



Department  
for Education

# **Setting up the School Support Staff Negotiating Body (SSSNB)**

**Government consultation response**

**July 2026**

# Contents

Introduction	3
Ministerial foreword	4
Executive summary	6
Methodology	12
Analysis of respondents	13
Topic 1: Definition of ‘school support staff’ to inform who is in scope of the SSSNB	17
Topic 1, Proposal 1: Exclude employees whose pay and/or conditions are negotiated or set through certain other pay or negotiating bodies	18
Government response to Topic 1, Proposal 1	22
Topic 1, Proposal 2: Academy trust employees who work from locations other than academies	24
Government response to Topic 1, Proposal 2	27
Topic 1, Proposal 3: Exclude executive leaders of academy trusts	29
Government response to Topic 1, Proposal 3	36
Topic 2: Call for evidence on existing pay and terms and conditions	38
Topic 2: Evidence from employers	38
Topic 2: Evidence from employees	45
Government response to Topic 2	48
Topic 3: Agency workers	50
Topic 3, Part 1: Call for evidence on agency workers in school support staff roles	51
Topic 3, Part 2: Consultation on bringing agency workers into the SSSNB	61
Government response to Topic 3	75
Equalities impact questions	77
Government response to the equalities impact questions	81
Any other comments	82
Next steps	83
Annex A: List of other pay or negotiating bodies excluded from the SSSNB	84
Annex B: Consultation questions	85
Annex C: Methodology	93
Annex D: Organisations that responded to the consultation	98

## Introduction

The government held a public consultation between 11 June and 18 July 2025 on setting up the School Support Staff Negotiating Body (SSSNB)<sup>1</sup>.

It sought views on how to define school support staff to inform decisions about which staff will be in scope of the SSSNB; collected evidence on current pay and conditions arrangements for school support staff; and sought views on whether agency workers who are working in support staff roles in schools should be in scope of the SSSNB.

This report sets out the findings from each question and the government's response to each topic from the consultation.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Setting up the School Support Staff Negotiating Body \(SSSNB\) - Department for Education - Citizen Space](#).

## Ministerial foreword

Schools change lives. That change comes from the efforts of everyone who works in our schools – leaders, teachers, and over three quarters of a million support staff who work week in week out to make them safe, supportive and inclusive environments in which all our children can achieve and thrive. Support staff are the backbone of our schools: supporting pupils and teachers, keeping buildings running smoothly, and ensuring schools remain calm, well organised places where knowledge flows from one generation to the next.

More than half of the directly employed workforce in our schools are support staff. Their work brings the change parents welcome from this government: creating more inclusive provision for pupils with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND), rolling out free breakfast clubs in primary schools, improving school food standards, and expanding school-based nursery provision.

For too long their voice has not been heard clearly by their employers or by the government, and the work they do has lacked the recognition it deserves. Too many do not feel properly rewarded for the contribution they make, and too often they decide to move on, leaving vacancies in the vital roles that support our children to succeed. In 2023, the Low Pay Commission added teaching assistants to its list of low paying occupations.

This government is determined to ensure that work pays, which is why, within our first 100 days of entering power, we introduced legislation to establish the SSSNB. Through the Employment Rights Act (ERA) 2025 and the Plan to Make Work Pay, support staff will, for the first time, benefit from a dedicated national body to negotiate pay and conditions, and to advise on training and career progression.

The SSSNB will bring together trade unions and employer representatives to agree statutory minimum terms and conditions. Crucially, the legislation protects staff from being worse off under the SSSNB. Where new minimums are set, those currently below them will see their terms improved, while those already on more favourable terms will retain them. No member of support staff will therefore see a reduction in pay, terms or conditions as a result of these reforms. At the same time, employers will retain the flexibility to offer more than the statutory minimum, enabling them to respond to local needs and labour market conditions.

Moving to a dedicated negotiating body marks an important step forward, recognising the professionalism of this workforce, the importance of the trade union role, and providing a clearer framework for improving pay, conditions and career progression. Initially, the SSSNB will focus on delivering real improvements so that staff can see tangible benefits as quickly as possible, while supporting a smooth transition for employers.

As set out in our Schools White Paper, the first area for improvement will be maternity pay. No-one should feel they must choose between a career in education and starting a family. This will be the first national uplift to support staff maternity provision in 25 years, and as Minister for Women & Equalities as well as Secretary of State for Education, I am deeply proud of this important step in strengthening the overall offer for this predominantly female workforce.

I am grateful to the many individuals, schools, trade unions, academy trusts and other organisations who responded to this consultation. Your insights and experience have been invaluable in shaping the next stage of this reform. I look forward to working with the SSSNB and partners across the sector to deliver meaningful improvements, ensuring that support staff, who contribute so much to our schools, are properly recognised, rewarded and supported. And to everyone who works in our schools, bringing change to children's lives - be assured that this government will back you to succeed.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Bridget Phillipson". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

**Rt Hon. Bridget Phillipson MP**  
**Secretary of State for Education and Minister for Women & Equalities**

## Executive summary

### Topic 1: Definition of ‘school support staff’ to inform who is in scope of the SSSNB

#### We asked

Topic 1 collected views on the definition of school support staff, to inform decisions about which staff will be in scope of the SSSNB when it commences operation. The ERA 2025 broadly defines school support staff as anyone who: is not a teacher, is employed by a local authority, maintained school governing body or an academy proprietor in England, and works wholly at one or more maintained school or academy.

The government consulted on using secondary legislation to:

- **exclude** employees whose pay and/or conditions are negotiated or set through certain pay or negotiating bodies other than the National Joint Council for Local Government Services (the NJC)<sup>2</sup>
- **include** academy trust employees in support staff roles who work from locations other than academies
- **exclude** executive leaders of academy trusts, regardless of work location

Respondents were asked whether they agreed with the above, and about how these staff could be legally defined in regulations.

#### We heard

Across all three proposals, most respondents supported the government’s approach, though levels of agreement varied between individuals and organisations.

- **proposal 1:** the majority of both individuals and organisations agreed with excluding staff whose pay is already set by other national pay or negotiating bodies; and with the excluded bodies listed in the consultation, although agreement from individual respondents was slightly higher than from organisations. There were also a few suggestions of additional bodies to exclude
- **proposal 2:** the majority of both individuals and organisations agreed with the proposal to include academy trust support staff who work from locations other than academies, with agreement from individual respondents higher than from organisations. Some organisations that opposed this proposal were concerned about the clarity of definitions, the diversity of centrally-based roles within

---

<sup>2</sup> [Local government services | Local Government Association.](#)

academy trusts, the distinct nature of central roles compared to school-based roles, and that there is insufficient data to properly assess the impact

- **proposal 3:** the majority of both individuals and organisations agreed with excluding executive leaders of academy trusts, with agreement from individual respondents higher than from organisations. Some of those who suggested that executive leaders should be in the SSSNB's scope called for transparent mechanisms to oversee executive pay. As recently announced, we are updating the academy trust handbook (ATH) to introduce new requirements to limit pay increases for academy trust executives, so that levels of pay and progression are fair, proportionate and aligned to wider public sector pay principles. Organisations representing senior school leaders also argued that the exclusion should extend beyond executive leaders to cover senior non-teaching leaders with strategic responsibilities in both maintained schools and academies, to avoid inconsistency in how senior leadership roles are treated across the sector

## Government response to Topic 1

For the purposes of the SSSNB, 'support staff' will mean directly employed staff, other than teachers, who support the operation of schools, including supporting pupils, school facilities and school processes, up to and including middle leadership roles. We want all staff who work in this capacity for schools to benefit from the SSSNB, and to ensure we are not including staff beyond this.

Having carefully considered the feedback, we will:

- proceed with the proposal to exclude staff covered by national pay bodies other than the NJC (Annex A sets out the updated list of pay bodies we intend to exclude in secondary legislation)
- proceed with the proposal to include academy trust employees in support staff roles who work from locations other than one or more academies
- proceed with the proposal to exclude executive leaders working for academy trusts
- extend the above to also exclude senior non-teaching staff with strategic responsibilities working in maintained schools and academies

We will use regulations in the autumn to establish the SSSNB in line with the above and we will publish non-statutory guidance to support employers.

## Topic 2: Call for evidence on the existing terms, and current pay and conditions

### We asked

In Topic 2, the government sought evidence on the current pay and conditions of school support staff to support the transition from existing arrangements to the SSSNB.

### We heard

From employers:

- most respondents use the NJC 'Green Book'<sup>3</sup> as their benchmark, often with local adaptations to address recruitment and retention challenges, regional pressures and operational needs
- most employers pay support staff on the NJC spine, again with local modifications (for example, extra points, market supplements, regional allowances)
- employers commonly rely on job evaluation, benchmarking and role profiles, balanced against budget constraints and historic Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) (TUPE) arrangements<sup>4</sup>
- organisations were more likely than individuals to flag concerns around equal pay, interactions with job evaluation, and cost pressures

From employees:

- most respondents were unsure and a minority said they were concerned about changes to their contracts
- where employees provided further information, concerns were expressed about:
  - safeguarding of current entitlements (for example, leave, sick pay, maternity and paternity pay, redundancy)
  - desire for clear communication and transparency on grading, hours, breaks, holiday and progression
  - retaining flexible contract options (for example, part-time hours, working term-time only or term-time plus additional weeks), which help to protect work-life balance, whilst stressing that flexibility must not result in

---

<sup>3</sup> [Local government terms and conditions \(Green book\) | Local Government Association](#)

<sup>4</sup> When a business changes owner, its employees may be protected under the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) regulations (TUPE). See [Business transfers, takeovers and TUPE: Overview - GOV.UK](#) for the government's guidance on this.

reduced income or loss of benefits such as holiday pay provisions or financial security

- ensuring fair, role-reflective pay (for example, based on skills, responsibilities and qualifications)

## Government response to Topic 2

The call for evidence emphasised the importance of protections for employees and flexibility for both employers and employees.

As set out in the consultation, the SSSNB will establish minimum statutory terms and conditions ('floors'), but not maxima ('ceilings'). The ERA 2025 confirms this in law through the principle of 'no detriment'. This means:

- staff who currently have more favourable terms than any minimum set by the SSSNB will retain them
- staff whose terms fall below SSSNB minimums will be uplifted to the statutory floors
- employers will continue to have the flexibility to offer more than the statutory minimums, ensuring they can respond to local needs and labour market conditions

This approach protects staff while ensuring that employers retain the autonomy they need to respond to local labour markets and operational challenges.

Responses to the call for evidence also emphasised the importance of moving smoothly from the existing arrangements to the SSSNB. We will enable a phased, managed transition to allow employers and staff to adapt to the new system, with staff remaining on their existing arrangements for the 2026-27 financial year, and with SSSNB outcomes applying from the 2027-28 financial year at the earliest. The initial focus of the SSSNB will be on establishing new minimum levels for terms and conditions with incremental changes to contracts that lead to cumulative improvements in support staff terms and conditions each year.

We are taking concerns about equal pay and burdens very seriously, and we will continue to work with the sector to assess burdens and support employers to continue to operate in line with their equal pay obligations. We will continue to engage actively with all our partners as we develop the secondary legislation, guidance and supporting materials necessary for the successful implementation of the SSSNB.

## Topic 3: Agency workers

### We asked

In Topic 3, the government collected evidence on the use of agency workers in schools and sought views on whether agency workers should be brought into the scope of the SSSNB in future legislation.

### We heard

- there was very limited engagement from agency workers and employment agencies with these questions
- there were mixed views on the inclusion of agency workers, with most respondents unsure about their inclusion, the impact, and any conditions that would be necessary to make inclusion workable
- 1 in 5 organisations believe that agency workers should be included, compared with 1 in 3 individuals
- trade unions were the only type of organisation that clearly supported the inclusion of agency workers

### Government response to Topic 3

The government recognises the contribution of agency staff and is committed to job security, fair treatment and decent pay for all workers.

Given the limited evidence base in this section and the lack of clear consensus, we will not at this stage commit to extending the SSSNB to agency workers in future legislation. The initial focus of the SSSNB will be on staff directly employed by local authorities, governing bodies and academy trusts in England. Within the first year of the SSSNB's operation, the Department for Education (DfE) will work with SSSNB member organisations to review the evidence and position for agency workers.

### Next steps

Secondary legislation will be used to include and exclude staff from the scope of the SSSNB as set out above.

The regulations will include definitions that employers will need to assess their staff against. We intend to publish non-statutory guidance to support employers to consistently identify the staff that will benefit from these new arrangements.

School support staff will continue to be covered by their existing arrangements for the 2026-27 financial year, with the first improvements to contracts as a result of the SSSNB being implemented from the 2027-28 financial year at the earliest.

We will continue to work with stakeholders on the establishment of the SSSNB and processes and will publish updated information on the dedicated SSSNB GOV.UK<sup>5</sup> page in due course.

