. 72% of primary teachers), whereas primary teachers more commonly rated recorded lessons as effective (73% vs. 64% of secondary teachers).

All teachers with experience of using remote education were asked about the barriers to it working effectively. By far the most commonly reported barriers were pupil motivation and engagement (91%) and availability of technology in pupils' homes (89%). Teachers in schools with the highest proportion of pupils eligible for free school meals (FSM) were particularly likely to report availability of technology in pupils' homes as a barrier (94% vs. 89% overall).

## Relationship, Sex and Health Education (RSHE)

Over six-in-ten (62%) teachers were teaching RSHE, with primary teachers more likely to be doing so than secondary teachers (74% vs. 49%). Of these RSHE teachers, nearly all (95%) taught to pupils with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND).

Among those teaching RSHE to pupils with SEND, over half (57%) said they differentiate their teaching for these pupils. Scaffolded lessons were the most popular method of

differentiation (72%), with over half also using adjusted seating arrangements (56%), frequent praise for small steps (55%), and small group teaching (51%).

## Money management

Half of schools (50%) taught money management to pupils this academic year, with significantly more secondary schools (69%) reporting this than primary schools (46%). Reasons for having no plans to teach money management included there being a lack of time in the curriculum (46%), that it wasn't part of the curriculum (43%) and that they don't have time to plan/arrange it (36%). Primary schools spontaneously reported that the age of their children was too young to justify teaching them money management (17%).

## Physical Education (PE)

Primary teachers that taught PE were asked how confident they felt teaching different PE skills. Different skills were asked about for KS1 or KS2 teachers, but both were asked about swimming and water safety skills and confidence to participate in physical activities.

Enjoyment of being physically active (93%) and fundamental movement skills (91%) were the aspects that teachers felt most confident teaching at KS1. Meanwhile, running, jumping, throwing and catching (93%), and having the confidence to participate in physical activities (91%) were aspects that teachers felt most confident teaching at KS2. At both KS1 and KS2 teachers reported having the least confidence in teaching performance of dances (72% confident at KS1 and 63% at KS2) and supporting lessons that teach swimming and water safety skills (34% confident at KS1 and 52% confident at KS2).<sup>1</sup>

## Music education

More than eight-in-ten schools offered musical instrument (89%) and singing lessons (85%), while less common activities included a termly school performance (54%) and the opportunity to watch a live performance off-site (58%).

Schools that provided singing lessons most commonly provided these on a whole class basis (74%), while musical instrument lessons were likely to be provided on a one-to-one basis (62%) or small group basis (57%).

---

<sup>1</sup> KS1 teachers were asked about "Performance of simple dances", whereas KS2 were asked about "Dances using a range of movement patterns"

In relation to group musical activities in schools that provided musical instrument or singing lessons, pupils were more likely to be able to join a choir (80%) than a band (39%) or orchestra (25%). Furthermore, secondary schools were more likely to provide all of these activities than primary schools (choir: 88% vs. 78%, band: 84% vs. 30%, orchestra: 62% vs. 17%).

## Film and music streaming licences

Just under a quarter (23%) of school leaders said they were confident in their knowledge of what copyrighted materials schools are currently permitted to use, as part of the Department for Education (DfE) central copyright scheme. In contrast, three-quarters (73%) were not confident, with one-in-three (34%) reporting that they were not confident at all.

Schools were asked how interested they would be in being able to stream and record/share films digitally, i.e., for film clubs. Over eight-in-ten (84%) were interested, with 47% very interested in this. Just over one-in-ten (12%) schools were not interested.

Similarly, schools were asked about their interest in streaming and recording/sharing music digitally e.g., for school websites and as part of school productions. More schools expressed an interest in music compared to films, with over nine-in-ten (93%) interested in this and over six-in-ten very interested (63%). Four percent were not interested in this proposal.

Schools were then asked to choose from two proposals as to how these licences should be purchased. Around half of schools (49%) would prefer that the Department for Education buys a film streaming license centrally. In contrast, around three-in-ten (29%) preferred that schools decide for themselves whether to purchase a license. Around a quarter (23%) were unsure.

A similar question was asked about music licences. In line with film streaming, just under half (47%) of schools would prefer that the Department for Education buys a music streaming license centrally. Around a third (32%) want schools decide for themselves whether to purchase a license. Around one-in-five (21%) were not sure.

## School Food Standards (SFS)

Just under a third (31%) of schools said that they had a School Food Policy, whereas nearly half of schools (47%) did not have a policy, comprising of 17% who were currently developing one and 30% who were not currently developing a policy. A further fifth (22%) said they were unsure.

Schools were asked who is principally responsible for their food provision. At lunchtimes, private contractors appointed by the school were the most common provision (37%). Outside of lunch, in-house provision was the most common (28%).

The most common approaches used by schools to ensure compliance with School Food Standards was to agree this within catering contracts (69%), followed by annual assurance from caterers/the local authority (42%). A minority (4%) said they were not using any of the listed approaches to comply.

## Parent Pledge

All leaders, primary teachers and secondary teachers of English or maths were asked if they had heard of the Parent Pledge. Over a third (37%) had heard of the pledge before, including 13% who had only heard the name and nothing else. Awareness was higher among leaders (57% had heard of the pledge vs. 30% of teachers).

All schools were asked, on average, how often pupils were assessed for attainment in English and maths (aside from statutory assessments such as Key Stage 2 tests and formal qualification exams such as GCSEs). The vast majority of schools tested attainment in English and maths at least once a term (97% and 98% respectively). The type of assessment used varied by phase. Almost all secondary schools (99%) used assessments designed at a department or school level, compared with 51% of primary schools. Primary schools on the other hand were much more likely than secondary schools to use classroom observation (91% vs. 47%) and commercially-produced assessments (87% vs. 53%).

A third (33%) of schools reported that all, or nearly all, pupils who required targeted academic support in English received it, and 29% reported that all/ nearly all pupils requiring academic support in maths received it. Just under a quarter of teachers reported that all/nearly all pupils they teach who required targeted academic support received it in English (23%) or maths (23%).

The most common type of targeted academic support provided was teaching assistant support, both for pupils who need support in English (92% of schools) and maths (92% of schools). Specific interventions to support language development and literacy (e.g., phonics) was provided by 88% of schools while 85% provided extra support from teachers.

Parents' evenings were the most common way parents and carers were kept informed of progress in English and Maths (100% of schools for English, 99% for maths), and the majority also used formal end of year reports (93% of schools for English, 92% for maths) for this specific purpose. Other means schools used, that did not involve meetings or calls with parents, included formal end of term reports (27% in English, 30% in maths),

email correspondence (29% and 26% respectively), mobile apps (14% and 12% respectively), and messaging platforms e.g., WhatsApp (9% and 10% respectively).

## Pupil mental health

Three-quarters of teachers agreed that they know how to help pupils with mental health issues access support offered by their school (76%) and that they feel equipped to identify behaviour that may be linked to a mental health issue (75%).

Fewer agreed that they felt equipped to teach pupils in their class who had mental health needs (61%), and less than half agreed that they knew how to help pupils with mental health issues access specialist support outside of school (44%); they had access to mental health professionals if they needed specialist advice about pupils' mental health (40%); and that students were able to access specialist support when needed (37%).

When compared to March 2022, when this question was last asked, there has been a significant increase in those agreeing that they 'feel equipped to identify a behaviour that may be linked to a mental health issue' (75% in June 2022 vs. 67% in March 2022), 'feel equipped to teach children in my class who have mental health needs' (61% vs. 51%), and that they 'know how to help pupils with mental health issues access specialist support outside of school/college'. (44% vs. 38%).

Results on these measures have fluctuated quite widely across the waves that these questions have been asked, and the increase in this wave compared to March 2022 represent results returning to levels seen in December 2021.

## Post-16 programmes

Awareness of post-16 programmes has remained largely consistent since June 2021, with the vast majority of Key Stage 4 and 5 teachers having heard of A Levels (98%) and apprenticeships (98%). Over two-thirds were aware of T Levels (68%) and around a third were aware of traineeships (36%).

Teachers that were aware of the listed post-16 programmes were asked how much they knew about each. Over nine-in-ten (94%) said they knew a lot about A Levels, compared to around a quarter (26%) for apprenticeships, and less than one-in-ten knew a lot about T Levels (6%) and traineeships (5%).

KS4 teachers that were aware of each programme were then asked whether they would encourage their pupils to consider it. At least nine-in-ten said they would encourage all, most or some pupils to consider A Levels (96%) or apprenticeships (90%). Considerably

fewer said they would encourage pupils to consider traineeships (59%) or T Levels (55%).

This was in line with results from July 2021, with the only change being an increase in the proportion who would encourage pupils to consider T Levels (55% vs. 44% in July 2021).

## Careers information and advice

Secondary schools were asked about the providers that they invited to speak to year 8-13 pupils about the qualifications or training they offer. Respondents were asked to select the year groups that the specific providers had spoken to. Universities and Higher Education Institutions (87%), apprenticeships providers (86%), employers (85%), and FE providers (83%) were invited by more than eight-in-ten secondary schools to speak to pupils. Other education providers, such as independent training providers/university technical college/studio schools, were invited to speak to pupils by 56% of secondary schools.