---

<sup>5</sup> [School Support Staff Negotiating Body \(SSSNB\) - GOV.UK.](#)

## Methodology

The consultation consisted of 55 questions, which are set out in full at Annex B. A summary of the approach taken to analysing responses to the consultation is provided below, with the full methodology included in Annex C.

### Quantitative analysis

Where relevant data was available, multiple-choice questions were analysed quantitatively, with data presented as numbers and percentages of those who answered each question.

For each question, the available quantitative data from all respondents is presented, along with data for responses from individuals and from organisations. Analysing results for relevant segments, for example, individuals and organisations, is a standard method in consultation reporting. As the consultation was not a representative sample, it was not possible to complete a formal weighting of respondent types. This segmented approach ensures that the consultation findings appropriately reflect the views of individual respondents, many of whom are support staff, and organisations that employ or represent large numbers of support staff. For example, one of the main trade unions that responded reports representing around 250,000 school support staff members<sup>6</sup>.

### Qualitative analysis

Free-text responses were analysed qualitatively to identify key themes and issues raised. Where helpful, anonymised quotations are presented throughout the analysis to illustrate the views of differing respondent types.

While all responses were read by DfE officials, to improve efficiency artificial intelligence (AI) tools were used to help identify and group common themes across large volumes of text. This analysis was carefully checked and validated by data science and policy professionals to ensure it accurately reflected what respondents had said. Key themes have been summarised for each question. As with the quantitative analysis, a segmented approach was utilised so that the findings reflect the views of individual respondents and organisations where different themes were identified based on the respondent types.

---

<sup>6</sup> [Schools - UNISON National](#)

## Analysis of respondents

In total, 2,891 respondents answered the consultation questions, of which 2,677 respondents said they were individuals. A further 214 respondents said they were representing a range of differing organisations, including maintained schools and academy trusts, local authorities, representative bodies and trade unions.

## Demographic information

Individual respondents were asked to specify their gender, age, ethnicity and whether they have disabilities or are neurodivergent. Providing this information was optional. Of the individual respondents:

- 85.3% said they were female
- 83.4% said they were aged over 40 at the time of the consultation. The most commonly stated (41.0%) age group of respondents was between 50 and 59 years old
- 93.1% said that their ethnicity was white
- 15.7% said that they had a physical or mental health condition or illness lasting, or expected to last, for 12 months or more
- 6.5% said that they were neurodivergent

## Role of respondents

All individual respondents were required to specify their role:

- 90.7% said they were in a school support staff role at the time of the consultation
- 6.3% said they were senior leaders in a school, academy trust or local authority (to note, this only reflects those responses reported as an individual, not on behalf of an organisation)
- 2.2% said they were in other unspecified roles
- Fewer than 1% said they were agency workers, volunteers for a charity, membership body, or other organisation with an interest in education or employment, or said their role related to a trade union, an employer or a business representative group

## School support staff roles

Individual respondents who identified as being school support staff were asked to specify their type of support staff role. This question was optional. Of the 2,398 individual respondents who answered this question, just under half (43.1%) said that they were employed as teaching assistants. One in five (20.4%) said they were school business professionals. All other types of support staff each accounted for less than 10%.

**Table 1: Breakdown of responses to Q7 from individuals by support staff role**

Respondent type	Number of Responses	Percentage of responses
Administrative staff (for example, office staff, secretaries, central support staff)	215	9.0%
Auxiliary staff (for example, catering staff, midday supervisors, cleaners, maintenance staff)	62	2.6%
Leadership non-teacher (members of a school's senior leadership team who are not teachers)	36	1.5%
Not listed or unsure	196	8.2%
Other non-classroom-based school support staff (for example, matrons, nurses, medical staff, librarians, exam officers and invigilators, pastoral support and attendance staff)	177	7.4%
School business professionals (for example, bursars, business managers, finance officers, office managers, premises managers, information and communication technology (ICT) network managers)	488	20.4%
Teaching assistants (TAs) (for example, TAs, higher level TAs, SEND assistants, minority ethnic support staff, or others providing classroom-based support)	1,034	43.1%
Technicians (supporting for example, science, design and technology, craft, or ICT)	190	7.9%
Total	2,398	100%

## Organisations

In question 13, respondents who said they were responding on behalf of an organisation were asked to specify the type of organisations that they represented. A list of the organisations that responded is included in Annex D.

Of the 214 respondents who responded as organisations:

- most said they were employers of support staff, for example, academy trusts (37.4%), local authorities (28.5%) or maintained schools (15.9%)
- smaller numbers of responses were received from those who said they worked for other types of organisations, including trade unions (6.1%), representative bodies (2.3%) and employment agencies (2.3%). While the number of organisations is relatively small, organisations like trade unions and representative bodies responded on behalf of a large number of individuals or member organisations

Organisations were asked to complete optional questions about the numbers of support staff they employed. The data from the main employer types that answered these questions shows that:

- the 80 academy trusts that responded said they employ around 57,000 support staff
- the 61 local authorities that responded said they employ around 159,000 support staff

**Table 2: Breakdown of organisation types (in response to Q13)**

<b>Organisation type</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Percentage of responses</b>
An academy trust (for example, human resources (HR), finance or executive leader)	80	37.4%
A local authority (as an employer or oversight body for maintained schools)	61	28.5%
A maintained school or federation (for example, headteacher, governor or school business manager)	34	15.9%
A trade union (branch level)	7	3.3%
A trade union (national level)	6	2.8%
An academy or free school (for example, principal or local governor)	6	2.8%
A membership body or professional association for school staff or education professionals	5	2.3%
An employment agency	5	2.3%
Other unspecified	4	1.9%
Another stakeholder or representative organisation	3	1.4%
An employer or business representative organisation	2	0.9%
A charity or voluntary organisation working in education or employment	1	0.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Topic 1: Definition of ‘school support staff’ to inform who is in scope of the SSSNB

Topic 1 collected views on the definition of school support staff, to inform decisions about which staff will be in scope of the SSSNB when it commences operation.

In summary, the ERA 2025<sup>7</sup> defines school support staff as:

- staff employed by local authorities and governing bodies to work wholly at one or more maintained schools, as long as their pay is not set through the statutory teacher pay process
- staff employed by academy trusts to work wholly at one or more academies, who are not qualified teachers

While not exhaustive, this definition broadly covers the types of school staff who are currently covered by the NJC for terms and conditions<sup>8</sup>, and the types of roles listed as support staff in the School Workforce Census<sup>9</sup>.

The ERA 2025 sets out certain powers for the government to refine this definition and the staff in scope using secondary legislation. The government consulted on using secondary legislation to:

- exclude employees whose pay and/or conditions are negotiated or set through certain other pay or negotiating bodies
- include academy trust employees in support staff roles who work from locations other than academies
- exclude executive leaders of academy trusts, regardless of work location

Respondents were asked two questions about each proposal: a) whether they agreed with the proposal and b) whether they agreed with the proposed definitions to be included in regulations.

This part of the report includes quantitative and qualitative summaries of DfE’s analysis of the responses to each proposal, and the government’s response.

---

<sup>7</sup> The full wording can be found in paragraph 1 of schedule 4 of the [Employment Rights Act 2025](#) which will insert a new section 148C in the Education Act 2002.

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.local.gov.uk/our-support/workforce-and-hr-support/local-government-services>

<sup>9</sup> School Workforce census, reporting year 2024, Department for Education (2025). Available at: [School workforce in England, reporting year 2024 - Explore education statistics - GOV.UK](#)

## Topic 1, Proposal 1: Exclude employees whose pay and/or conditions are negotiated or set through certain other pay or negotiating bodies

The government proposed that any support staff who are covered by national pay or negotiating bodies other than the NJC, should not be included within the scope of the SSSNB. Any support staff covered by pay or negotiating bodies listed in regulations would therefore be excluded from the SSSNB's remit. The consultation proposed that staff whose pay and/or conditions are set by the following bodies would be excluded:

- **The School Teachers' Review Body (STRB)** – where the definition in the ERA 2025 does not already exclude these staff. The STRB currently covers teachers and school leaders in maintained schools
- **The Joint Negotiating Committee (JNC) for Youth and Community Workers.** This JNC covers youth workers and community development staff, often employed by local authorities
- **The Soulbury Committee.** This committee covers educational psychologists, educational improvement professionals, and managers of youth or community services
- **The JNC for Local Authority Craft and Associated Employees.** This JNC covers skilled tradespeople such as plumbers, electricians, and maintenance workers employed by local authorities
- **The JNC for Chief Officers of Local Authorities.** This JNC covers senior officers, such as directors of services within local authorities
- **The Committee for Support Staff (subcommittee) of the NJC for Staff in Sixth Form Colleges.** This covers support staff in sixth form colleges and some 16-19 academies under a separate national agreement

### Q20: Do you agree with our proposal to exclude staff from the SSSNB whose pay and conditions are determined through existing pay and negotiating bodies (other than the NJC)?

#### We heard:

2,669 individuals and 211 organisations responded to this question. The majority of respondents (86.6%) agreed with this proposal. Agreement was broadly similar from individual respondents (86.5%) and organisations (88.2%).

**Table 3: Overall responses to Q20**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	2,495	86.6%
No	158	5.5%
Unsure	227	7.9%
Total	2,880	100.0%

**Table 4: Responses to Q20 by individuals and organisations**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	2,309	86.5%	186	88.2%
No	147	5.5%	11	5.2%
Unsure	213	8.0%	14	6.6%
Total	2,669	100.0%	211	100.0%

### Q23: Do you agree with how we have defined ‘staff covered by the named existing pay and negotiating bodies’?

#### We heard:

2,661 individuals and 211 organisations responded to this question. The majority of respondents (89%) agreed with the definition proposed in the consultation. Agreement from individual respondents (89.4%) was higher than from organisations (83.9%).

**Table 5: Overall responses to Q23**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	2,555	89.0%
No	113	3.9%
Unsure	204	7.1%
Total	2,872	100.0%

**Table 6: Responses to Q23 by individuals and organisations**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Individuals total</b>	<b>Individuals %</b>	<b>Organisations total</b>	<b>Organisations %</b>
Yes	2,378	89.4%	177	83.9%
No	96	3.6%	17	8.1%
Unsure	187	7.0%	17	8.1%
Total	2,661	100%	211	100%

### **Qualitative analysis**

In total, 175 individuals and 25 organisations provided free text responses to question 20, and 107 individuals and 30 organisations provided free text responses to question 23.

Common themes included:

- the view that a single pay review body for all education staff would simplify systems, reduce inequities, and enhance collective bargaining power across roles and institutions
- advocating for the importance of including all support staff, regardless of role or institution type, to ensure fairness, unity, and consistent treatment across the sector while avoiding exclusionary practices

Feedback specifically from organisations included:

- some organisations that employ school support staff were supportive of the list of excluded bodies, but others suggested additional bodies to be included
- while the list of excluded bodies clearly defines those who will not be included in the SSSNB, for those who are, some respondents emphasised the importance of broad category definitions that allow for local flexibility in pay structures while avoiding overly prescriptive national approaches that could undermine academy trust autonomy or create inconsistencies between academies and maintained schools
- employers were also concerned about the possibility of additional burdens and equal pay risks arising from the new arrangements
- a representative organisation pointed out that the composition of craftworkers on the JNC for Local Authority Craft and Associated Employees has changed since 2010, and that consideration should therefore be given as to whether it remains appropriate for this body to be excluded

Feedback specifically from individuals included:

- some were supportive of a single national pay system to standardise pay scales, simplify processes, reduce bureaucracy, and ensure consistent treatment of all education staff across institutions
- some said that excluding the named bodies from the SSSNB might foster division, weaken collective bargaining power, and create inequities in pay and representation across similar roles in different contexts

Additionally, some respondents suggested that the following bodies should be added to those who are excluded from the scope of the SSSNB's remit:

- The NJC Committee for Teaching Staff in Sixth Form Colleges
- The NJC for Teachers in Residential Establishments or JNC of Teachers in Residential Establishments
- The JNC for Chief Executives of Local Authorities

A number of respondents chose 'unclear' as they were unfamiliar with the other negotiating bodies and could not provide an informed response.

We agree with all proposed bodies to exclude, but we also recommend that DfE specifically excludes staff covered by the NJC Committee for Teaching Staff in Sixth Form Colleges.

**From a trade union which represents school support staff**

## Government response to Topic 1, Proposal 1

**The government will proceed with this proposal. Support staff whose pay and/or conditions are negotiated or set through certain other pay or negotiating bodies will not be included in the SSSNB.**

Support staff make up roughly half of the directly employed school workforce, yet most are currently employed on terms and conditions negotiated by the NJC - a bargaining framework that covers a much wider range of local government functions.

Our aim is that the SSSNB will be a new, sector-specific body that fully reflects the needs of school support staff. It will provide support staff with a distinct voice and allow for terms and conditions that are better aligned with the realities of working in schools.

A clear majority of respondents (86.6%) agreed with the principle that staff who are covered by national pay or negotiating bodies other than the NJC should be excluded from the scope of the SSSNB. Respondents recognised that these bodies serve specific professions with sector-wide arrangements that reflect their specialist workforce needs.

Where staff already fall under dedicated national pay or negotiating bodies other than the NJC, including the STRB, the JNC for Youth and Community Workers, the Soulbury Committee, the JNC for Local Authority Craft and Associated Employees, and the NJC Committee for Staff in Sixth Form Colleges; they should remain within those frameworks. These arrangements are long-standing, well understood, and designed to reflect the requirements of their respective professions. Including them within the SSSNB would risk undermining established national structures and creating unnecessary complexity.

Several respondents suggested additional bodies that should be added to the exclusion list. Whilst we do not anticipate that many staff on the additional bodies would be captured by the SSSNB (for example, staff in sixth form colleges are already out of scope of the SSSNB based on the ERA 2025 definition), we have reflected these suggestions in the updated list of excluded bodies at Annex A, to ensure that staff covered by any of the bodies listed are not in scope of the SSSNB.

Unqualified teachers and trainee teachers in maintained schools are already excluded from the SSSNB through the existing definition. In the future, as a result of the measures in the Children's Wellbeing and Schools Act (CWSA) 2026, academies will be required to offer at least a minimum level of pay and to have regard to the School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document (STPCD), meaning they must follow it unless they have a good reason not to. However, these changes will not be in place when the SSSNB becomes operational. We want this exclusion to also apply in academies from the outset, so we will also use a separate regulation making power to exclude unqualified teachers and trainee teachers in academies from the SSSNB, ensuring consistency with maintained schools. Early years educators without Qualified Teacher Status (QTS), who are currently covered by the NJC, will be in scope of the SSSNB.

We recognise that some respondents advocated for a single national framework covering all school and education staff. However, the purpose of the SSSNB is to give school support staff a specific voice that represents their needs. Staff who will not be covered by the SSSNB should remain on the existing arrangements that serve their professions.

We also recognise the concerns raised by some respondents about potential administrative burdens and equal pay implications. We will continue to work closely with stakeholders to ensure that the introduction of the SSSNB is proportionate, well-managed and minimises disruption, and that employers and employees are supported through the transition with necessary guidance.

## Topic 1, Proposal 2: Academy trust employees who work from locations other than academies

The ERA 2025 establishes that support staff employed by academy trusts and working wholly at an academy or academies are in scope of the SSSNB. It also gives the government the power to bring in other academy trust employees carrying out work of a prescribed description for the purposes of academies through regulations.

In the consultation, the government proposed that staff in support staff roles who work from locations other than an academy or academies should be in scope of the SSSNB. This could include HR or administrative staff working from an academy trust's central or head office.

### Q21: Do you agree with the proposal to include academy trust employees in support staff roles who work from locations other than academies (including off-site academy staff)?

#### We heard:

2,673 individuals and 212 organisations responded to this question. The majority of respondents (91.9%) agreed with this proposal. Agreement from individual respondents (93.0%) was higher than from organisations (78.3%).

**Table 7: Overall responses to Q21**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	2,651	91.9%
No	123	4.3%
Unsure	111	3.9%
Total	2,885	100%

**Table 8: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q21**

Answer	Individuals Total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	2,485	93.0%	166	78.3%
No	95	3.6%	28	13.2%
Unsure	93	3.5%	18	8.5%
Total	2,673	100%	212	100%

## Q24: Do you agree with how we have defined central academy trust staff?

### We heard:

2,665 individuals and 211 organisations responded to this question. The majority of respondents (93.5%) agreed with the definition. A higher proportion of individuals (94.6%) than organisations (79.6%) agreed with the definition.

**Table 9: Overall responses to Q24**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	2,689	93.5%
No	70	2.4%
Unsure	117	4.1%
Total	2,876	100%

**Table 10: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q24**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	2,521	94.6%	168	79.6%
No	45	1.7%	25	11.8%
Unsure	99	3.7%	18	8.5%
Total	2,665	100%	211	100%

### Qualitative analysis

In total, 97 individuals and 48 organisations provided free text responses to question 21, and 55 individuals and 36 organisations provided free text responses to question 24.

Those in favour of including central academy trust support staff said that this would improve equity and parity across employment models and support for minimum standards with room for local flexibility. Some were concerned about a two-tier workforce if central staff are not included, and the risk of undermining morale for staff.

Those not in favour of including central academy trust staff argued that this proposal would undermine the autonomy of the academy system, and that academy trusts should be responsible for determining the roles that should be in scope.

Feedback specifically from organisations included:

- a suggestion that the focus should be on pupil facing roles based on the distinct nature of school based versus central roles; that including centrally-based

academy trust staff would lead to administrative burdens for academy trusts based on the complexity and variability of academy trust staffing models; and that there is a lack of data held on central academy trust staff to assess the impact of inclusion

- some organisations argued that central academy trust staff should be included but only if senior staff are excluded (linked to the next proposal)

In their feedback, some individual respondents:

- emphasised the fundamental differences between school-based and off-site roles, particularly in terms of direct student interaction, working environments, and responsibilities, such as administrative versus student-facing duties

Academy trusts, as independent employers, should determine to which roles the SSSNB applies. There are too many roles and too many employers for the SSSNB to be able to identify each nuance and define where each specific role in a school or trust sits. This would undermine the legal autonomy of trusts and their ability to structure their workforce in a way that is most effective in improving outcomes for children

**From a representative body which responded on behalf of academy trusts**

If the SSSNB establishes a floor for pay and core terms and conditions, we do agree that trust employees who work from locations other than academies should be included. Having school-based professional services staff on different terms and conditions to central professional services staff would make career development moves more difficult. Our trust works as one family; we would not want to impose distinctions between central office based staff and those in schools.

**From an academy trust which reports that it employs around 1,200 school support staff**

Many academy trusts currently use the outcome of the national NJC negotiations to determine the pay and conditions for their support staff irrespective of location. On that basis the same school support staff roles in academies should be in scope for the SSSNB. This would be consistent with the previous approach of one set of collectively agreed terms applying across all those employees.

**From a representative body which responded on behalf of local authorities and their maintained schools**

## Government response to Topic 1, Proposal 2

**The government will proceed with this proposal. Academy trust employees in support staff roles who work from locations other than an academy or academies will be included in the SSSNB.**

Our aim is to ensure that directly employed staff, other than teachers, supporting the operation of schools - including supporting pupils, school facilities and school processes - up to and including middle leadership roles, are included within the scope of the SSSNB and will benefit from the statutory minimum levels that follow from it. This applies whether those staff work in a single school, across a group of schools, or from a central location within an academy trust.

The consultation showed strong support for this approach. Across all respondents, 91.9% agreed that academy trust employees in support staff roles who work from locations other than academies should be included. Agreement was high among both individuals (93.0%) and organisations (78.3%). A similarly high proportion of all respondents (93.5%) agreed with the definition of central academy trust staff. These findings demonstrate clear backing for ensuring parity and avoiding the development of a two-tier system between school-based support staff and central academy trust support staff.

We recognise the concerns raised by those who disagreed, including those responding on behalf of academy trusts, who emphasised the distinctiveness of central roles and the importance of academy trusts retaining autonomy over staffing models. The new legislation in the ERA 2025 allows employers to offer more favourable terms than those set by the SSSNB, ensuring academy trusts retain flexibility and can continue to innovate in how they structure and reward staff.

We also heard concerns about the complexity and diversity of central academy trust roles and the need for clear definitions and better data on central trust roles. Our intention is to include support staff in operational roles equivalent to those performed in schools, and to not include those in senior strategic leadership or executive leadership positions (linked to the proposal below). For example, staff in administrative, IT, estates, and other business support functions will be in scope if they are not senior strategic roles, and staff in more senior roles, like Chief Executive Officers (CEOs), Chief Operating Officers (COOs), Chief Financial Officers (CFOs), and Finance Directors will not be in scope. We also do not intend to include staff providing wider professional advisory services, such as in-house lawyers, which are found in the private sector and do not have equivalents in maintained schools.

We want to avoid inadvertently including staff who are not considered to be support staff, and whose needs and functions are qualitatively different to the intended cohort. Accordingly, academy trust employees in support staff roles who work from locations other than at an academy or academies, will be included within the first set of regulations

establishing the SSSNB. This ensures that staff performing comparable operational functions for schools receive consistent statutory minimum protections, regardless of where they are physically located or how their employer structures its staffing model.

We will work closely with stakeholders, including representative organisations, during the development of the secondary legislation to ensure that definitions of 'support staff' working centrally are clear, practical and workable.

The transition to the SSSNB will also be gradual so that the system and staff can adapt to the new arrangements. In the early stages, the focus will be on incremental changes to contracts that lead to cumulative improvements in support staff terms and conditions each year. This includes establishing a clear framework of baseline terms and conditions applicable across the system, while allowing employers to continue to offer more generous terms and conditions where appropriate.

This approach is intended to deliver early, practical improvements for support staff before taking on more complex reforms in the longer term.

## Topic 1, Proposal 3: Exclude executive leaders of academy trusts

The government proposed that executive leaders of academy trusts should not be included within the SSSNB's scope. This was because senior leaders like CEOs, COOs or CFOs have distinct characteristics and needs from the intended support staff cohort. Executive leader (as defined in the Academy Trusts: Governance Guide<sup>10</sup>) pay is subject to the requirements set out in the ATH<sup>11</sup>.

In the consultation, the government proposed that these staff should be defined in line with the CWSA 2026. In secondary legislation, they would be described as 'staff appointed by the proprietor of an academy as an executive leader of the proprietor'. In plain terms, this means senior leaders, such as CEOs, who are directly appointed by an academy trust and have overall responsibility for running it.

### Q22: Do you agree with the proposal to exclude executive leaders of academy trusts from the SSSNB?

#### We heard:

2,674 individuals and 210 organisations responded to this question. The majority (83.7%) of all respondents agreed with the proposal. A higher proportion of individuals (84.6%) than organisations (72.9%) agreed with the proposal.

**Table 11: Overall responses to Q22**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	2,414	83.7%
No	313	10.9%
Unsure	157	5.4%
Total	2,884	100%

---

<sup>10</sup> [Academy trusts: governance guide - GOV.UK](#)

<sup>11</sup> [Academy trust handbook 2025: effective from 1 September 2025 - GOV.UK](#)

**Table 12: Responses to Q22 by individuals and organisations**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	2,261	84.6%	153	72.9%
No	284	10.6%	29	13.8%
Unsure	129	4.8%	28	13.3%
Total	2,674	100%	210	100%

### Q25: Do you agree with how we have defined executive leaders of academy trusts?

#### We heard:

2,588 individuals and 211 organisations responded to this question. The majority (90.5%) of all respondents agreed with the definition. A higher proportion of individuals (91.8%) than organisations (73.9%) agreed with the definition.

**Table 13: Overall responses to Q25**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	2,532	90.5%
No	86	3.1%
Unsure	181	6.5%
Total	2,799	100%

**Table 14: Responses to Q25 by individuals and organisations**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	2,376	91.8%	156	73.9%
No	60	2.3%	26	12.3%
Unsure	152	5.9%	29	13.7%
Total	2,588	100%	211	100%

#### Qualitative analysis

In total, 237 individuals and 61 organisations provided free text responses to question 22, and 71 individuals and 43 organisations provided free text responses to question 25. Common themes included:

- the definition of executive leaders should clearly distinguish roles with strategic oversight, and that it should be precise, practical, and avoid ambiguity or misclassification
- respondents who suggested executive leaders should be in the SSSNB's scope called for transparent mechanisms to oversee executive pay, including salary caps, external oversight, and clear frameworks to ensure accountability, public trust, and responsible use of public funds.

Feedback specifically from organisations included:

- some agreed with the principle of excluding executive leaders, but felt the definition was too narrow and should be expanded to other leaders whose responsibilities and needs are different from those traditionally considered 'support staff', including in maintained schools as well as in academies
- in line with arguments made in responses to the previous proposal, some suggested that academy trusts should have autonomy to determine specific roles that are included in and excluded from the SSSNB. In particular, some organisations representing academies disagreed with the proposed definition due to concerns about possible reduced autonomy
- some were concerned that a 'one size fits all' approach would fail to account for localised variability in academy trusts, and variabilities in role responsibilities across academy trusts
- some trade unions argued against the exclusion of executive leaders, and that all non-teaching roles up to and including the most senior staff in academies should be included to help address pay disparities across the sector

feedback specifically from individual respondents included:

- calls for transparency and accountability in executive pay, including public oversight, benchmarking against comparable roles, and aligning remuneration with performance and public sector standards
- concerns about pay inequalities: excluding executive leaders from the SSSNB could exacerbate pay disparities, creating inequities between senior leaders and lower-paid staff while fostering perceptions of unfairness within academy trusts

Those working in business leadership roles are not support staff. They do not ‘support’ the work of teachers and leaders; they themselves are senior leaders. business or executive leaders who undertake whole school, college or trust responsibilities and are an integral part of the leadership team. This should be reflected in their status and remuneration by them being brought into the scope of the STPCD alongside other leadership colleagues.