Those in Years 8 or 9 were most likely to receive talks from employers (46%) and talks from Universities and Higher Education Institutions (31%).

In three-quarters of secondary schools, Years 10 or 11 received a talk from employers (76%), apprenticeships providers (74%) and FE providers (73%). Those in Years 12 or 13 were most likely to receive a talk from Universities and Higher Education Institutions (54%).

Secondary teachers were asked how often they discuss career paths and opportunities within the regular lessons that they teach. Around half (48%) of secondary teachers reported discussing these topics in at least some of their lessons (of whom 7% discussed this in most lessons and 41% in some lessons). Approaching half (47%) said they discussed career paths and opportunities in a few lessons. Five percent reported that they never discussed these topics in their lessons.

## National Centre for Computing Education (NCCE)

Just over six-in-ten school leaders (61%) had heard of the NCCE, with 28% knowing at least a bit about it. Five percent said they knew a lot about it. Just under four-in-ten school leaders (38%) had not heard of the NCCE.

A third of schools where the leader was aware of the NCCE (33%) had used resources, training or support provided by them, with a similar proportion saying they had not (35%), and a further three-in-ten (31%) reporting that they did not know.

The most common reason for not using NCCE resources, training or support (among those who knew at least a bit about NCCE) were not knowing enough about it, which was reported by around a quarter (26%), followed by school staff having sufficient expertise to provide high quality computing education (17%).

## Levelling Up Premium (LUP)

As part of the Government's levelling up programme, from Autumn 2022, maths, physics, chemistry, and computing teachers in the first five years of their careers who choose to work in disadvantaged schools, including in Education Investment areas, can claim a Levelling Up Premium (LUP) payment. The LUP payment gives eligible teachers up to £3,000 tax-free annually in the next three academic years up to 2024-25.

Over four-in-ten secondary leaders and teachers (44%) were aware of the LUP. This consisted of three-in-ten (30%) who had heard of the LUP but did not know any details about it, 12% who knew a bit about it and 1% who reported that they knew a lot about the LUP. Half of secondary leaders and teachers (51%) had not heard of the LUP.

Those who were aware of the LUP were asked where they found out about it. One-in-three (33%) had heard of it through a colleague, followed by around a quarter (26%) who found out about it via national and trade media (e.g., newspapers, news website, Schools Week), and a similar number (23%) who had heard of it through social media.

## Teaching School Hubs (TSH)

As of June 2022, around three-quarters (74%) of leaders and 45% of teachers were aware of any programmes or services being delivered by their local Teaching School Hub. Only a minority (3% of leaders and 4% of teachers) reported that none of the listed programmes and services were being delivered, though this was more commonly reported by those in rural schools (7% vs. 3% in urban areas). Just over half (51%) of teachers and 23% of leaders were unsure what programmes were on offer from their local TSH.

Early Careers Framework (ECF) and National Professional Qualifications (NPQs) were the most commonly delivered programmes. Overall, 10% of all leaders and teachers had accessed ECF through a local Teaching School Hub since September 2021, and 9% had accessed NPQs this way.

Just over a third (35%) of leaders and teachers were aware that programmes were being delivered by their local TSH but had not accessed them. Most commonly, this was because the programmes were not relevant to them (49%), although over a quarter (27%) reported they had not accessed any because they did not have the time.

## Workload

School leaders and teachers were asked what actions their school had taken over the past 12 months to reduce workload. Overall, school leaders were much more likely (93%) than teachers (65%) to report that any action had been taken.

The most common action that school leaders reported was reviewing workload related to marking (69%) followed by consulting with staff about potential ways to reduce workload (e.g., staff meetings) (58%), and promoting or further developing existing teacher support schemes and/or wellbeing programmes (54%). The top actions that teachers reported their school having taken were reviewing workload related to marking (39%), consulting with staff about potential ways to reduce workload (29%), and reviewing workload related to data monitoring or the number of 'data drops' (22%).

Compared to the last time this question was asked, in June 2021, there were increases in the proportion of both school leaders and teachers who reported that their school had reviewed workload related to marking (69% vs. 63% of school leaders in June 2021; and 39% compared to 36% of teachers). The proportion reporting that their schools had used the DfE workload reduction toolkit had also increased from June 2021 among both groups, from 16% to 21% among leaders and 1% to 2% among teachers.

## Staff absence and vaccinations

School leaders were asked to compare staff absence to a typical summer before the pandemic. Most schools (71%) reported that staff absence was higher now, secondary schools were more likely to report that staff absence was higher than primary schools (80% of secondary schools vs. 69% of primary schools).

Under half (43%) of schools reported that their school had provided flu vaccines for staff. Those that had provided them were most likely to have done so through a voucher scheme (21%) or through on-site provision from an occupational health provider (16%).

# Introduction

This report presents findings from the June 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 5 to 7 minutes to complete) covered a range of topical issues in education including workloads, childcare provision over the summer and the availability of extra-curricular activities. A total of 1,030 school leaders and 2,313 classroom teachers participated in the June wave. There were no questions put to college respondents in the June wave.

## 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 throughout the 2021/22 academic year. At the time of the June survey, the majority (56%) of school leaders and teachers on the panel 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. However, colleges were not invited to take part in this wave.

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 June wave. 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 mostly seeing a different set of questions. Where two leaders were from the same school, 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 June wave.

The survey was administered online, with fieldwork lasting from 27<sup>th</sup> June to 4<sup>th</sup> July 2022. Respondents received an email invite, two reminder emails and one text reminder (where mobile numbers were provided by respondents).

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

**Table 1. Response rate by key group**

	<b>Primary Leaders</b>	<b>Secondary Leaders</b>	<b>Primary Teachers</b>	<b>Secondary Teachers</b>
Starting sample	2,883	1,893	3,210	3,256
Completed responses	678	352	1,060	1,253
Response rate	<b>24%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>38%</b>

## Weighting

Two types of weighting were applied to school leader data, depending on whether questions were asking for school-level or individual-level answers from these respondents. All school teacher data was weighted to individual-level.

### School-level weighting

At the analysis stage, for questions reported at 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).

Where leader responses are weighted to school-level, these findings are reported as a percentage of 'schools'. Charts showing data weighted to school-level have a 'schools weighting' flag in the top left.

### Individual-level weighting

For the analysis on an individual- rather than school level, the responses from school leaders and classroom teachers were weighted to the full in-scope population of school leaders and teachers. The population data for the individual weighting was taken from the Schools Workforce Census based on November 2020 data (the most current available data).

Where leader data is weighted to individual level, these findings are reported as a percentage of 'leaders'. Charts showing data weighted to individual-level have an 'individual weighting' flag in the top left.

## Panel A/B weighting approach

For the June 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 five weights being created:

- Panel A school-level
- Panel B school-level
- Panel A individual
- Panel B individual
- Combined individual (for the Pupil Pledge and Levelling Up Premium questions which were asked of individuals in both panel A and B to maximise the base size.

## 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 (1,659 in panel A and 1,684 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 1,659 or 1,684) lies within a +/- 3.4% range for panel A and B (i.e., 46.6% - 53.4%). 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 522), we can be 95% confident that for a survey result of 50% the sampling error is +/- 6.1%.

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.

Where averages are reported, the mean average is used as standard, unless otherwise specified.

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).


# Summer childcare provision

This chapter investigates whether primary schools will be offering childcare provision over the summer. It details what forms this might take, who will be principally responsible for running this provision and whether the primary school will accept government funded support for childcare costs (including Tax Free Childcare and childcare vouchers)

## Activities/childcare that will be offered

Just over half of primary schools (56%) had no plans to offer activities or provision over the summer holidays. A third (36%) did have plans and, as shown in Figure 1, childcare (for example, half-day or full-day holiday clubs) was the most common offering (21% of primaries), followed by enrichment activities (16%). Just under one-in-ten (8%) of primary schools were unsure of their plans for summer provision at the time of fieldwork in June.

**Figure 1. Activities/childcare offered at primary schools over the summer**



Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. A1: Panel A Primary Leaders (n=326).  
Responses with less than 1% not charted.

There was no significant difference between the proportion of academies and non-academies offering childcare (21% vs. 20% respectively), however sponsor-led


academies were less likely than other groups to offer childcare provision (6% vs. 21% overall).

Schools with the highest proportion of pupils eligible for FSM were less likely to be offering any form of activities or childcare (21% vs. 36% overall). This difference was especially notable for 'childcare' (7% vs. 21% overall) and 'enrichment activities' (7% vs. 16% overall).

## Responsibility for provision

Schools with plans to provide childcare provision over the summer were asked who they anticipate will run the majority of this provision. As shown in Figure 2, the majority (59%) said it will be principally run by a private provider, with just over a third (34%) expecting to use school staff to run the provision.

**Figure 2. Who leaders anticipate will run majority of summer provision**



Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. A2: Panel A Leaders at schools with summer provision (n=116).