**From a membership body that represents school and academy trust leaders**

The freedom to set executive pay (within the statutory guidelines) is useful when we need to be competitive in order to attract the best leaders into our Trust.

**From an academy trust which reports that it employs over 300 school support staff**

**Q26: Are there any other staff who, under the broad definition of ‘school support staff’ in the Employment Rights Bill<sup>12</sup>, would still be included (after the proposed exclusions above) — but who you think should not be?**

**We heard:**

2,557 individuals and 209 organisations responded to this question. Less than one in five (17.6%) of all respondents answered ‘yes’ to this question. A slightly higher proportion of organisations (22.5%) than individuals (17.2%) expressed this view. Most respondents (68.9%) answered ‘no’ to this question.

**Table 15: Overall responses to Q26**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	488	17.6%
No	1,905	68.9%
Unsure	373	13.5%
Total	2,766	100%

---

<sup>12</sup> This Bill has become law and is now the ERA 2025.

**Table 16: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q26**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Individuals total</b>	<b>Individuals %</b>	<b>Organisations Total</b>	<b>Organisations %</b>
Yes	441	17.2%	47	22.5%
No	1,772	69.3%	133	63.6%
Unsure	344	13.5%	29	13.9%
Total	2,557	100%	209	100%

### **Qualitative analysis**

In total 157 individuals and 41 organisations provided free text feedback. Common themes included:

- suggestions for other staff who should be excluded from the definition in the legislation, including strategic roles like school business leaders, and academy trust-level staff should be excluded as their responsibilities align with organisational leadership rather than operational or student-facing support functions
- a more simplified definition focusing on ‘staff who are not teachers’ is needed to reduce confusion around hybrid roles while ensuring clear boundaries between school-based support roles and external providers

Some organisations suggested that:

- support staff employed by local authorities, academy trusts, or external providers who work across multiple schools or are not directly managed by individual schools should be excluded

Some individual respondents said that:

- non-teaching staff centrally employed by academy trusts who do not provide educational support, like caterers, caretakers, HR or finance staff, should not be included because they operate under different working conditions and pay structures compared to those carrying out similar roles in mainstream schools
- ICT professionals, including technicians and network managers, perform advanced technical functions requiring specialised expertise. Their responsibilities necessitate a distinct classification reflecting their technical skillset and value.

## Q27: Are there any other staff working centrally for academy trusts who you think should be included (but would not be under our current proposal)?

### We heard:

2,549 individuals and 207 organisations responded to this question. Less than one in ten of all respondents (7.8%) answered 'yes' to this question. The majority (67.2%) of all respondents did not think that any other staff working centrally for academy trusts should be included. This view was consistent across both individuals (67.2%) and organisations (67.6%).

**Table 17: Overall responses to Q27**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	215	7.8%
No	1,852	67.2%
Unsure	689	25.0%
Total	2,756	100%

**Table 18: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q27**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations Total	Organisations %
Yes	189	7.4%	26	12.6%
No	1,712	67.2%	140	67.6%
Unsure	648	25.4%	41	19.8%
Total	2,549	100%	207	100%

### Qualitative analysis

In total, 193 individuals and 41 organisations provided free text feedback to this question. Common themes included:

- calls for the inclusion of all non-teaching, operational support staff and governance professionals in academy trusts, including outsourced workers like cleaning and catering operatives; ICT, HR, finance, and facilities management staff; HR and compliance specialists; pastoral and SEND support staff; early years practitioners and wraparound care staff; exam officers and administrative specialists. Including these roles would ensure equity across all operational staff

Feedback specifically from organisations included:

- calls for clarity on role definitions for academy trust staff like office managers, finance assistants, governance professionals, and centrally employed staff to address inconsistencies in categorisations between academy trusts
- some academy trusts said that executive-level business leaders and their administrative teams should be included due to their critical leadership responsibilities supporting academy trust boards or senior executives

Feedback specifically from individual respondents included:

- exams officers and invigilators play a critical role in ensuring the smooth execution of examinations, compliance with regulations, and logistical planning, and should be explicitly recognised as distinct from other administrative or casual roles
- including outsourced staff (for example cleaners or catering staff), casual workers (for example invigilators or minibus drivers), and agency staff are essential to school operations despite non-standard employment arrangements. They should be included to address disparities in recognition

Executive leaders are not support staff and should not be brought within the scope of the SSSNB. Trust boards and leaders must retain full autonomy over the pay, conditions, and responsibilities of their executive teams. The component parts of the executive leadership team will differ between each trust. As this autonomy will be necessary to determine the roles that are excluded, the same principle should apply for trusts to determine which are included.

**From a representative body which responded on behalf of academy trusts**

## Government response to Topic 1, Proposal 3

**The government will proceed with this proposal. Executive leaders in academy trusts will be excluded from the scope of the SSSNB. This exclusion will be extended to senior leaders with strategic responsibilities in maintained schools and academies.**

A substantial majority of respondents (83.7%) agreed that executive leaders of academy trusts should be excluded from the scope of the SSSNB. Many respondents - particularly academy trusts - emphasised the need to preserve the flexibility to design leadership structures that support the academy trust's strategic and legal responsibilities, including financial management, organisational oversight and school improvement across multiple schools. We agree that the SSSNB is not the right approach for executive leaders.

We also agree with respondents who said that individuals who hold strategic and organisational leadership responsibilities are not 'school support staff', and that the definition of 'executive leaders' alone would not fully capture senior non-teaching leadership roles in maintained schools and academy trusts. Senior, non-teaching leaders such as finance directors, senior business, finance and operational leaders within schools and academy trusts have responsibilities that are qualitatively different from operational support staff roles. They plan, direct and control activity across entire organisations. These roles therefore fall outside the intended scope of the SSSNB.

Excluding senior leaders across all settings creates a clear, consistent boundary between operational support staff (in scope) and strategic leadership roles (out of scope), regardless of employer type.

Some respondents, including trade unions, argued that excluding executive leaders could reinforce pay inequalities. Others called for greater oversight of senior pay. We acknowledge these concerns. However, the SSSNB is intended to address the needs of the school support staff workforce, not the most senior roles. More widely, we are clear that levels of pay and progression for academy trust executives must be fair, proportionate and aligned to wider public sector pay principles, and that academy trustees should adhere to these principles in setting pay, supported by our guidance and advice. We have recently announced changes to the ATH to take effect from September 2026. This will limit executive pay increases, ensuring appropriate transparency and value for money for taxpayers and bringing academy trust executive pay in line with the wider public sector.

We also heard calls for clearer definitions and for guidance that avoids misclassifying specialist operational roles (such as ICT managers or finance officers) as senior leaders simply because they hold supervisory responsibilities. We agree that clarity is essential. We will work closely with stakeholders, including representative organisations, during the

development of secondary legislation to ensure that definitions of 'senior leaders' are clear, practical and workable. This will ensure that:

- operational support roles (up to and including middle leaders) remain within the SSSNB's scope
- strategic senior and executive leaders are consistently and appropriately excluded

This approach reinforces the purpose of the SSSNB: to establish consistent minimum terms and conditions for the operational school support staff workforce, while retaining the autonomy and flexibility that is needed to run academy trusts and maintained schools effectively and ensure that every child has the opportunity to achieve and thrive in their educational environment.

## Topic 2: Call for evidence on existing pay and terms and conditions

Topic 2 of the consultation was a call for evidence to enhance the government and DfE's understanding of the current arrangements for pay, terms and conditions of support staff, and to inform the transition to the new system under the SSSNB. This part of the report includes quantitative and qualitative summaries of DfE's analysis of each question included in the call for evidence, and the government's response. The qualitative and quantitative analysis is presented as described in the methodology.

### Topic 2: Evidence from employers

Employers were asked to respond to the following questions.

#### Q28: Do you use NJC National Agreement on Pay and Conditions of Service (the Green Book) for school support staff?

##### We heard:

1,276 individuals and 191 organisations responded to this question. Most respondents (67.2%) said they use the Green Book for school support staff. A higher proportion of organisations (79.6%) than individual respondents (65.4%) said they use the Green Book.

**Table 19: Overall responses to Q28**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	986	67.2%
No	91	6.2%
Unsure	390	26.6%
Total	1,467	100%

**Table 20: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q28**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	834	65.4%	152	79.6%
No	63	4.9%	28	14.7%
Unsure	379	29.7%	11	5.8%
Total	1,276	100%	191	100%

## Qualitative analysis

In total, 80 individuals and 43 organisations provided free text feedback. Common themes included:

- the Green Book or alternative frameworks provide a baseline, but employers make local amendments to pay, leave, or other terms to address recruitment challenges, operational needs, or regional priorities. This partial adherence reflects a balance between national consistency and local flexibility
- historical agreements, including those from TUPE transfers, also shape variations in terms and conditions across schools or regions and within organisations

Feedback specifically from organisations included:

- some employers said they make local amendments to pay, leave, or other terms to address recruitment challenges, market demands, operational needs, or regional priorities
- some employers were also concerned about potential cost increases associated with fully aligning with national frameworks, while striving to maintain financial sustainability
- some academy trusts said they prefer to maintain decision-making autonomy at academy trust or organisational level rather than adhering strictly to national agreements like the Green Book, to add localised flexibilities

We mainly default to the Green Book, though we have some historical staff who joined the trust on slightly different terms which are honoured.

### **From an academy trust which reports that it employs around 200 school support staff**

Yes, we do use the Green Book, however, some provisions have been agreed locally and are more favourable, for example maternity and annual leave.

### **From a local authority which reports that it employs over 1,200 school support staff**

## Q29: Do you pay school support staff based on the pay points in the NJC pay spine?

### We heard:

925 individuals and 191 organisations responded to this question. Most respondents (73.7%) said that they pay school support staff based on the pay points in the NJC pay spine. A slightly higher proportion of organisations (77.5%) than individual respondents (73.0%) said they use the NJC pay spine. Around a fifth of individual respondents (20.3%) were unsure, compared with a much smaller proportion (5.2%) of organisations.

**Table 21: Overall responses to Q29**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	823	73.7%
No	95	8.5%
Unsure	198	17.7%
Total	1,116	100%

**Table 22: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q29**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	675	73.0%	148	77.5%
No	62	6.7%	33	17.3%
Unsure	188	20.3%	10	5.2%
Total	925	100%	191	100%

### Qualitative analysis

In total, 90 individuals and 53 organisations provided free text feedback in response to question 29. Common themes included:

- similar to question 28, many employers use the NJC pay spine as a foundation, adapting it locally by modifying grades, adding points, or incorporating regional adjustments to reflect regional or organisational priorities like recruitment and retention in challenging labour markets
- placement within a pay grade can also be influenced by candidate-specific factors such as prior experience, qualifications, expertise, or line management responsibilities. To attract and retain talent, particularly in senior roles or in areas where the cost of living is relatively high, employers said they adjust pay structures by introducing market supplements, regional allowances, or competitive rates

- some employers have developed independent pay structures or adopted alternative frameworks to better align with operational needs while maintaining flexibility for career progression and competitiveness. For example, when staff transfer under TUPE regulations, their previous pay grades are retained unless replaced by a new employer-specific framework that aligns with organisational needs

Feedback specifically from organisations included:

- some employers said they utilise bespoke local agreements, like the Greater London Provincial Council (GLPC) pay spine for London, the Kent Scheme or the Hay Scale, independently negotiated scales like United Learning, or separate collective bargaining mechanisms

Feedback specifically from individuals included:

- concerns that some pay scales are outdated and fail to adequately reflect the skills, responsibilities, and experience required for certain roles, especially senior positions in schools

### **Q30: How do you decide where to put support staff (that is, at which pay point) on the pay structure that you use?**

#### **We heard:**

This was a free text only option so there is no quantitative analysis of this question.

#### **Qualitative analysis**

In total, 538 individuals and 188 organisations provided free text feedback to this question. Common themes included:

- many said they use formal job evaluation systems, external benchmarking and detailed role profiles to assess responsibilities, skills, and accountability. This helps to ensure equity, fairness, transparency, consistency, and compliance with equal pay legislation, and competitiveness in attracting and retaining staff
- some respondents said that budgetary limitations significantly influence pay decisions, as employers strive to balance fair compensation with financial sustainability at the school or academy trust level amidst rising costs like inflation or minimum wage increases. Other challenges include outdated job descriptions or evaluation systems that fail to reflect modern roles

Feedback specifically from organisations included:

- some employers said they align roles with similar responsibilities within organisations and against local job markets and national frameworks, to maintain fairness and address historical disparities in pay structures. Localised recruitment

challenges and retention needs also influence pay placement, with higher starting salaries or incentives offered for hard-to-fill or specialised roles

- in local authorities that provided feedback to this question, decisions about pay points often involve consultation with trade unions or staff representatives to ensure transparency, fairness, and alignment with organisational priorities
- in academy trusts, inherited pay structures from local authorities or TUPE agreements continue to influence decisions for existing staff while new roles are aligned with current frameworks. There are challenges to maintaining consistency across regions with varying historical agreements

Feedback specifically from individual respondents included:

- views that decisions on pay placement should consider an individual's skills, qualifications, prior experience, and specific responsibilities. Additional factors like previous salaries or recruitment discussions may also influence initial placement decisions
- views that many employers start new staff at the bottom of the pay scale unless significant prior experience justifies a higher placement. Structured progression policies provide clear pathways for career development through annual increments within grades

We use benchmarking on role profiles across the Trust's schools and other available vacancies in similar roles. Our benchmark scale point allocation originated from the local authority job evaluation exercise.