Among schools using private providers to run the majority of their summer provision, the majority (61%) said that the provider would be Ofsted-registered. Just over one-in-ten

(11%) said they would not be, with nearly three-in-ten (28%) unsure of the provider's registration status.

## **Government support for childcare**


The government offers a range of support to families in paying for childcare and activities over the summer, including Tax Free Childcare and childcare vouchers. Four-in-ten schools offering provision over the summer (40%) said that they would accept government funded support for childcare costs, though a further 40% were unsure. Just over a fifth (21%) said they would not accept this type of support.

## Extra-curricular activities

Schools were asked to indicate from a pre-set list which extra-curricular activities they had been able to offer pupils in this academic year. Extra-curricular activities were defined as those that took place outside of curriculum teaching time and as a regular activity, rather than a one-off event such as a school trip.

From the 40 activities listed, schools reported offering a median of 10 activities, a substantial increase since June 2021 (3 activities) when this question was last asked. As shown in Figure 3, the vast majority of schools had offered sports and physical activities (98% vs 72% in June 2021), including team sports (95%), and running and athletics (60%). Nine-in-ten (90% vs. 39% in June 2021) had been able to offer performing arts, including choir (67%) and dance (55%). Three-quarters of schools had offered hobby and interest clubs (75% vs. 31% in June 2021), with around two-thirds (67%) having offered creative arts. A minority (5%) had been able to offer uniform groups, for example Scouts or Brownies. Only 1% had been unable to offer any activities this academic year, a considerable decrease from June 2021 (22%).

**Figure 3. Types of activities schools have been able to offer this academic year**



Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. L1: Panel A Leaders (n=508). \*indicates significant difference between primary and secondary.

Differences between phase were prominent, with secondary schools much more likely to offer a wider range of activities (9.6 activities offered on average by primaries vs. 20.2 activities on average in secondaries). Secondaries offered, on average, a greater number of:

- Sports activities (4.4 vs. 3.4 among primaries, out of 8 activities listed),
- Performing arts (3.5 vs. 2.1, out of 6 activities listed),
- Creative arts (1.8 vs. 0.9, out of 3 activities listed),
- Clubs relating to academic subject (2.6 vs. 0.9, out of 5 activities listed),
- Hobby and interest clubs (3.8 vs. 1.5, out of 10 activities listed),
- Volunteering (4.1 vs. 0.8, out of 6 activities listed).

A minority of schools (2%) were not offering any form of sports and physical activity. Typically, these schools offered a range of other activities instead, such as choir and cookery, although, as noted above, 1% of schools were unable to offer any activities.


## Remote education

At the time of the June survey, current DfE guidance suggested that schools consider providing remote education to pupils in circumstances when in-person attendance either not possible or contrary to government guidance. For example, this could be occasions when:

- school leaders decide that it is not possible for their setting to open safely,
- individual pupils are unable to physically attend their school but are able to continue learning (e.g., pupils with an infectious disease).

Schools were asked if they were planning to use remote education for any reason next year. Around half (49%) indicated they were. As shown in Figure 4 this was more common among secondary schools (58% vs. 47% of primary schools). Primary schools on the other hand were more likely to be unsure whether they would offer it or not (27% vs. 19% of secondary schools). Overall, a quarter (25%) were not planning to use remote education for any reason in the next academic year.

**Figure 4. Proportion of schools planning to use remote education next year**




Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. P1: Panel A leaders (n=508). \*indicates a significant difference between primary and secondary.

Differences could also be seen by FSM-eligibility. Schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were the most likely to be planning to offer remote education in the next academic year (62% vs. 49% overall).

As shown in Figure 5, among schools planning to (or unsure if they would) offer remote education, by far the most common reason for doing so would be if the school needed to close to all or most pupils. Over three-quarters (76%) of schools open to offering remote

education would do so if a pupil is recovering from an operation or physical injury, but is well enough to learn.

**Figure 5. Situations in which schools would use remote education**




Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. P3: Panel A leaders planning on using remote education or unsure if they will (n=384)

## Reasons for not offering remote education

Of the 25% of schools not planning to use remote education in the next academic year, the majority were not planning to do so due to a lack of demand (69%). Around a third (38%) were not planning to offer this because face-to-face attendance may be discouraged as a result, this was a much more common reason among secondary schools (56% vs. 35%). The full list of reasons provided by schools is shown below in Figure 6.

**Figure 6. Reasons schools are not planning to offer remote education**




Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. P2: Panel A leaders not planning on offering remote education (n=124)

## Forms of remote education teachers find to be most effective

Teachers were asked to indicate how effective they found each type of remote education listed. Live lessons were felt to be the most effective, with three-quarters (75%) of teachers who had used these lessons rating them as either fairly or very effective.

On the other hand, recommended reading of books or textbooks was the most poorly rated in terms of effectiveness, with 58% of teachers who used this form of remote learning rating it as either not very or not at all effective.

**Figure 7. Effectiveness of different forms of remote learning**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. P2: Panel A teachers who have used each form of remote education listed (n ranges from 1,005 to 1,069)

Differences were evident by phase, with secondary teachers more likely to find live lessons effective (78% vs. 72% of primary teachers) and also more likely to rate online worksheets and activities as effective (67% vs. 55%).

Primary teachers on the other hand were more likely to rate the following forms of remote education as effective:


- recorded video lessons (73% vs. 64% of secondary teachers),
- recommended reading of online resources (44% v. 38%),
- recommended reading of books and textbooks (46% vs. 32%).

Teachers were also asked an open-response question to uncover if there were any other forms of remote education that they consider to be effective. The majority (64%) did not feel there were any further effective forms of remote education. Amongst those giving a response, the most commonly cited effective forms of remote education were other recorded lessons, interactive digital learning platforms such as Kerboodle, Bedrock or Seesaw, or online organisational learning platforms such as Google classroom.

## Barriers to remote education working effectively

All teachers with experience of using remote education were asked about the barriers to this working effectively. By far the most commonly reported barriers were pupil motivation and engagement (91%) and availability of technology in pupils' homes (89%).

**Figure 8. Barriers to remote education working effectively (prompted list)**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. P2: Panel A teachers who have used remote education (n=1140). \*indicates a significant difference between primary and secondary.

As demonstrated in Figure 8 above, there were significant differences by phase with secondary teachers more likely than primary to report pupil motivation (95% vs. 87%) and potential truancy (27% vs. 6%) as barriers. Primary teachers on the other hand were slightly more likely than secondary to face barriers around availability of technology in pupils' homes (91% vs. 87%) and time constraints to organise and deliver remote education sessions (54% vs. 46%).


Teachers in schools with the highest proportion of pupils eligible for FSM were more likely than average to report availability of technology in pupils' homes as a barrier (94% vs. 89% overall), and pupils' access to sufficient connectivity (88% vs. 81%).

# Relationship, Sex and Health Education (RSHE)

This chapter investigates whether teachers personally taught Relationships, Sex and Health Education (RSHE), and the differentiations in teaching made for pupils with SEND within this curriculum area. There is evidence to suggest that pupils with SEND are more vulnerable to abuse or exploitation.<sup>2</sup> Some may demonstrate sexualised behaviour which may be harmful to themselves or others.<sup>3</sup> Conversely, pupils with SEND are often perceived as being child-like or non-sexual which can lead to them not being taught about sex and relationships appropriately. Differentiated teaching enables these pupils to access the curriculum and learn what a healthy relationship looks like, helping to prevent potential incidents of abuse.

Over six-in-ten (62%) teachers personally taught RSHE. As shown in Figure 9 primary teachers were more likely to do so than secondary teachers (74% vs. 49% respectively).

**Figure 9. Whether personally teaches Relationships, Sex and Health Education**



Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. M1: Panel B Teachers (n=1162).

\*indicates significant difference between primary and secondary.

<sup>2</sup> Jones, Lisa, Mark A. Bellis, Sara Wood, Karen Hughes, Ellie McCoy, Lindsay Eckley, Geoff Bates, Christopher Mikton, Tom Shakespeare, and Alana Officer. 'Prevalence and Risk of Violence against Children with Disabilities: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Observational Studies'. *The Lancet* 380, no. 9845 (8 September 2012): 899–907. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)60692-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60692-8). Available here: [Prevalence and risk of violence against children with disabilities: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies - The Lancet](#)

<sup>3</sup> [Residential schools Investigation Report | IICSA Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse](#)

## **Differentiation for pupils with SEND**


Among all teachers of RSHE, 4% do not teach any pupils with SEND. This was more common among secondary teachers (7% did not teach pupils with SEND vs. 3% of primary).

Among teachers that do teach RSHE to pupils with SEND, over half (57%) said they differentiated their teaching for these pupils, 42% said they did not and 1% answered 'don't know'

## **Methods of differentiation**

Those that differentiated their teaching for SEND pupils used a range of methods to do so, with scaffolded lessons being the most popular (72%), as shown in Figure 10. Over half were also using adjusted seating arrangements (56%), frequent praise for small steps (55%), and small group teaching (51%).

**Figure 10. Methods used to differentiate RSHE teaching for pupils with SEND**



Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. M1: Panel B Teachers that differentiate teaching for pupils with SEND (n=377). \*indicates significant difference between primary and secondary teachers.