**From an academy trust which reports that it employs over 300 school support staff**

We evaluate roles using the Green Book and the job profile for the role. This determines the pay grade for the role and our policy is to place employees on the bottom scale point within those grades. However, managers do have discretion to appoint further up the pay grade if required for recruitment and retention purposes.

**From a local authority which reports that it employs over 800 school support staff**

We use the Hay job evaluation to evaluate job descriptions to determine which grade a post should be allocated to. Employees then progress through the pay points within the grade annually during the annual pay review.

**From a local authority which reports that it employs over 5,000 school support staff**

## Q31: Are there any parts of contracts with your staff that you would be concerned about changing under the SSSNB?

### We heard:

634 individuals and 186 organisations responded to this question. Just under half of all respondents (42.0%) said that there are not any parts of contracts with their staff that they would be concerned about changing under the SSSNB, and a similar proportion (40.9%) were unsure. Organisations (42.5%) were much more likely than individual respondents (9.8%) to be concerned about changing parts of their staff's contracts.

**Table 23: Overall responses to Q31**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	141	17.2%
No	344	42.0%
Unsure	335	40.9%
Total	820	100%

**Table 24: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q31**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	62	9.8%	79	42.5%
No	280	44.2%	64	34.4%
Unsure	292	46.1%	43	23.1%
Total	634	100%	186	100%

### Qualitative analysis

In total, 77 individuals and 99 organisations provided free text feedback to this question. The most common themes arising from the feedback from all respondents included:

- safeguarding current entitlements such as annual leave, sick pay, maternity and paternity benefits, and redundancy terms are critical for maintaining morale and avoiding dissatisfaction under a new framework
- moving away from existing terms and conditions could create inconsistencies, impede the recruitment of good quality support staff, lead to equality risks and negatively impact on morale
- challenges around fairness in term-time-only calculations compared to full-year staff, with clearer guidance needed on working hours, holiday entitlements, and alignment with teacher contracts

Feedback specifically from organisations included:

- concerns expressed by local authority employers around equal pay risks if staff on SSSNB terms are paid differently from equivalent roles in the Green Book; clarity is needed on interactions with existing job evaluation schemes; significant changes to pay structures or entitlements could impose unsustainable financial burdens on employers, staff reductions, service delivery impacts, or loss of locally negotiated enhancements
- concerns expressed by academy trust employers around the need for flexibility and autonomy to tailor contractual arrangements to local contexts; that any overly restrictive terms under SSSNB could exacerbate recruitment difficulties for more specialised roles; and that flexibility in offering incentives was seen as essential to attract talent

Feedback specifically from individual respondents included:

- the need to maintain flexibility in working hours, term-time arrangements, and holiday entitlements to support operational needs and staff well-being. Some expressed concerns about potential inflexible terms under SSSNB frameworks
- ensuring fairness in pay structures was a key concern, with calls for clear differentiation based on responsibilities, qualifications, and experience rather than tenure alone

We have staff who are non-executives, such as safeguarding leads, but who are paid on Green Book terms and conditions. There is a danger that staff like these will fall between definitions, as they are not support staff or executives.

**From an academy trust which reports that it employs over 1,000 school support staff**

Changes to pay and conditions may result in equal pay challenges. We have been consulting and changing a number of support staff contracts from all year round to term-time-only and changes to this may bring about challenges.

**From a local authority which reports that it employs over 3,200 school support staff**

## Topic 2: Evidence from employees

Employees were asked to respond to the following question:

### Q32: Are there any parts of your current contract that you would be concerned about changing under the SSSNB?

#### We heard:

1,949 individuals and 105 organisations responded to this question. 12.5% of respondents said they were concerned about their contracts changing, with most respondents saying they were unsure (47.2%). Individual respondents (48.2%) were more likely to be unsure than organisations (29.5%), and organisations (20.0%) were more likely to be concerned than individuals (12.1%).

**Table 25: Overall responses to Q32**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	257	12.5%
No	827	40.3%
Unsure	970	47.2%
Total	2,054	100%

**Table 26: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q32**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	236	12.1%	21	20.0%
No	774	39.7%	53	50.5%
Unsure	939	48.2%	31	29.5%
Total	1,949	100%	105	100%

#### Qualitative analysis

In total, 326 individuals and 34 organisations provided free text feedback to this question. Common themes included:

- concerns about pay cuts, reduced remuneration, and reduction in benefits (for example working hours, sick pay, or holiday entitlements) and calls for protection against unilateral changes to contracts and the erosion of TUPE protections
- advocacy for pay structures that reflect specific roles, specialised skills (for example, SEND staff), tenure, and additional responsibilities while addressing

disparities in grading and ensuring fair pro-rated pay for part-time staff or extra hours worked

Feedback specifically from individual respondents included:

- calls for clear communication regarding proposed changes to contracts with transparent guidance on how pay is determined alongside detailed contracts outlining hours worked, duties, holiday entitlements, notice periods, allowances, grading and pay progression
- concerns from some that they may be assigned additional duties without proper training or corresponding increases in pay under new contractual arrangements
- support from some for standardised contracts for fairness, while others feared they could erode local benefits like holiday entitlements or tenure-based rewards. Balancing equity with regional flexibility was seen as critical by some respondents
- calls from some for the retention of flexible contract options (for example, term-time-only arrangements or annualised hours) to accommodate personal circumstances while ensuring changes do not negatively impact work-life balance or financial stability
- concerns expressed by a small number about job security and outsourcing and advocated for protection through SSSNB agreements to ensure stability in employment terms
- concerns expressed by a small number about maintaining employer pension contributions and other long-term benefits under the new terms to ensure financial security without reductions in entitlements or protections

Pay has not kept pace with the changing nature of school support roles and the current pay scales do not allow for career progression.

**From a school business professional**

Terms in our contracts are being used by our school to force support staff into taking on tasks that outweigh our roles. I would be concerned if this did not change.

**From a teaching assistant**

I am concerned about potential changes to flexibility in pay due to responsibility and skills. My academy trust pays above NJC pay scale.

**From a technician**

I want to see clarity in terms of any proposed contract changes, more clarification on contractual benefits and rights under a new SSSNB.

**From a school business professional**

At the moment, my current contract specifies spine points according to my local county. I would want reassurance that I would not lower my current spine points under a national agreement. Our role is already poorly defined as 'admin' and I would not want that to worsen.

**From an exams officer**

## Government response to Topic 2

Topic 2 was a call for evidence designed to improve our understanding of the current arrangements for the pay, terms and conditions of school support staff. The school system has changed significantly since the first SSSNB was established in 2010 and this evidence will help the government and DfE prepare for the transition to the new system under the SSSNB. We are grateful to the many employers and employees who shared detailed information about their current frameworks, challenges and priorities. Across the responses, several clear themes emerged.

First, most employers reported using the Green Book as the basis for determining pay and conditions for support staff, although many indicated that they adapt it locally. Employers explained that they make modifications to address local recruitment and retention difficulties, labour-market pressures, operational needs and regional priorities. Some settings, including academy trusts, use alternative frameworks or bespoke pay structures. Support staff themselves also valued the flexibility offered by current arrangements, particularly where this supports family circumstances, work-life balance, or local cost-of-living factors.

Second, we heard that employers are concerned about maintaining the ability to tailor pay, grading and entitlements to reflect the diverse and increasingly specialised nature of support staff roles. Many referred to market supplements, regional adjustments or targeted incentives that help them recruit and retain skilled staff. Respondents also highlighted the continued impact of TUPE arrangements and historic agreements, which have created variation within and across schools and academy trusts.

Third, we heard a strong message from both employers and staff about the importance of certainty and protection during transition. Many respondents wanted reassurance that existing contractual entitlements; for example, annual leave, sick pay, maternity and paternity provisions, redundancy terms and term-time arrangements, would not be reduced. Concerns were also raised about equal pay risks, particularly if SSSNB terms interact differently with local government job-evaluation schemes or with locally enhanced arrangements in academies.

We recognise the importance of protections for staff, and flexibilities for both employers and staff. As set out in the consultation, the SSSNB will establish minimum statutory terms and conditions, not maxima. The ERA 2025 now confirms this in law. This means that:

- staff who currently have more favourable terms than any minimum set by the SSSNB will retain them
- staff whose terms fall below SSSNB minimums will be uplifted to the statutory floor

- employers will continue to have the flexibility to offer more than the statutory minimums, ensuring they can respond to local needs and labour market conditions

This approach protects staff while ensuring that employers retain the autonomy they need to respond to local labour markets and operational challenges.

We also recognise the need for a smooth and managed transition. To support this, school support staff will continue under their existing arrangements during the 2026–27 financial year, with SSSNB outcomes applying from the 2027–28 financial year at the earliest. This phased approach provides time for staff, employers and representative bodies to understand how the SSSNB will operate and to prepare for implementation.

Finally, we take seriously the concerns raised about equal pay risks and implementation burdens. We are working closely with trade unions and national employer bodies, including the Local Government Association and academy trust representatives, to understand any interactions with existing job evaluation schemes and to ensure that guidance supports employers to manage transition confidently and in compliance with their legal duties.

We will continue to engage actively with employers, support staff and representative bodies as we develop the secondary legislation, guidance and supporting materials necessary for the successful implementation of the SSSNB.

## Topic 3: Agency workers

In some schools and academy trusts, agency workers<sup>13</sup> are temporarily employed as support staff. As outlined in the consultation, this group was not included in the new legislation that established the SSSNB because the government wanted to:

- a) find out more about differences in agency workers' working patterns and employment terms from support staff who are permanently employed by schools and academy trusts
- b) consult on whether, and how, to include agency staff in the SSSNB's remit through future legislation

Topic 3 is therefore presented in two parts. Part 1 includes the analysis of evidence collected from employment agencies, agency workers and employers on the current arrangements for agency workers in school support staff roles. Part 2 is the analysis of the government's consultation on whether agency workers should be in scope of the SSSNB in the future.

---

<sup>13</sup> In the consultation, 'agency workers' were defined as people who have a contract with an employment business (or 'agency') and work temporarily for a 'hirer' – in this case, a school employer. This is normally called 'temporary agency work' or 'temping'. This does not include workers who get permanent or fixed-term jobs at a school through an agency, as they are employed by a school, and not by an agency.

## Topic 3, Part 1: Call for evidence on agency workers in school support staff roles

In the first part of Topic 3, the government sought evidence from employment agencies and agency workers on the current arrangements for agency workers who are temporarily employed in school support staff roles.

### Topic 3, Part 1: Evidence from employment agencies

Employment agencies were asked to respond to the following questions.

#### Q33: Have you placed any individual workers in both school support staff roles and other types of roles not related to schools (outside of schools, academies, or academy trust offices)?

##### We heard:

In total, 140 individuals and 32 organisations, including 5 employment agencies, responded to this question. A quarter (25%) of all respondents said they have placed individual workers in the specified roles. A higher proportion of organisations (31.2%) than individual respondents (23.6%) said that they had done this. Over a third of individual respondents (39.3%) were unsure of their answer to this question.

There was no option for respondents to provide additional free text feedback in response to this question, so there is no qualitative analysis.

**Table 27: Overall responses to Q33**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	43	25.0%
No	69	40.1%
Unsure	60	34.9%
Total	172	100%

**Table 28: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q33**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	33	23.6%	10	31.2%
No	52	37.1%	17	53.1%
Unsure	55	39.3%	5	15.6%
Total	140	100%	32	100%

## Q34: Do you use the NJC agreements to help set pay and conditions for agency workers in school support staff roles?

### We heard:

In total, 117 individuals and 18 organisations, including 3 employment agencies, responded to this question. Less than one in five (18.5%) of all respondents said that they use the NJC agreements to help set pay and conditions for agency support staff. Over half (52.6%) were unsure and just under a third (28.9%) stated that they do not use it. 16.7% of the 18 organisations that answered this question use the NJC for pay and conditions, and half (50%) of these organisations do not use it.