Primary teachers were more likely than secondary teachers to:

- use small group teaching (60% vs. 35%),
- use individual teaching (38% vs. 20%),
- work with parents to consolidate learning (25% vs. 3%).

Teachers from schools with the highest proportion of pupils eligible for FSM were more likely to allow for additional time to 'over learn' (29% vs. 22% overall). They were also more likely than those from schools with the lowest proportion of these pupils to incorporate short, sharp teaching sessions for new concepts (33% vs. 15%).

## Money management


Economic and financial education are important parts of a broad and balanced curriculum that provide the essential knowledge to ensure that young people are prepared to manage money well and make sound financial decisions. Pupils currently receive financial education through the maths and citizenship curricula which are compulsory for maintained schools at key stages 1 to 4 for maths; and at key stages 3 and 4 for citizenship.

Half of schools (50%) had taught money management (e.g., how to make good decisions about spending and saving) to pupils this academic year, with a quarter (25%) reporting they hadn't yet but planned to in future. A smaller proportion (15%) reported that they didn't have any plans to teach money management and 10% don't know if they had or not.

Secondary schools (69%) were more likely to report that they had taught money management than primary schools (46%), and primary schools were more likely to report that they had no plans to teach it (17% of primary schools vs. 4% of secondary schools).

As shown in Figure 11, schools that had no plans to teach money management most commonly reported that this was because there was a lack of time in the curriculum (46%), that it was not part of the curriculum (43%) and/or that they do not have time to plan/arrange it (36%). Less common reasons included: that children in their school were too young to be taught money management (16%), a figure which was only reported spontaneously by primary schools; a lack of teaching resources (12%); and having no particular reason for not teaching it (10%).

**Figure 11. Reasons for not teaching money management in schools**



Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. N2: Panel A schools with no plans to teach money management (n=63). Responses less than 5% not charted.


## Physical Education (PE)

The Department for Education will be delivering on the manifesto commitment to invest in primary school PE teaching to ensure that it is delivered well at Key stages 1 and 2. An initial measure of teacher confidence in the delivery of various elements of PE will help to inform their approach to supporting the improvement of PE in primary schools.

Primary teachers that taught physical education (PE) to Key Stage 1 or 2 (KS1 or 2) were asked how confident they were in teaching PE lessons focussed on improving a range of skills. Different skills were asked about for KS1 or KS2 teachers, but both were asked about swimming and water safety skills and confidence to participate in physical activities.

As shown in Figure 12, enjoying being physically active was an aspect of PE that most KS1 teachers felt confident in teaching (93%), followed by teaching fundamental movement skills (91%). Having the confidence to participate in sport and physical activity (89%), participation in team games (85%) and performance of simple dances (72%) were also aspects of PE that teachers felt confident teaching. Teachers were less likely to be confident in supporting lessons that teach swimming and water safety, with around half (49%) reporting that they weren't confident, with 27% not confident at all.


**Figure 12. Primary teachers' confidence in teaching aspects of PE lessons to KS1**



Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. J2\_X: Panel B primary teachers that teach PE to KS1 (n=141).

Amongst primary teachers that taught PE to KS2, running, jumping, throwing and catching was an aspect of PE that these teachers felt the most confident in teaching (93%), followed by having confidence to participate in physical activities (91%). Participation in outdoor activity challenges (individually or within a team) (85%), participation in competitive games (84%), development of flexibility, strength, technique, control and balance (77%) and the comparison of pupils' own performances with previous ones (77%) were also aspects of PE that teachers felt confident teaching. Teachers were less likely to feel confident teaching dances using a range of movement patterns (63%) or supporting lessons that teach swimming and water safety skills (52%), mirroring the findings of those that taught KS1.

**Figure 13. Primary teachers' confidence in teaching aspects of PE lessons to KS2**



Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. J3\_X: Panel B primary teachers that teach PE to KS2 (n=224).


Among KS2 teachers, female teachers felt more confident in teaching dances using a range of movement patterns than male teachers (67% for females vs. 46% for males).

# Music education

Music is a statutory subject in the national curriculum<sup>4</sup> for all children in primary school and for the first years of secondary (from key stage 1 to 3). The Department for Education's policy is that music education is an essential part of the curriculum and the development of children and young people, including through its positive impact on wellbeing, confidence, and communication skills. The music education questions asked in previous waves of the SCP supported the development of National Plan for Music Education, published in June 2022. The questions asked in the June 2022 survey will inform how much and what kinds of music education schools are currently providing, as well as to what extent resources such as music practice space and opportunities to watch musical performances are available to pupils.

As shown in Figure 14, most schools offered musical instrument lessons (89%), singing lessons (85%), and the opportunity to watch a live performance at school (71%). Other activities that were less commonly offered included providing a space for rehearsals and individual practice (65%), the opportunity to watch a live performance off-site (58%), and a termly school performance (54%). For all activities, schools that were not offering them this academic year were unlikely to have plans to offer them in the future.

**Figure 14. Activities related to music education offered in the past year**



Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. K1\_X: Panel A leaders (n=508).


<sup>4</sup> [National curriculum in England: music programmes of study - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-music-programmes-of-study)

There were some differences by type of school:

- Secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to offer the opportunity to watch a live performance off-site (78% vs. 54%), to provide a space for rehearsals and individual practice (95% vs. 60%) and to provide musical instrument lessons (95% vs. 88%).
- Schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely than those with the highest proportion to offer a termly school performance (67% vs. 49%), to provide a space for rehearsals and individual practice (75% vs. 59%), to provide musical instrument lessons (97% vs. 84%), or to provide singing lessons (93% vs. 81%).
- Schools in urban areas were more likely to offer the opportunity to watch a live performance at school than those in rural areas (73% vs. 59%).

As shown in Figure 15 at an overall level, schools were more likely to offer singing lessons on a whole class basis (74%), than on a small-group basis (57%) or one-to-one basis (22%). Over eight-in-ten primary schools (85%) and secondary schools (87%) offered singing lessons in any form. Primary schools more commonly offered singing lessons on a whole class basis than secondary schools (78% of primary schools vs. 52% of secondary schools), whereas secondary schools were most likely to offer these on a one-to-one (76% of secondary schools vs. 11% of primary schools) or small group basis (75% of secondary schools vs. 54% of primary schools).

**Figure 15. Format singing lessons are offered in, by phase**




Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. K2\_1: Panel A leaders that offer singing lessons (n=434). \* Indicates significant difference between primary and secondary schools.

Schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely than those with the highest proportion to offer singing lessons on a one-to-one basis (28% vs 9%) and small group basis (68% vs. 48%). Meanwhile schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely than those with the lowest proportion to provide them on a whole class basis (81% vs. 68%).

As shown in Figure 16, at an overall level, schools were similarly likely to offer musical instrument lessons in all formats (65% for the whole class, 62% one-to-one, and 57% for a small group). Secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to offer musical instrument lessons in any form (95% of secondary schools vs. 88% of primary schools), and more commonly offered musical instrument lessons on a one-to-one basis than primary schools (93% vs. 56%), while primary schools were more likely than secondary schools to provide them on a whole class basis (69% vs. 44%).

**Figure 16. Format musical instrument lessons are offered in, by phase**




Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. K2\_2: Panel A leaders that offer musical instrument lessons (n=459). \* Indicates significant difference between primary and secondary schools.

Schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely than those with the highest proportion to provide musical instrument lessons on a one-to-one basis (77% vs. 39%). While those with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely than those with the lowest proportion to provide them on a whole class basis (69% vs. 53%).

In relation to group musical and singing activities, schools that provided singing or musical instrument lessons were asked whether pupils were able to join a choir, band or orchestra at their school. As shown in Figure 17, schools were more likely to offer pupils the possibility of joining a choir (80%) than a band (39%) or orchestra (25%).

**Figure 17. Whether schools provide musical choirs/bands/orchestras**



Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. K3\_X: Panel A leaders that offer musical instrument/singing lessons (n=484).

Differences by subgroup included the following:


- Secondary schools were more likely to provide all group musical activities than primary schools (choir: 88% vs. 78%, band: 84% vs. 30%, orchestra: 62% vs. 17%).
- Schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely than those with the highest proportion to provide choirs (87% vs. 72%) and orchestras (36% vs. 14%).
- Schools in London were more likely than average to provide a choir (94% vs. 80%).

## Film and music streaming licences

The Department for Education purchases licenses for schools to access copyrighted materials to support teaching and extracurricular activities. The DfE are keen to understand schools' demand to access materials digitally, in order to inform policy decisions on future copyright licensing agreements.

As shown in Figure 18, just under a quarter (23%) of leaders said they were confident in their knowledge of the DfE central copyright scheme. In contrast, three-quarters (73%) were not confident with one-in-three (34%) reporting that they were not confident at all.

**Figure 18. How leaders rate their confidence in their knowledge of what copyrighted materials schools are currently permitted to use**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. G1: Panel B leaders (n=522) Statement shortened from "How confident are you that you know what copyrighted materials schools are currently permitted to use, as part of the DfE central copyright scheme?"