**Table 29: Overall responses to Q34**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	25	18.5%
No	39	28.9%
Unsure	71	52.6%
Total	135	100%

**Table 30: Responses by Responses by individuals and organisations to Q34**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	22	18.8%	3	16.7%
No	30	25.6%	9	50.0%
Unsure	65	55.6%	6	33.3%
Total	117	100%	18	100%

### Qualitative analysis

In total, 14 individuals and 10 organisations provided free text feedback to this question. Themes arising from the feedback from organisations included:

- some employers, including employment agencies, said they use the NJC pay scales and compliance with the Agency Workers Regulations (AWR) to ensure fairness and alignment with standard practises. However, the application varies across contracts, dependent upon local demand, budgets, or fixed daily rates
- some set independent pay scales outside NJC terms, and some employment agencies offer additional benefits like higher wages or travel allowances to attract workers

Themes arising from the feedback from individual respondents included:

- while the NJC serves as a benchmark in some cases, its application varies widely across agencies, and agency workers' terms differ due to the temporary nature of their roles. Agencies set fixed daily rates or fees based on market conditions, local knowledge, or specific role requirements, which schools either accept or negotiate based on their budgets
- concerns are raised about high agency costs and the reliance on agency staff due to insufficient remuneration and working conditions in education for support staff roles

We do not consistently use the NJC across our business. We mostly pay a 'market' rate which is assessed by our local consultants, using national minimum wage, national living wage, and local knowledge of rates of pay.

**From an employment agency**

### **Q35: Do you place staff in school support staff roles in England only?**

#### **We heard:**

In total, 98 individuals and 16 organisations, including 5 employment agencies, responded to this question. Under half of all respondents (41.2%), including over two thirds of organisations (68.8%) said that they place staff in school support staff roles in England only. Over half of all respondents (50.9%) and individuals (57.1%) were unsure. Less than one in ten respondents (7.9%) answered 'no' to this question.

**Table 31: Overall responses to Q35**

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	47	41.2%
No	9	7.9%
Unsure	58	50.9%
Total	114	100%

**Table 32: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q35**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	36	36.7%	11	68.8%
No	6	6.1%	3	18.8%
Unsure	56	57.1%	2	12.5%
Total	98	100%	16	100%

**Qualitative analysis**

Free text feedback was provided by 3 respondents to this question. They said that they sometimes placed staff in settings that were located outside of England, mainly in the other parts of the United Kingdom.

**Q36: (If 'yes' to Q35) Does hourly pay differ between school-based roles and non-school roles?****We heard:**

Those who answered 'yes' to Q35 were asked whether the hourly pay of the staff they placed in school support staff differs between school-based and non-school based roles. In total, 24 individuals and 10 organisations, including 1 employment agency, responded to this question. There was no clear consensus; 35.3% of all respondents agreed, 26.5% disagreed and 38.2% were unsure.

**Table 33: Overall responses to Q36**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	12	35.3%
No	9	26.5%
Unsure	13	38.2%
Total	34	100%

**Table 34: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q36**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	10	41.7%	2	20.0%
No	5	20.8%	4	40.0%
Unsure	9	37.5%	4	40.0%
Total	24	100%	10	100%

### Qualitative analysis

Free text feedback was provided by 1 individual and 3 organisations in response to this question. The themes arising from this feedback were:

- pay differences between school-based and non-school based roles vary depending on the type of role and the context of the employment
- some agencies apply consistent grading systems for support staff across all settings, while others report variable pay rates based on job type

### Q37: Do the workers' terms and conditions differ between school-based roles and non-school roles?

#### We heard:

In total, 23 individuals and 10 organisations, including 1 employment agency answered this question. There was no consensus, with a third (33.3%) selecting each of the three options. Organisations were more likely to indicate that the terms and conditions do not differ than individual respondents.

**Table 35: Overall responses to Q37**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	11	33.3%
No	11	33.3%
Unsure	11	33.3%
Total	33	100%

**Table 36: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q37**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	9	39.1%	2	20.0%
No	6	26.1%	5	50.0%
Unsure	8	34.8%	3	30.0%
Total	23	100%	10	100%

### Qualitative summary

Free text feedback for this question was provided by 1 individual respondent and 3 organisations. The themes arising from this feedback were:

- terms and conditions differ primarily due to the nature of school schedules
- school-based roles often do not provide pay during school holiday periods, though they may offer access to term-time holidays or days off

## Topic 3, Part 1: Evidence from agency workers

Agency workers were asked to respond to the following questions.

### Q38: Do you only work in school settings in England (including academies or for academy trusts), or do you also work in schools elsewhere in the UK or abroad?

#### We heard:

94 individuals and 11 organisations responded to this question. Around two thirds of all respondents (65.7%) and individuals (66.0%) said that they only worked in school settings in England. Just under a third (31.4%) of all respondents were unsure, and 2.9% said that they worked in settings outside of England.

**Table 37: Overall responses to Q38**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	69	65.7%
No	3	2.9%
Unsure	33	31.4%
Total	105	100%

**Table 38: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q38**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	62	66.0%	7	63.6%
No	1	1.1%	2	18.2%
Unsure	31	33.0%	2	18.2%
Total	94	100%	11	100%

**Qualitative analysis**

The three individual respondents who provided free text feedback to this question said that they had been placed in schools in other parts of the United Kingdom.

**Q39: Have any of your individual placements in schools or academies lasted more than 12 weeks?****We heard:**

81 individuals and 8 organisations responded to this question. Just under half (44.9%) of all respondents had been in placements that lasted for more than 12 weeks and a similar proportion (42.7%) were unsure. Just over one in ten (12.4%) of all respondents had not been in placements for more than 12 weeks.

**Table 39: Overall responses to Q39**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	40	44.9%
No	11	12.4%
Unsure	38	42.7%
Total	89	100%

**Table 40: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q39**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	37	45.7%	3	37.5%
No	10	12.3%	1	12.5%
Unsure	34	42.0%	4	50.0%
Total	81	100%	8	100%

## Qualitative analysis

There was no free text option for this question but respondents were able to provide additional feedback in response to question 40.

### Q40: In your placement(s) lasting more than 12 weeks, did you receive the same pay and conditions as directly employed staff doing the same or a similar role — after the 12-week point?

#### We heard:

74 individuals and 8 organisations responded to this question. Less than one in five (17.1%) of all respondents said that they received the same pay as directly employed staff. Over half (56.1%) were unsure and around a quarter (26.8%) said that they do not receive the same pay and conditions as directly employed staff.

**Table 41: Overall responses to Q40**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	14	17.1%
No	22	26.8%
Unsure	46	56.1%
Total	82	100%

**Table 42: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q40**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	11	14.9%	3	37.5%
No	22	29.7%	0	0.0%
Unsure	41	55.4%	5	62.5%
Total	74	100%	8	100%

## Qualitative analysis

Free text feedback for this question was provided by 11 individual respondents. The most common themes arising from this feedback were:

- some said that agency workers receive a higher daily rate, to compensate for the lack of benefits like sick pay, holiday entitlements, and other employment rights
- others reported being paid significantly less than permanent staff despite performing similar roles

- some were not informed about their entitlement to equal pay after 12 weeks or faced resistance from schools if they sought parity with directly employed staff

[I receive] no holiday, sick leave, continuous professional development, or performance management review process and am not part of any trust incentive schemes.

**From an agency worker**

## Topic 3, Part 1: Evidence from school or academy trust employers

School and academy trust employers were asked to respond to the following question.

### Q41: What are your main reasons for hiring temporary agency staff in support staff roles?

#### We heard:

465 individuals and 161 organisations responded to this multiple-choice question. The most commonly cited reasons for hiring temporary agency staff in support staff roles were to address recruitment difficulties and to cover long- and short-term absences. Temporary agency staff were also frequently hired to meet short-term needs for specific skills.

**Table 43: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q41**

Reason	Overall	Individuals	Organisations
To cover short-term absences	441	324	117
To cover long-term absences	397	289	108
To address recruitment difficulties	377	265	112
To meet a short-term need for specific skills	293	209	84
Because it is more cost-effective	27	21	6
Other	37	27	10

#### Qualitative analysis

In total, 42 individual respondents and 20 organisations provided free text feedback for this question.

Common themes arising from the feedback from organisations included:

- some highlighted the difficulties of attracting and retaining good quality permanent staff, and that temporary staff are considered to be a more flexible and immediate solution for schools that cannot afford to hire staff permanently
- agency workers are being employed to address longer-term planned absences like maternity leave, and unforeseen emergencies like illness, and to provide specialised support for children with SEND

Common themes arising from the feedback from individual respondents included:

- limited budgets make long-term hiring difficult, with temporary staffing offering cost-effective solutions by avoiding long-term commitments such as redundancy costs or pension contributions while providing financial flexibility
- temporary staffing allows schools to adapt to short-term absences, fluctuating student numbers, or uncertain future funding and enrolment levels without committing to permanent contracts

Recruitment in the specialist sector is very difficult [as we can only offer] term-time-only contracts [and] low pay, compared with other less demanding roles with increased competition for staff, from supermarkets and similar types of employers.

**From an academy trust which reports that it employs over 150 school support staff**

## Topic 3, Part 2: Consultation on bringing agency workers into the SSSNB

In the second part of Topic 3, the government consulted on the possible impacts of including agency workers in the scope of the SSSNB. This included general questions for all respondents, and questions specifically for employment agencies, school support staff, and employers.

### Topic 3, Part 2: Questions for all respondents

All respondents were asked to respond to the following questions.

#### Q42: Do you think agency workers should be included in the SSSNB in the future?

##### We heard:

2,370 individuals and 205 organisations responded to this question. Across all respondents there was no real consensus. Just under a third (31.8%) thought that agency workers should be included in the SSSNB in the future, with just over a third (38.5%) unsure, A higher proportion of organisations (47.3%) than individuals (28.2%) were opposed to agency workers being included in the SSSNB in the future.

**Table 44: Overall responses to Q42**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	818	31.8%
No	765	29.7%
Unsure	992	38.5%
Total	2,575	100%

**Table 45: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q42**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	775	32.7%	43	21.0%
No	668	28.2%	97	47.3%
Unsure	927	39.1%	65	31.7%
Total	2,370	100%	205	100%

## Qualitative analysis

In total, 575 individuals and 126 organisations provided free text feedback in response to this question.

Common themes from those who were in favour of including agency workers in the SSSNB included:

- including agency workers in the SSSNB could add parity in pay, benefits, and protections with permanent staff, reducing exploitation, wage disparities, and unequal treatment while fostering fairness and inclusion across the workforce
- not including agency workers risks creating a two-tier workforce, undermining cohesion, morale, and fairness among school staff

Common themes from those who were opposed to including agency workers in the SSSNB included:

- including agency workers in the SSSNB could increase costs for schools through higher pay rates, pensions, or administrative burdens, and potentially divert resources from core educational priorities
- existing AWR already provide sufficient protections after a qualifying period, making further inclusion under SSSNB unnecessary

We are in favour of agency workers having the same terms and conditions and rates of pay as directly employed workers in the same workplace. This would create equality across the board and is a step towards ending the exploitation of agency and temporary workers which both disadvantages agency workers and is used to drive down wages for the permanent workforce.

### **From a trade union which represents school support staff**

We should be aiming for high quality support staff who want to stay in a role within a school over a longer-term period. One of the advantages of remaining with an employer is the improved rights and benefits of that contract.

### **From a school business professional**

## Q43: If agency workers were included in the SSSNB, do you think they would need to have contracts to work only in school settings?

### We heard:

2,256 individuals and 201 organisations responded to this question. Nearly half of all respondents (46.8%) were unsure. Of those that expressed an opinion, a similar proportion of individuals (40.1%) and organisations (36.8%) believed that agency workers would need contracts to work only in school settings.

**Table 46: Overall responses to Q43**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	979	39.8%
No	327	13.3%
Unsure	1,151	46.8%
Total	2,457	100%

**Table 47: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q43**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	905	40.1%	74	36.8%
No	279	12.4%	48	23.9%
Unsure	1072	47.5%	79	39.3%
Total	2,256	100%	201	100%

### Qualitative analysis

In total, 341 individuals and 96 organisations provided free text feedback in response to this question.

Common themes included:

- including agency workers in the SSSNB could promote fairness and consistency, but may also increase costs for schools due to higher rates or fees charged by agencies, and reduce income flexibility for workers who rely on cross-sector opportunities to supplement earnings
- agency workers value the ability to work across sectors for financial stability, variety, and autonomy, with some adding valuable cross-sector expertise

- a tailored approach may be needed, with longer-term placements benefiting from school-specific contracts for stability, while shorter-term or casual roles requiring more flexibility to meet workers' and schools' needs

Feedback specifically from organisations included:

- flexible contracts are essential to preserve agency workers' freedom to operate across sectors, ensuring schools can access a broad talent pool while respecting individual employment preferences
- restricting agency workers to school-only contracts could reduce the pool of available staff, making it harder for schools to recruit skilled professionals or specialists who also work in other sectors

Feedback specifically from individual respondents to this question included:

- ensuring agency workers receive comparable terms to permanent school staff is critical for equity. However, disparities in pay, rights, and conditions between education and other sectors must also be addressed to avoid creating broader inequities
- many school-based agency roles are inherently temporary or seasonal (for example, covering absences or exam invigilation), making restrictive school-only contracts impractical for both workers and schools

A separate contract is likely to be needed to meet the specific terms and requirements of working in or supporting a school or academy.