Secondary leaders were more likely to report that they were confident about their knowledge of copyright regulations, compared to primary leaders (30% vs. 19% of primary leaders).

## Interest in streaming music and film

Over eight-in-ten schools (84%) were interested in being able to stream and record/share films digitally, e.g., for film clubs, with 47% very interested in this. Just over one-in-ten (12%) schools were not interested.

Similarly, schools were asked about their interest in streaming and recording/sharing music digitally e.g., for school websites and as part of school productions. More schools expressed an interest in music compared to films, with over nine-in-ten (93%) interested in this and over six-in-ten very interested (63%). Four percent were not interested in this proposal.

**Figure 19. How interested would schools be in being able to stream and record/share films and music digitally**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. G2\_1 and 2: Panel B leaders (n=522). 'Not at all interested' for music was reported by <1% and is not shown on the Figure. NB. NETs do not match chart exactly due to rounding.

Primary schools were more likely to not be interested in film streaming compared to secondaries (14% vs. 4% of secondaries).

Within secondary schools, non-academy secondaries were more likely to be interested in both film and music compared to secondary academies (98% vs. 86% of academy secondaries with regards to film, 100% vs. 86% for music streaming).

## Schools' preference for how licences could be purchased


Schools were asked to choose from two proposals as to how these licences could be purchased. For films, a central license purchased by DfE would cost all schools roughly 40p per pupil per annum (p.a.) and save administrative burden. For the Department for Education to obtain these efficiencies, individual schools could not opt out. If schools wanted to purchase a streaming license individually this would cost around 68p per pupil p.a. Without a licence, a school would not be permitted to play films digitally.

Around half of schools (49%) would prefer that the Department for Education buys a film streaming license centrally. In contrast, around three-in-ten (29%) preferred that schools decide for themselves whether to purchase a license. Around a quarter (23%) were unsure.

A similar question was asked about music licences. A central licence purchased by DfE would cost all schools roughly 70p per pupil per annum (p.a.) and save administrative

burden. If schools wanted to purchase a streaming license individually this would cost around 75p per pupil p.a. Without a licence, a school would not be permitted to play, record or share music digitally. This question received a similar response as with film streaming, with just under half (47%) preferring that the Department for Education buys a music streaming license centrally. Around a third (32%) want schools to decide for themselves whether to purchase a license. Around one-in-five (21%) were not sure. Responses to both questions are shown in Figure 20.

**Figure 20. How schools would prefer film and music licences to be purchased**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. G3a and G3b: Panel B leaders (n=522)


Schools with an Ofsted rating of 'Outstanding' were less likely than average to want the Department for Education to buy a film or music streaming license centrally (34% vs. 49% of all schools for film; 35% vs. 47% for music).

# School Food Standards

The government's Levelling Up White Paper outlined initiatives designed to strengthen adherence with School Food Standards. The Department for Education encourages schools to have begun developing whole school policies setting out their approach to food provision; food education; the role of the catering team; and encouraging the take-up of school lunches. This policy should cover food throughout the day.

Just under a third (31%) of schools had a School Food Policy. Nearly half (47%) did not have a policy. As shown in Figure 21, this comprises of 17% who were currently developing one and 30% who were not. Primary schools were more likely than secondaries to be in the process of developing a policy (18% vs. 11%). Among those that had a School Food Policy, around a third (36%) said it covered all the mentioned elements.

**Figure 21. Whether school has a School Food Policy**




Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. R1: Panel B Leaders (n=522) \*Indicates significant difference between primary and secondary.

## Responsibility for catering provision

At lunchtimes, private contractors appointed by the school were the most common way of providing catering (37%). Outside of lunch, in-house provision was the most common provision (28%) if available.


**Figure 22. Providers of lunchtime catering**



Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. R2: Panel B Leaders (n=522). Responses with 3% or less are not charted. \*Indicates significant difference between primary and secondary

Primary schools were more likely than secondaries to use Local Authority provision for lunch (28% vs. 7%), and secondaries were more likely to offer in-house services (32% vs. 16%).

**Figure 23. Providers of catering outside of lunchtimes**




Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. R3: Panel B Leaders (n=522). Responses with 3% or less overall are not charted. \*Indicates significant difference between primary and secondary.

For provision outside of lunch, secondary schools were more likely than primaries to use private contractors appointed by the school (34% vs. 6% respectively), and those appointed by the school group (20% vs. 1% respectively). Primary schools were more likely to say they did not offer any catering service outside of lunchtimes (59% vs 7% for secondaries).

## School Food Standards

Schools were asked which methods they used to ensure compliance with the School Food Standards. As shown in Figure 24, the most common approach was to agree this within catering contracts (69%), followed by annual assurance from caterers/the local authority (42%). A minority (4%) said they were not using any of the listed approaches to comply.

**Figure 24. School approach to ensuring it complies with School Food Standards**



Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. R4: Panel B Leaders (n=522). \*Indicates significant difference between primary and secondary.

Schools with the lowest proportion of pupils eligible for FSM were more likely to seek annual assurances from caterers/their local authorities (55%) when compared to with all schools (42%).


## Parent Pledge

The Parent Pledge provides a commitment to parents and carers that any child who falls behind in English or maths will receive timely and evidence-based support to help them catch up, and that schools will keep parents updated on their child's progress.

Just over a third (37%) of leaders and teachers had heard of the Parent Pledge, including 13% who had only heard the name and nothing else.

As shown in Figure 25, awareness was higher among leaders (57% had heard of the pledge vs. 30% of teachers) and 45% of leaders knew 'a little' or 'a lot' about the pledge compared to 17% of teachers. Among leaders, headteachers were the most likely to have heard of the pledge (76%), compared to 52% and 44% respectively for deputy and assistant heads.

**Figure 25. Awareness of the 'Parent Pledge'**




Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. O1: Panel B leaders, primary teachers, and secondary teachers of English or maths (n=1,433). \* Indicates a significantly higher difference between leaders and teachers.

## Assessments in English and maths

All schools were asked, on average, how often pupils were assessed for attainment in English and maths (aside from statutory assessments such as Key Stage 2 tests and formal qualification exams such as GCSEs). As shown in Figure 26, the vast majority of

schools tested attainment in English and maths at least once a term (97% and 98% respectively).

**Figure 26. How often pupils are assessed in English and maths**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. O2: Panel B leaders (n=522).


Assessments were carried out more frequently in secondary schools. Over half (54%) of secondary schools reported assessing pupils in maths at least once per half-term, compared to 27% of primary schools. Primary schools were more likely to assess maths once per term (72% vs. 38% of secondary schools).

A very similar pattern was seen in English assessment. Close to half (45%) of secondary schools assessed this at least once per half-term (compared to 25% of primary schools). Again, primary schools were more likely to assess English once per term (73% vs. 47%).

Schools with the lowest proportion of pupils eligible for FSM carried out these assessments more often. English assessments were carried out at least once every half term by 41% of schools in the lowest FSM quintile (compared to 28% of schools overall). However, when looking at frequency of assessment over a wider time period (per term rather than per half-term) there was no difference by FSM quintile.

As shown in Figure 27, there were significant differences by school phase in the type of assessment used, with almost all secondary schools (99%) using assessments designed at a department or school level, compared with 51% of primary schools. Primary schools on the other hand were much more likely than secondary to use classroom observation (91% vs. 47%) and commercial assessments (87% vs. 53%).

**Figure 27. Methods used to assess pupil attainment in English/math**




Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. O3: Panel B leaders in schools that carry out any assessment (n=520). \* Indicates a significantly higher difference between primary and secondary schools.

## Targeted academic support

Leaders, primary teachers and secondary teachers of English and maths were asked what proportion of pupils requiring targeted academic support in these subjects receive it. Targeted academic support was explained as including extra support from a teacher or teaching assistant, or 1-1 or small-group tutoring.

Leaders were asked to respond on a school-level. As shown in Figure 28, a third (33%) of schools reported that all, or nearly all, pupils who required targeted academic support in English received it, and 29% reported that all/ nearly all pupils requiring academic support in maths received it.

**Figure 28. What proportion of pupils who need targeted academic support receive it (as reported by schools)**




Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. R1: Panel B leaders (n=522). “Not applicable - no pupils need targeted academic support” was also an available answer code, not charted (<0.3% of schools).

Primary schools were more likely than secondary schools to report that all, or nearly all, pupils who need targeted academic support received it, for both English (35% vs. 20% of secondary schools) and maths (31% vs. 19% of secondary schools).

Schools with the highest proportion of pupils eligible for FSM were the least likely to be able to provide targeted academic support for all pupils who need it. For English, one-in-five (20%) of schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were able to provide targeted support to all/nearly all pupils who need it, compared with 43% of schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils. The same pattern was seen for targeted maths support (17% vs. 42%).

Teachers were asked to respond thinking only about the pupils they teach. As shown in Figure 29, just under a quarter of teachers reported that nearly all pupils who required targeted academic support received it in English (23%) or maths (23%) – slightly lower than the proportions reported by schools. Only a small minority of teachers reported that no pupils in their classes required targeted academic support in English (1%) or maths (2%).