**From a local authority which reports that it employs over 8,000 school support staff**

Many agency workers work in all sorts of different organisations and a contract to work only in school settings may restrict their employment options.

**From an academy trust which reports that it employs over 800 school support staff**

**Q44: Are there any other conditions you think would need to be met for agency workers to be included in the SSSNB?**

**We heard:**

2,204 individuals and 197 organisations responded to this question. Less than one in ten of all respondents (6.5%) answered 'yes', and nearly three quarters (70.9%) were unsure. 21.9% of individuals and 30.5% of organisations answered 'no' to this question.

**Table 48: Overall responses to Q44**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	157	6.5%
No	542	22.6%
Unsure	1,702	70.9%
Total	2,401	100%

**Table 49: Responses by individuals and organisations to Q44**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	136	6.2%	21	10.7%
No	482	21.9%	60	30.5%
Unsure	1,586	72.0%	116	58.9%
Total	2,204	100%	197	100%

### Qualitative analysis

In total, 208 individuals and 59 organisations provided free text feedback in response to this question.

Common themes included:

- agency workers should receive pay, benefits like pensions and sick pay, and working conditions comparable to permanent staff performing equivalent roles, with clear communication of entitlements and consideration for service duration or qualifying periods
- to ensure consistent quality in schools, agency workers should meet specific eligibility criteria, including relevant qualifications, role-specific training (for example, in safeguarding or classroom management), and minimum experience levels

Feedback specifically from organisations included:

- agency workers should only be included in the SSSNB if they are in core school support roles with direct equivalents among employed staff (for example, teaching assistants) and have been in the same role for at least 12 weeks to ensure integration and comparability with permanent staff

- inclusion in the SSSNB must align with the AWR, ensuring pay parity after 12 weeks, access to professional development, and compliance with ethical standards through a nationally recognised framework

Feedback specifically from individual respondents included:

- comparable rights (for example, sick pay, holiday pay) should be provided after a qualifying period, with consistent service recognised for progression opportunities; this ensures fairness while maintaining distinctions between agency and permanent staff
- all agency workers must adhere to stringent safeguarding measures, including enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service checks and compliance with national standards, to ensure children’s safety across all educational settings

### **Q45: What impact do you think including agency workers in the remit of SSSNB would have on agency workers, employment agencies, school and academy employers, permanent or fixed-term employees and the SSSNB?**

#### **We heard:**

Respondents were asked whether including agency workers in the remit of SSSNB would have a positive (Pos), negative (Neg), or neutral (Neu) effect on the five groups. They could also indicate that they were unsure (Uns).

There was no consensus from the responses received to this question. Across the five groups, over half of all respondents were either unsure or believed that including agency workers in the remit of the SSSNB would have a neutral effect. Of the five groups, the highest proportion (42.5%) of all respondents believed that agency workers would benefit most from being included in the SSSNB’s remit.

**Table 50: Overall responses to Q45**

	Total	Total Pos	% Pos	Total Neg	% Neg	Total Uns	% Uns	Total Neu	% Neu
Agency workers	2,398	1,020	42.5%	173	7.2%	920	38.4%	285	11.9%
Employment agencies	2,382	454	19.1%	480	20.2%	1,032	43.3%	416	17.5%
School and academy employers	2,407	668	27.8%	485	20.1%	837	34.8%	417	17.3%
Permanent or fixed-term employees	2,409	725	30.1%	366	15.2%	812	33.7%	506	21.0%
The SSSNB	2,398	665	27.7%	270	11.3%	1092	45.5%	371	15.5%

**Table 51: Responses to Q45 from individuals**

	Total	Total Pos	% Pos	Total Neg	% Neg	Total Uns	% Uns	Total Neu	% Neu
Agency workers	2,202	942	42.8%	147	6.7%	851	38.6%	262	11.9%
Employment agencies	2,186	431	19.7%	389	17.8%	974	44.6%	392	17.9%
School and academy employers	2,209	626	28.3%	408	18.5%	788	35.7%	387	17.5%
Permanent or fixed-term employees	2,215	688	31.1%	329	14.9%	760	34.3%	438	19.8%
The SSSNB	2,202	632	28.7%	215	9.8%	1,016	46.1%	339	15.4%

**Table 52: Responses to Q45 from organisations**

	Total	Total Pos	% Pos	Total Neg	% Neg	Total Uns	% Uns	Total Neu	% Neu
Agency workers	196	78	39.8%	26	13.3%	69	35.2%	23	11.7%
Employment agencies	196	23	11.7%	91	46.4%	58	29.6%	24	12.2%
School and academy employers	198	42	21.2%	77	38.9%	49	24.7%	30	15.2%
Permanent or fixed-term employees	194	37	19.1%	37	19.1%	52	26.8%	68	35.1%
The SSSNB	196	33	16.8%	55	28.1%	76	38.8%	32	16.3%

### Qualitative analysis

Varying numbers of individuals and organisations provided free text feedback in response to the possible impact of including agency workers in the SSSNB on each of the five groups included in the question. Common themes included:

- **agency workers:** this could lead to better pay and working conditions, promote fairness and reduce disparities with permanent staff, ensure more equitable treatment, and foster belonging and recognition. This could also limit flexibility by restricting choices around workdays or locations, and negatively affect work-life balance or earning potential
- **employment agencies:** this could lead to improved regulations and reshaped agency operations, leading to market consolidation or shifts toward quality-

focused services. This could also lead to the disruption of traditional business models with higher operational costs and reduced profit margins which could threaten the financial viability of smaller agencies

- **permanent or fixed-term employees:** this could improve parity in pay and conditions, address perceptions of a two-tier workforce and promote professional equity. This could also cause resentment and workplace tensions between permanent and agency employees
- **school and academy employers:** this could lead to fairer and more consistent working practices, improved staff retention rates and long-term workforce stability. This could also lead to financial pressures, particularly in smaller settings or in special schools
- **SSSNB:** this could promote fairness and address disparities in pay, entitlements, treatment and unity through equitable representation for all staff types. This could also introduce significant administrative challenges, legal adjustments, resource demands, increased costs and workloads, and delay the establishment of the decision-making processes

## Topic 3, Part 2: Questions for employment agencies

Representatives from employment agencies were asked to respond to the following questions.

### Q46: If agency workers were included in the SSSNB, what impact do you think this would have on demand for temporary labour?

#### We heard:

In total, 184 individuals and 17 organisations, including 5 employment agencies, responded to this question. Just over one in ten of all respondents believed that including agency workers in the SSSNB would have a positive impact on demand for temporary labour. Most (60.7%) were unsure. A quarter (25.0%) of individuals and just over a third (35.3%) of organisations believed that bringing agency workers into the SSSNB would have a negative impact.

**Table 53: Overall responses to Q46**

Answer	Total	Percent
Positive impact	27	13.4%
Negative impact	52	25.9%
Unsure	122	60.7%
Total	201	100%

**Table 54: Responses to Q46 by individuals and organisations**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Positive impact	26	14.1%	1	5.9%
Negative impact	46	25.0%	6	35.3%
Unsure	112	60.9%	10	58.8%
Total	184	100%	17	100%

### Qualitative analysis

Free text feedback in response to this question was provided by 19 individuals and 8 organisations. Common themes were that:

- negative impacts might include increased costs for schools and reduced demand for temporary staff. Schools may instead utilise permanent staff, internal cover arrangements, or directly employ more support staff on permanent terms
- positive impacts might include better pay and conditions under the SSSNB attracting more talent to the sector, improved workforce quality and better workforce planning and retention strategies

### Q47: If your agency operates outside England, do you think the SSSNB including agency workers in England only would have any impacts?

#### We heard:

104 individuals and 6 organisations, including 2 employment agencies responded to this question. There was no consensus. Just over one in ten (10.9%) of all respondents thought that including agency workers in England only would have any impacts, with the vast majority (84.5%) being unsure.

**Table 55: Overall responses to Q47**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	12	10.9%
No	5	4.6%
Unsure	93	84.5%
Total	110	100%

**Table 56: Responses to Q47 by individuals and organisations**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	10	9.6%	2	33.3%
No	5	4.8%	0	0.0%
Unsure	89	85.6%	4	66.7%
Total	104	100%	6	100%

### Qualitative analysis

Free text feedback in response to this question was provided by 1 individual and 3 organisations. This included:

- there could be disparities and confusion if the SSSNB includes agency workers in England only
- there could be perceptions of unfairness amongst agencies operating in multiple parts of the United Kingdom

### **Q48: If you think including agency workers in the SSSNB could have negative impacts on agency workers or employment agencies, what steps do you think your agency would need to take to manage or reduce those impacts?**

#### **We heard:**

This was a free text-only question, so there is no quantitative analysis.

### Qualitative analysis

Free text feedback in response to this question was provided by 3 individuals and 4 organisations (including 3 employment agencies). This included:

- agencies would need to respond by increasing costs, which would be passed on to employers

- agency workers would be negatively affected if this leads to fewer opportunities for temporary work

## Q49: Do you have a view on which organisation(s) should represent employment agencies on the SSSNB?

### We heard:

437 individuals and 30 organisations, including 5 employment agencies, responded to this question. The vast majority (96.4%) of all respondents did not express a view on the organisations that should represent employment agencies on the SSSNB.

**Table 57: Overall responses to Q49**

Answer	Total	Percent
Yes	17	3.6%
No	450	96.4%
Unsure	0	0.0%
Total	467	100%

**Table 58: Responses to Q49 by individuals and organisations**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
Yes	11	2.5%	6	20.0%
No	426	97.5%	24	80.0%
Unsure	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	437	100%	30	100%

### Qualitative analysis

Of the 4 individuals and 6 organisations (including 4 employment agencies) that provided written feedback, most suggested that the Recruitment and Employment Confederation should represent employment agencies on the SSSNB.

## Topic 3, Part 2: Question for school support staff

School support staff were asked to respond to the following question.

### Q50: Would you be more or less likely to work through an agency if agency workers were included in the SSSNB?

#### We heard:

1,921 individuals and 54 organisations responded to this question. Just under a third (30.3%) of individual respondents said that they would be more likely to work through an agency. The highest proportion of respondents (35%) were neutral while less than one in ten (9.4%) said that they would be less likely to work through an agency if agency workers were included in the SSSNB.

As there was no free text option for this question, there is no qualitative analysis.

**Table 59: Overall responses to Q50**

Answer	Total	Percent
More likely	599	30.3%
Less likely	186	9.4%
Unsure	490	24.8%
Neutral	700	35.4%
Total	1,975	100%

**Table 60: Responses to Q50 by individuals and organisations**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
More likely	584	30.4%	15	27.8%
Less likely	181	9.4%	5	9.3%
Unsure	477	24.8%	13	24.1%
Neutral	679	35.3%	21	38.9%
Total	1,921	100%	54	100%

## Topic 3, Part 2: Question for employers

Employers of support staff were asked to respond to the following question.

### Q51: Would you be more or less likely to hire agency workers if they were included in the SSSNB?

#### We heard:

In total, 571 individuals and 154 organisations responded to this question. There was no overall consensus: of all respondents, most were either unsure (33.0%) or neutral (37.4%). Organisations (24.0%) would be less likely to hire agency workers if they were included in the SSSNB than individuals (13.7%).

**Table 61: Overall responses to Q51**

Answer	Total	Percent
More likely	100	13.8%
Less likely	115	15.9%
Unsure	239	33.0%
Neutral	271	37.4%
Total	725	100%

**Table 62: Responses to Q51 by individuals and organisations**

Answer	Individuals total	Individuals %	Organisations total	Organisations %
More likely	85	14.9%	15	9.7%
Less likely	78	13.7%	37	24.0%
Unsure	193	33.8%	46	29.9%
Neutral	215	37.7%	56	36.4%
Total	571	100%	154	100%

#### Qualitative analysis

Free text feedback in response to this question was provided by 122 individuals and 80 organisations. Common themes included:

- the importance of balancing fair pay and equitable treatment for agency workers with cost-effectiveness

- decisions about hiring agency workers will continue to be dependent upon operational needs, local contexts and factors such as recruitment challenges, immediate staffing gaps, and the availability of suitable candidates
- the ability to quickly address short-term or urgent staffing needs is a key advantage of hiring agency workers, with concerns that stricter terms under the SSSNB could reduce this flexibility and impact operational responsiveness

Feedback specifically from organisations included:

- there may be increased costs for employers if agency workers are included in the SSSNB without additional funding to offset financial pressures and ensure viability within school budgets
- some employers viewed the above challenges as an opportunity to prioritise long-term strategies such as investing in permanent staff recruitment and retention over reliance on temporary agency workers

Feedback specifically from individual respondents included:

- respondents valued the flexibility provided by agency workers but expressed concerns that increased administrative complexity or rigid frameworks under the SSSNB could undermine this benefit and discourage their use
- some supported aligning pay and conditions for agency workers with permanent staff, citing potential benefits like improved morale and team cohesion, but also highlighted challenges in balancing fairness with financial constraints

The cost benefit would be reduced. Therefore, having staff you know well and can manage internally would be more appealing.