**Figure 29. What proportion of pupils who need targeted academic support receive it (as reported by teachers)**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. O4: Panel B primary teachers, and secondary teachers of English or maths (n=714/723).

Similar to findings reported at a school-level, primary teachers were more likely than secondary teachers to report that all/nearly all pupils that required targeted academic support in their class received it, both for English (27% vs. 11%) and maths (27% vs. 9%). Teachers in schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were the most likely to report all/nearly all pupils who required targeted support received it in English (30% vs. 23% overall)<sup>5</sup> and maths (34% vs. 23% overall).

## Types of targeted academic support offered

Within schools who had pupils who needed additional support, the most common provision was teaching assistant support, both for pupils who needed support in English (92% of schools) and maths (92% of schools.<sup>6</sup>). Over three-quarters of schools also provided;


- Specific interventions to support language and literacy (88% in English),
- Extra support from teacher (88% in maths, 85% in English),
- Individual or small-group tutoring (75% in maths, 73% in English).

<sup>5</sup> Finding for English not statistically significant and should be interpreted as indicative only.

<sup>6</sup> Schools who do not have any pupils requiring additional support were excluded from the base (<0.3% of schools).

As shown in Figure 30 below, primary schools were more likely than secondary schools to provide a range of targeted academic support for pupils behind in English including teaching assistants (96% vs. 68% of secondary) and specific interventions to support language development and literacy (91% vs. 69%). However, secondary schools were more likely to provide tutoring (80% vs. 71% of primary schools).

**Figure 30. Support provided for pupils behind in English (as reported by schools)**




Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. O5: Panel B leaders who have pupils requiring support (n=521).

Similar patterns could be seen in the provision of support for pupils who are behind in maths, with primary schools more likely than secondary to provide teaching assistant support (97% vs. 70%) and specific interventions to support numeracy (77% vs. 59%).

When teachers were asked about the targeted academic support they provide for pupils who are behind in English and maths, the results largely reflected those of schools with the exception that teachers more commonly reported providing extra support themselves.

**Figure 31. Support provided for pupils who are behind in English and maths (as reported by teachers)**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. O5: Panel B primary teachers, and secondary teachers of English or maths, who have pupils requiring support (n=708).


## Informing parents and carers of progress

Parents' evenings were the most commonly used method to keep parents and carers informed of progress in both English (100% of schools) and maths (99% of schools). Formal end of year reports were also used by the majority of schools to report progress

in English (93%) and maths (92%). Around half of schools used calls to parents (49% for English, 48% for maths). Other means schools used that did not involve meetings or calls with parents included formal end of term reports (27% in English, 30% in maths), email correspondence (29% and 26% respectively), mobile apps (14% and 12% respectively), and messaging platforms (9% and 10% respectively).


However, as shown in Figure 32 and Figure 33 below, there were a number of significant differences between the methods used by primary and secondary schools. Most notably, primary schools were more likely to use formal end of year reports, to inform parents of progress in English and maths specifically, whereas secondary schools were more likely to use formal end of term reports and calls to parents.

**Figure 32. How schools keep parents/carers informed of progress in English**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. O6\_1: Panel B leaders (n=522). NB. When data is weighted, 99.52% of all schools selected Parents' evenings code – this is rounded to 100%.

**Figure 33. How schools keep parents/carers informed of progress in maths**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. O6\_1: Panel B leaders (n=522).

Responses from teachers echoed those at school level, with parents' evenings and formal end of year reports the most commonly cited method used to keep parents and carers updated of progress in English (98% and 86% respectively) and maths (98% and 88% respectively). Just under half of teachers reported using calls to parents to keep them updated about progress both in English (47%) and maths (45%).

# Pupil mental health

This chapter covers teachers' confidence in identifying pupils with mental health needs and helping them to access mental health and wellbeing support, as well as their confidence in being able to teach pupils with mental health issues effectively. The findings in this section will help to inform the Department for Education's understanding of how well teachers feel able to promote and support the mental wellbeing of children and young people, and the support the Department for Education provides.

## Teachers' views on supporting pupil mental health and wellbeing

Three-quarters of teachers agreed that they knew how to help pupils with mental health issues access support offered by their school (76%) and that they felt equipped to identify behaviour that may be linked to a mental health issue (75%).

Fewer agreed that they felt equipped to teach pupils in their class who have mental health needs (61%), with less than half agreeing that they knew how to help pupils with mental health issues access specialist support outside of school (44%); they had access to mental health professionals if they needed specialist advice about pupils' mental health (40%); and that students were able to access specialist support when needed (37%).

The findings are compared to those from previous waves of the survey in Figure 34.


In general, levels of agreement with the statements have fluctuated over time. Comparing against June 2021, one year prior to this survey, there has been an increase in agreement for all but one statement (access to mental health professionals for specialist advice).

In comparison to March 2022, the most recent wave in which this question was asked, there has been a significant increase 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' (75% in June 2022 vs. 67% in March 2022),
- 'I feel equipped to teach children in my class who have mental health needs' (61% in June 2022 vs. 51% in March 2022),
- 'I know how to help pupils with mental health issues access specialist support outside of school/college' (44% in June 2022 vs. 38% in March 2022).

Results on these measures have fluctuated quite widely across the waves that these questions have been asked, and the increase in this wave compared to March 2022 represents results returning to levels seen in December 2021.

**Figure 34. Teachers' agreement with statements regarding pupil mental health**



Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. I1: Panel A Teachers (n=1,151). 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 significant increase since March 2022.

Primary teachers were more likely than secondary to:

- say they knew how to help pupils with mental health issues access specialist support outside of school (48% vs. 41%),

- feel equipped to teach pupils in their class who have mental health needs (65% vs. 56%).

On the other hand, secondary teachers were more likely than primary to agree that pupils were able to access specialist support when needed (44% vs. 31%).

In addition to this, urban schools were more likely than rural schools (39% vs. 30%) to agree that students were able to access specialist support when needed.


## Post-16 programmes

The section covers questions asked of teachers in Key Stage 4 and 5 about their awareness of and familiarity with certain post-16 programmes (A Levels, apprenticeships, traineeships, and the new T Level qualifications), as well as how likely they would be to encourage pupils to take them. Teacher awareness and knowledge of a range of post-16 options, both on academic and technical pathways, is important to enable them to help young people decide what route is right for them. Evidence gathered here will also allow the Department for Education to track awareness of new programmes, like T Levels, as they expand and roll out more widely.

### Awareness

The vast majority of KS4/5 teachers had heard of A Levels (98%) and apprenticeships (98%). Over two-thirds were aware of T Levels (68%), with around a third aware of traineeships (36%). As shown in Figure 35, when compared to July 2021, there has been an increase in awareness of T Levels (68% vs. 52% in July), with awareness of the other three programmes having remained consistent.

**Figure 35. Proportion of KS4/5 teachers aware of post-16 programmes**




Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. H1: Panel B KS4/5 Teachers (n=595). July 2021 survey. C1: All KS4 and KS5 teachers (n=458). \*Indicates significant difference between July 2021 and June 2022.

## Knowledge

Over nine-in-ten teachers (94%) said they knew a lot about A Levels, compared to around a quarter (26%) for apprenticeships, and less than one-in-ten for T Levels (6%) and traineeships (5%).

As shown in Figure 36, around a third of those that had heard of T Levels and traineeships, knew nothing about them beyond name (32% and 34% respectively).

**Figure 36. Teachers' awareness and knowledge of post-16 programmes**



Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. H2: Panel B KS4/5 Teachers (n=595). H2: Teachers that were aware of each qualification (T Levels n=406, traineeships n=215, apprenticeships n=581, A Levels n=585).

Teachers from urban schools were more likely to say they knew nothing of traineeships beyond name (38% vs. 19% for rural).


Teachers from schools with the highest proportion of pupils eligible for FSM were more likely to know a lot about apprenticeships than those from schools with the lowest proportion (33% vs. 13% respectively). This was also true for traineeships (13% vs. 0% respectively).

## Encouraging pupils to consider different post-16 programmes

KS4 teachers that were aware of each qualification were then asked whether they would encourage their pupils to consider it. A Levels were the qualification teachers were most likely to encourage for at least some pupils (96%), with nine-in-ten saying the same for apprenticeships (90%). Considerably fewer said they would encourage studying traineeships (59%) and T Levels (55%) to some or more pupils.

This was largely in keeping with July 2021 findings, barring an increase in those that said they would encourage pupils to consider T Levels (44% in July).

**Figure 37. Proportion of pupils that teachers would encourage to do post-16 programmes**



Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. H3: Panel B KS4 Teachers (n=394).

Teachers from schools with the highest proportion of pupils eligible for FSM were more likely to encourage them to consider T Levels (67% vs 55% overall). In contrast, those from schools with the lowest proportion were more likely to say they would encourage this to very few/no pupils (41% vs. 25% overall).

Those teaching STEM subjects were less likely than other subjects to encourage most/all or some pupils to consider traineeships (50% vs. 59% overall).

## Careers information and advice

The ‘Careers guidance and access for education and training providers’ statutory guidance outlines the importance of high-quality careers education and guidance in school or college.<sup>7</sup> Schools have an important role to make pupils aware of the full range of academic and vocational options available to them, including through inviting in providers of technical education and apprenticeships to talk to pupils about their offer.

### Who secondary schools have invited to speak to their pupils

Secondary schools were asked who they have invited to speak to pupils about the qualifications or training they offer. Universities and Higher Education Institutions (87%), apprenticeships providers (86%), employers (85%), and FE providers (83%) had been invited by more than eight-in-ten schools to speak to pupils between Years 8-13. Other education providers, such as independent training providers/university technical college/studio schools, were invited to speak by 56% of schools.

Those in Years 8 or 9 were most likely to receive talks from employers (46%), followed by universities (31%).


Three-quarters of schools had hosted a talk from employers (76%), apprenticeships providers (74%) and FE providers (73%) for those in Years 10 or 11.

Lastly, for Years 12 or 13, schools were most likely to host a talk from universities (54%). A full breakdown of this can be found in Figure 38.

---

<sup>7</sup> [Careers guidance and access for education and training providers - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/careers-guidance-and-access-for-education-and-training-providers)

**Figure 38. Who schools have invited to speak to pupils about the qualifications or training they offer**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. B1: Panel B Secondary leaders (n=170)

Schools with an Ofsted rating of 'Outstanding' were more likely to have invited employers to speak at their school compared to the overall average (97% vs. 85% overall).

Those with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely than average to invite the following to speak:

- FE providers to speak to those in Years 8 or 9 (37% vs. 24% overall) and Years 10 or 11 (89% vs. 73% overall),
- Other education providers to speak to those in Years 10 or 11 (65% vs. 49% overall).

Conversely, those with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were less likely than average to invite the following to speak:

- Universities to speak to those in Years 12 or 13 (34% vs. 54% overall),
- Apprenticeships providers to speak to those in Years 12 or 13 (24% vs. 45% overall).

There were also some differences based on whether a school was an academy or not. Non-academies were more likely to invite the following to speak:

- FE providers to speak to those in Years 8 or 9 (36% vs. 21% of academies),
- Employers to speak to those in Years 8 or 9 (60% vs. 42% of academies),
- Universities to speak to those in Years 10 or 11 (79% vs. 61% of academies).

## Careers discussions within regular lessons

Teachers can help embed careers into the curriculum by highlighting the relevance of their curriculum subjects for a wide range of career pathways. Around half (48%) of secondary teachers reported discussing career paths and opportunities in at least some of the regular lessons that they teach. This constituted 7% who discussed this in most lessons and four-in-ten (41%) in some lessons. Approaching half (47%) said they discussed career paths and opportunities in a few lessons. Five percent reported that they never discussed these topics in their lessons.


# National Centre for Computing Education (NCCE)

The National Centre for Computing Education (NCCE) launched in November 2018, backed by £84 million of DfE funding, to improve the teaching of computing and drive-up participation in Computer Science at GCSE and A level, particularly amongst girls.

The Department for Education are in the process of procuring the next contract through to August 2025 and the NCCE will use the survey findings to improve their strategy to engage senior leaders with the programme and increase uptake of their services by schools in England.<sup>8</sup>

Just over six-in-ten school leaders (61%) had heard of the NCCE, with 28% knowing at least a bit about it. Five percent said they knew a lot about it. Just under four-in-ten school leaders (38%) had not heard of the NCCE. This is demonstrated in Figure 39.

**Figure 39. How much leaders know about the NCCE**




Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. Q1: Panel A leaders (n=508)

There were very few differences within subgroups, though leaders of schools within London were more likely to say they have not heard of it, compared to the average (54% vs. 38% of all schools).

A third of schools where the leader was aware of the NCCE (33%) said they had used resources, training or support provided by them, with a similar proportion saying they had not (35%), and a further three-in-ten (31%) reporting that they did not know.

<sup>8</sup> [Tech experts to provide National Centre for Computing Education - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/tech-experts-to-provide-national-centre-for-computing-education)

**Figure 40. Whether schools have used any resources, training or support provided by the NCCE**




Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. Q2: Panel A leaders that have heard of the NCCE (primary leaders n=204, secondary leaders n=105) \*indicates a significantly higher figure between primary and secondary schools

Primary schools were more likely to say that they had not used any resources, training or support provided by the NCCE, compared to secondaries (38% vs. 20%). Schools with an Ofsted rating of 'Outstanding' were less likely to say they had not used any resources compared to the average of all schools (17% vs. 35% of all schools), though they were not significantly more likely to say they had used any resources compared to the average of all schools.

Half of secondary schools said they did not know, higher than the 28% of primaries that said the same.

Schools that have not used NCCE but knew at least a bit about it were asked why they had not used any resources, training or support. The most common answer was they did not know enough about it, which was reported by around a quarter (26%), followed by school staff having sufficient expertise to provide high quality computing education (17%). The full list is shown in Figure 41.

**Figure 41. Reasons why schools have not used any resources, training or support provided by NCCE**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. Q3: Panel A leaders that have not used NCCE and know at least a bit about it (n=30)


## Levelling Up Premium

As part of the Government's levelling up programme, the Levelling Up Premium (LUP) was announced in October 2021.

From Autumn 2022, maths, physics, chemistry, and computing teachers in the first five years of their careers who choose to work in disadvantaged schools, including in Education Investment areas, can claim a LUP payment. The LUP payment gives eligible teachers up to £3,000 tax-free annually in the next three academic years up to 2024-25. The Department for Education published the full eligibility details on GOV.UK in May 2022, therefore findings will assess teachers' awareness of the policy and inform whether - and to what extent - further communications are required to raise awareness before teachers can claim from Autumn 2022.

Over four-in-ten secondary leaders and teachers (44%) were aware of the LUP. This consisted of three-in-ten (30%) who had heard of the LUP but did not know any details about it, 12% who knew a bit about it, and 1% who reported that they knew a lot about the LUP. Around half of secondary leaders and teachers (51%) had not heard of the LUP at all.

**Figure 42. How familiar teachers and leaders are with the Levelling Up Premium**




Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. D1: Secondary teachers and Panel B Secondary leaders (n=1,423)

Secondary leaders were more likely to know at least a bit about the LUP than secondary teachers (31% vs. 11% of secondary teachers). Leaders were also more likely to have heard of the LUP at all than teachers (70% vs 41%). In terms of subject area, secondary STEM teachers are the main audience for the LUP. In line with this, STEM teachers were more likely to know at least a bit about it compared to non-STEM teachers (15% vs. 9% of non-STEM teachers) and were more likely to have heard of it at all (45% vs. 37%).

## How leaders and teachers found out about the Levelling Up Premium

A third (33%) of those aware of the LUP had heard of it through a colleague, followed by around a quarter (26%) who found out about it via national and trade media (e.g., newspapers, news website, Schools Week), and a similar number (23%) who heard of it through social media. The full list asked to respondents is shown in Figure 43 below.

**Figure 43. How leaders and teachers found out about the Levelling Up Premium**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. D2: Secondary teachers and Panel B Secondary leaders aware of LUP (n=631) \*indicates percentage of leaders answering this code.  
0% of teachers gave this response.

Secondary leaders were more likely to have found out about the LUP through the following channels, compared to secondary teachers:

- National and trade media (34% vs. 24%),
- DfE communication channels (32% vs. 9%),
- A union (12% vs. 4%).

Thirteen percent of leaders also heard about the LUP through headteacher networks.

Teachers were more likely to have heard of the LUP via a colleague, compared to leaders (36% vs. 15%). Similarly, STEM teachers were more likely to have heard of it through a colleague, compared to non-STEM teachers (44% vs. 28%).

Conversely, those teaching non-STEM subjects were more likely to have heard of the LUP via national and trade media (29% vs. 18%), and social media (26% vs. 18%), compared to STEM teachers.


## Teaching School Hubs

Teaching School Hubs (TSH) are school-led centres of excellence for teacher and leadership training and development. These hubs became fully operational in September 2021.

As of June 2022, around three-quarters (74%) of leaders and 45% of teachers were aware of any programmes or services being delivered by their local TSH. Only a minority (3% of leaders and 4% of teachers) reported that none of the listed programmes and services were being delivered. Just over half (51%) of teachers and 23% of leaders were unsure what was on offer.

As shown in Figure 44 below, leaders were most likely to be aware of their Teaching School Hub delivering the Early Careers Framework (64%) followed by National Professional Qualifications (57%). Teachers on the other hand were most likely to be aware of the Initial Teacher Training offer (28%).

**Figure 44. Programmes and services used by local Teaching School Hub, as reported by leaders and teachers (prompted list)**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. F1: Panel A Leaders and teachers (n=1,659)

\*Indicates significant difference between leaders and teachers


There were some differences by phase, with secondary schools more likely than primary to report their local TSH delivered any of the listed programmes (55% vs. 42%). Leaders and teachers from primary schools were more likely to be unsure what was on offer (52% vs. 43%).