**From a maintained school which reports that it employs over 40 school support staff**

A standardised cost for agency staff included in the SSSNB would allow school employers to better plan and manage their budgets.

**From a local authority which reports that it employs over 5,200 school support staff**

## Government response to Topic 3

This government is committed to ensuring job security, fair treatment and decent pay for all workers. We recognise that agency workers often play an important role in supporting school operations, including in response to short-term pressures or specialist needs. However, the initial focus of the SSSNB will remain on improving recruitment and retention and establishing statutory minimum terms and conditions for directly employed school support staff.

The purpose of this part of the consultation was to gather evidence to help us understand the potential implications of extending the SSSNB's scope to include agency workers in future legislation and to consult on a proposal that only those agency workers who have a contract with an agency and work only in school settings would be included.

Many of the questions in this section of the consultation attracted fewer responses than other topics, and very few responses were received from employment agencies, meaning the evidence base remains limited. Across respondents, many were unsure, and overall the findings show no clear consensus on whether agency workers should be included in the SSSNB's remit. Views were divided between those who saw potential benefits in parity and fairness, and those who raised risks relating to cost, workforce supply, flexibility, and interactions with the AWR.

Given the mixed feedback and the lack of strong evidence at this stage, we will not commit to extending the remit of the SSSNB to agency workers in future or take a decision on which agency workers would be included in that event. Instead, within the first year of SSSNB operation, DfE will work with SSSNB member organisations to review the evidence and position for agency workers.

In addition, measures in the ERA 2025 and wider government plans will have implications for agency workers across sectors, including schools. We are tackling one-sided flexibility with an ambitious update of employment rights in the ERA 2025, including:

- a right to guaranteed hours, where the number of hours offered reflects the hours worked by a qualifying worker during a reference period
- a right to reasonable notice of shifts
- a right to payment for shifts cancelled, curtailed, or moved at short notice

These new rights will apply to eligible directly engaged workers and agency workers. The government will be consulting on these new rights before setting out the detail in regulations.

We intend to modernise and streamline regulations which govern agency work to enhance security, transparency and choice for workers. Through the ERA 2025, we have

legislated to include umbrella companies within the scope of the legislation covering employment agencies and employment businesses to enable the future regulation of umbrella companies. The Department for Business and Trade's consultation on Modernising the Agency Work Regulatory Framework<sup>14</sup> closed on 1 May 2026 and the evidence gathered is being carefully considered and a government response will be published in due course.

We will continue to monitor the effect of these developments over time.

---

<sup>14</sup> [Make Work Pay: modernising the Agency Work Regulatory Framework - GOV.UK.](#)

## Equalities impact questions

In accordance with the Equality Act (EA) 2010, when making decisions, government ministers must have 'due regard' to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination; advance equality of opportunity; and foster good relations, in relation to the nine protected characteristics included in the Act.

Respondents were asked about the possible impact of the proposals in the consultation on those with protected characteristics. DfE will use the findings to shape good, inclusive policy.

Specifically, DfE will use the findings from the consultation to update an internal equalities impact assessment, and as specific outcomes arise from the SSSNB statutory process, this will continue to be updated to assess the effects of the SSSNB on those with protected characteristics. This will include to consideration of mitigations to minimise the risk of unintended consequences for all staff that are in scope, including those with the protected characteristics.

All respondents could respond to the following questions.

## Questions

### **Q52: Could any of the proposals have an impact – positive or negative – on people with any of the nine protected characteristics?**

#### **We heard:**

Differing numbers of respondents responded to the nine questions on whether the proposals would have a positive or negative impact on each of the protected characteristics. These ranged from 468 respondents who responded to the question on age, to 144 who responded to the question on marriage and civil partnership. The numbers of respondents to each question are shown in brackets below:

- **Age** (468 respondents)
- **Disability** (335 respondents)
- **Gender reassignment** (179 respondents)
- **Marriage and civil partnership** (144 respondents)
- **Pregnancy and maternity** (281 respondents)
- **Race** (190 respondents)
- **Religion or belief** (173 respondents)
- **Sex** (231 respondents)

- **Sexual orientation** (163 respondents)

Respondents were able to provide free-text feedback on their views on whether the impact would be positive, negative or neutral. Key themes from those who believed that the proposals would have a positive impact included:

- standardising pay and conditions would promote fairness, reduce pay gaps, and minimise discrimination, ensuring equitable outcomes for employees with all characteristics, while aligning with EA 2010 standards
- enhanced workplace inclusion by challenging negative perceptions, and by improving access to reasonable adjustments, flexible working arrangements, and tailored support that would benefit workers with protected characteristics (for example, workers who are disabled, older and younger workers, women re-entering the workforce after career breaks or those who have previously experienced sex-based inequalities)
- the SSSNB could have a positive impact on long-standing structural inequalities in pay, job security, and representation

Others who were less positive were concerned that:

- the proposals would require careful implementation to avoid unintended consequences like indirect discrimination or the exclusion of certain groups from protections.
- the standardisation of pay and terms and conditions could result in biases in recruitment processes that disproportionately affect workers from some ethnic groups, older workers or those with disabilities

### **Q53: What action could help reduce any negative impacts you identified in the previous question?**

#### **We heard:**

106 individuals and 46 organisations provided free-text feedback in response to this question. Key themes included:

- when establishing the SSSNB, there should be equitable pay systems and consistent national standards, with built-in targeted measures like clear progression pathways and regular equal pay audits to address disparities such as gender pay gaps or regional differences, and to ensure fairness across differing roles and demographics
- decision-making structures should include diverse representation from under-represented groups to embed lived experiences into governance processes and diversity policies

## Q54: Are there any other equality-related impacts you think we should consider?

### We heard:

92 individuals and 42 organisations provided free-text feedback in response to this question. Key themes included:

- significant pay gaps persist across roles, disproportionately affecting women (including in senior positions where women continue to be under-represented), those with caregiving responsibilities and workers with intersectional protected characteristics such as race, gender, disability, and age. Addressing these disparities through transparent evaluations and equitable pay structures is essential for achieving fairness
- other marginalised groups that do not have protected characteristics, such as working-class staff, migrants, or those with hidden disabilities often feel under-represented in decision-making processes. Amplifying their voices without fear of judgement is crucial for equitable representation.
- similarly, geographic disparities in pay also create inequities among school support staff across different regions or rural areas. Addressing these disparities is critical to ensuring workforce equity nationwide, among those with and without protected characteristics
- some employers were concerned that differences between SSSNB and NJC pay structures could lead to equal pay claims if disparities arise between comparable roles
- some were concerned that older employees or those with disabilities may be adversely affected by changes to working practices if they are not given training, or if adjustments are not made

Most school support staff are women, and we anticipate that they will significantly benefit from the creation of the SSSNB as this will determine fairer pay, terms and conditions, address gender pay gaps and establish clearer progression opportunities.

#### **From a representative organisation for trade unions**

The proposals could have a negative impact on older workers if there are changes to job roles that increase physical demands or require rapid adaptation to new technologies without sufficient training and support. Staff with disabilities may be negatively impacted if the proposals do not explicitly consider the need for reasonable adjustments or accessible working environments.

#### **From an academy trust which reports that it that employs around 1,800 school support staff**

We believe the proposals to re-establish the SSSNB, particularly if extended to include outsourced and agency workers, would have a [high] impact on individuals with the protected characteristics of race and sex. These proposals offer a significant opportunity to address long-standing structural inequalities in the school workforce.

**From a trade union which represents school support staff**

We use the NJC job evaluation to determine the size and scope of a role. But this does not take into account the jobholder, just the role. If this is not considered during the establishment of the SSSNB there could be scope for equal pay claims between schools and local authorities as roles will be comparable.

**From a local authority which reports that it employs over 2,500 school support staff**

## Government response to the equalities impact questions

The SSSNB is intended to improve the working conditions of school support staff by agreeing new statutory minimum levels for pay and terms and conditions. The new arrangements are intended to result in fairer, more equitable pay and conditions for all support staff.

85% of those who responded to this consultation are female. This is broadly consistent with our understanding of the make-up of the school support staff workforce as a whole, as outlined in DfE's recent research on school support staff<sup>15</sup> and the School Workforce Census<sup>16</sup>.

As set out in our Schools White Paper, we have confirmed that the first condition that the SSSNB will negotiate improvements on will be maternity pay - the first national improvement to support staff maternity provision in 25 years. This is an important and long-overdue step in recognising the workforce and delivering a tangible improvement for female support staff, in line with the improvement we are delivering for teachers.

We have listened carefully to the concerns raised by respondents, particularly around indirect discrimination and possible risks to particular groups during implementation. After it is formally established as an arms-length body, when making decisions, the SSSNB will be required by the EA 2010 to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not. In considering whether to ratify any SSSNB agreement, the Secretary of State will also have due regard to these equality considerations. DfE will assess the impact of agreements reached once the SSSNB is operational and advise the Secretary of State on the equality impact of any agreements that it negotiates, and actions necessary to mitigate any unintended consequences.

---

<sup>15</sup> [The role and experience of support staff in schools - GOV.UK](#).

<sup>16</sup> School Workforce census, reporting year 2025, Department for Education (2026). Available at: [Release home - School workforce in England - Explore education statistics - GOV.UK](#)

## Any other comments

The consultation concluded with a final question in which respondents were able to provide any other comments on any of the topics covered in the consultation.

### Question

#### **Q55: Do you have any other comments on any of the topics covered in this consultation?**

##### **We heard:**

406 individuals and 80 organisations provided free-text feedback in response to this question. Common themes included:

- recognition that support staff are essential to school operations but often feel undervalued, with their contributions in teaching assistance, safeguarding, administration, and specialised roles overlooked or undercompensated compared to teaching staff.
- greater acknowledgment of the roles of all types of support staff is critical for morale and retention, but this is particularly important for staff in specialised roles like teaching assistants supporting children with SEND, exams officers, ICT professionals, attendance officers, and school business professionals
- support for equitable pay scales that reflect qualifications, experience, and responsibilities is essential to addressing pay disparities between support staff and teachers. In keeping with the previous point, some respondents emphasised the importance of fair pay in improving morale, professional recognition, and financial stability
- expanding responsibilities without updated job descriptions has led to excessive workloads and role ambiguity for support staff. Standardised job descriptions are needed to ensure fair compensation, manageable workloads, and alignment across schools, both locally and nationally
- representation for support staff in decision-making processes is critical to ensure that their voices are heard during policy development and during the establishment of the SSSNB
- some respondents suggested additional bodies to be added to the SSSNB

## Next steps

The Employment Rights Bill received Royal Assent on 18 December 2025 and is now the ERA 2025. The Act provides for the establishment of the SSSNB and confirms the legal basis for how it will work.

The government will use powers from the ERA 2025 to confirm which staff are in scope of the SSSNB, as outlined earlier in this document. The organisations that will represent them and their employers will be included in secondary legislation, which will be laid before Parliament later this year. We will continue to engage constructively with key stakeholders as we refine the details of the SSSNB's remit and its constitution.

Until the SSSNB is fully operational, staff will remain on their existing arrangements for the 2026-27 financial year, with SSSNB outcomes applying from the 2027-28 financial year at the earliest. This phased implementation will allow staff and employers time to understand how the law relating to the SSSNB applies to them and will ensure a smooth transition from the current NJC process, the terms of which most school support staff are currently employed on.

We will evaluate the impact of the SSSNB once it is operational and as outcomes from the new arrangements are delivered.

## **Annex A: List of other pay or negotiating bodies excluded from the SSSNB**

As proposed in the consultation, any staff whose pay and/or conditions are covered by the following bodies will not be included in the scope of the SSSNB:

- The School Teachers' Review Body (STRB – where the definition in the ERA does not already exclude these staff. The STRB covers teachers and school leaders
- The Joint Negotiating Committee (JNC for Youth and Community Workers. This covers youth workers and community development staff, often employed by local authorities
- The Soulbury Committee. This covers educational psychologists, educational improvement professionals, and managers of youth or community services
- The JNC for Local Authority Craft and Associated Employees. This covers skilled tradespeople such as plumbers, electricians, and maintenance workers employed by local authorities
- The JNC for Chief Officers of Local Authorities. This covers senior officers, such as directors of services within local authorities
- The Committee for Support Staff (subcommittee) of the National Joint Council (NJC for Staff in Sixth Form Colleges. This covers support staff in sixth form colleges and some 16-19 academies under a separate national agreement

In response to feedback received in the consultation, the following bodies will also be listed. Therefore any staff covered by these bodies will also be excluded from the scope of the SSSNB:

- The NJC Committee for Teaching Staff in Sixth Form Colleges
- The NJC for Teachers in Residential Establishments
- The JNC for Chief Executives of Local Authorities
- The National Health Service (NHS) Pay Review Body which advises on the pay of NHS staff, including nurses and health advisors on Agenda for Change terms and conditions

## Annex B: Consultation questions

The consultation consisted of the following 55 questions. As shown below, and as outlined in the methodology (