Schools in urban areas were more likely to report any programmes or services being delivered by their TSH (50% vs. 42% of schools in rural areas). Approaching one-in-ten (7%) of leaders and teachers in rural areas reported that no services were currently being delivered.

## Programmes and services accessed through locals TSHs

Leaders and teachers aware of programmes on offer from their local TSH were asked which they had personally accessed since September 2021. As shown in Figure 45, Early Careers Framework (ECF) and National Professional Qualifications (NPQs) were the most commonly accessed (21% and 19% respectively). This equates to 10% of all leaders and teachers accessing ECF through a local Teaching School Hub since September 2021, and 9% accessing NPQs this way.

**Figure 45. Proportion of leaders and teachers accessing services offered by local TSH**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. F2: Leaders and teachers who have programmes available from local TSH (n=902). Don't know was also an available answer option not charted (1% overall)


As shown in the Figure above, there were differences between teachers and leaders, with leaders more likely than teachers to have accessed Early Careers Framework (38% vs. 17%) and National Professional Qualifications (33% vs. 16%) where offered by their local TSH. Teachers on the other hand were more likely to have accessed other Continuous Professional Development (CPD) (34% vs. 25%).

Differences were also evident by phase, with primary leaders and teachers more likely to have accessed ECF (24% vs. 17% of secondary respondents) and NPQs (22% vs. 17%). Leaders and teachers in secondary schools were more likely to have accessed Initial Teacher Training (ITT) (10% vs. 6% primary).

## Reasons for not accessing programmes and services on offer

As shown in Figure 45 above, just over a third (35%) of leaders and teachers who were aware of programmes being delivered by their local TSH had not accessed any of them. Most commonly, this was because they felt the programmes were not relevant to them (49%). A further 27% reported they did not have enough time to use the programmes. This was more commonly reported by teachers (29% vs. 16% of leaders).

**Figure 46. Reasons for not accessing programmes offered by local TSH**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. F3: Leaders and teachers who have not accessed a TSH programme on offer to their school (n=306)

Leaders and teachers from Ofsted-rated outstanding schools were the most likely to report that programmes were not relevant to them (66% vs. 49%) overall. Those from schools with the highest proportion of pupils eligible for FSM were the least likely to feel programmes were not relevant (37% vs. 63% from schools with the lowest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils). By contrast, schools with the lowest proportion of pupils eligible for FSM were more likely to cite:

- they had accessed programmes through other delivery partners (23% vs. 11% overall),
- the programme times or dates were unsuitable (17% vs. 8%),
- their need was met by a curriculum hub (12% vs. 5%),
- their need was met by a private training provider (12% vs. 4%).

## Workload


Workload reduction is a longstanding priority for the Department for Education for Education. In the June 2022 survey, school leaders and teachers were asked which actions, if any, their school has taken to reduce workload in the last 12 months, with options covering both formal and informal activities. This question was previously asked with the same statements a year prior (in June 2021).

### School leaders' view of actions taken to reduce workload

The action that school leaders most commonly reported their school having taken was reviewing workload related to marking (69%). This was followed by consulting with staff about potential ways to reduce workload (e.g., staff meetings), which was mentioned by 58%, and promoting or further developing existing teacher support schemes and/or wellbeing programmes (54%).

Compared to the last time this question was asked, in June 2021, there was an increase in the number of schools that reported reviewing workload related to marking (69% vs. 63% in June 2021). There were also increases in reviewing workload related to planning (51% vs. 44%) and the proportion that reported using the DfE workload reduction toolkit (21% vs. 16%). However, there was a decline in the number reporting reviewing workload related to data monitoring or the number of 'data drops' compared to 12 months ago (50% vs. 56% in June 2021). Figure 47 below shows the full list of statements asked and how responses compare to those in June 2021.

**Figure 47. Actions taken by schools to reduce workload in the last 12 months (reported by school leaders)**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. C1: Panel A leaders (n=508) June 2021 survey. B1: All leaders (n=897) \*indicates significant difference between June 2022 and June 2021

There were some differences by school phase, with primary schools more likely than secondaries to have reviewed workload related to marking (71% vs. 60% of secondaries) and reviewed workload related to planning in the past 12 months (56% vs. 26% of secondaries). Meanwhile, secondary schools were more likely to report they had reviewed workload related to data monitoring or the number of 'data drops' than their primary counterparts (58% vs. 49% of primaries).


Schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely to report promoting or further developing existing teacher support schemes and/or wellbeing programmes in the past year, compared to schools with the lowest proportion (54% vs. 38%). Similarly, just under half (46%) of schools with an Ofsted rating of 'Requires Improvement' reported introducing teacher support schemes and/or wellbeing programmes in the past 12 months, higher than the proportion of schools with a rating of 'Outstanding' (23%).

## Teachers' view of actions taken to reduce workload

The same question was posed to teachers. Around two thirds (65%) reported that their school had taken some action to reduce workload in the last 12 months (lower than the 93% of leaders who reported that any action had been taken). Three-in-ten teachers (30%) reported that their school had not taken any of the listed actions to reduce workload in the last 12 months, and 5% did not know. The action that teachers most commonly reported was reviewing workload related to marking (39%), followed by consulting with staff about potential ways to reduce workload (29%), and reviewing workload related to data monitoring or the number of 'data drops' (22%).

These were also the top three actions reported in June 2021, though there has been a decline in the proportion reporting action relating to data monitoring compared to 12 months ago (22% in June 2022 vs. 26% in June 2021). However, there was an increase in the number of teachers who reported that their schools had reviewed workload related to planning compared to this time last year (18% vs. 14% in June 2021). Figure 48 below shows the full list of statements asked and how responses compare to those in June 2021.

**Figure 48. Actions taken by schools to reduce workload in the last 12 months (reported by teachers)**



Source: School College Panel, June 2022 survey. C1: Panel A teachers (n=1,151), June 2021 survey. B1: All teachers (n=979) \*indicates significant difference between June 2022 and June 2021

Primary teachers were significantly more likely to report that their school had taken none of the listed actions to reduce workload (34% compared to 26%). However, they were also more likely than secondary teachers to say that their school had reviewed workload related to planning (25% vs. 11%).

Meanwhile, secondary teachers were significantly more likely to report that their school had reviewed workload related to data monitoring or the number of 'data drops' (28% vs. 18% of primary teachers), promoted or further developed existing teacher support schemes and/or wellbeing programmes (23% vs. 17%), and introduced teacher support schemes and/or wellbeing programmes (23% vs. 14%).

Teachers from schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely to report that their school had reviewed workload related to planning compared to teachers from schools with the lowest proportion (25% vs. 13%).


A higher proportion of teachers from urban schools reported that at least one action has been taken, compared to those in rural schools (67% vs. 58%).

# Staff absence and vaccinations

## Staff absence

As shown in Figure 49, seven-in-ten (71%) schools reported that levels of staff absence were higher now than in a typical summer before the pandemic, while a small number (3%) reported lower levels.

**Figure 49. Staff absence levels compared to before the pandemic**



Source: School and College Panel, June 2022 survey. E1: Panel B leaders (n=522). \* Indicates significant difference between primary and secondary schools.

As shown in Figure 49, primary schools were more likely than secondary schools to report that staff absence levels were the same as they were before the pandemic (27% of primary schools vs. 17% of secondary schools). Further to this, secondary schools were more likely to report that levels of absence were higher than before the pandemic (80% vs. 69%).

Schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were more likely than those with the lowest proportion to report that levels of absence are significantly higher than they were before the pandemic (45% of schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils vs. 21% of schools with the lowest proportion).

Schools in London were more likely than average to report that levels of staff absence are significantly higher than they were before the pandemic (51% of schools in London vs. 34% on average).

## Vaccines

Under half (43%) of leaders reported that their school had provided flu vaccines for staff, with a higher proportion (54%) reporting that this was not the case and 3% reporting that they were unsure. Secondary schools were more likely to report providing flu vaccines than primary schools (54% vs. 41%). Schools with the highest proportion of FSM-eligible pupils were also more likely than those with the lowest proportion to report providing the vaccine for staff (50% vs. 34%).

Overall, one in five (21%) of schools provided flu vaccines through a voucher scheme and 16% provided them through on-site provision from an occupational health provider. Few schools provided flu vaccines via staff being reimbursed for the cost of the vaccine (3%) or through the Local Authority (2%). Sub-group differences reported included:

- Secondary schools were more likely than primary schools to report providing vaccines on-site from an occupational health provider (30% vs. 13%).
- Schools in urban areas were more likely than schools in rural areas to report providing vaccines via on-site provision from an occupational health provider (18% vs. 7%).
- Schools in the North West were more likely than average to report providing vaccines to staff (63% vs. 43%) and also to report providing them on-site from an occupational health provider (44% vs. 16%).



© Department for Education 2022

**Reference: RR1292**

**ISBN: 978-1-83870-435-3**

For any enquiries regarding this publication, contact us at:

[omnibus.surveys@education.gov.uk](mailto:omnibus.surveys@education.gov.uk) or [www.education.gov.uk/contactus](http://www.education.gov.uk/contactus)

This document is available for download at [www.gov.uk/government/publications](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications)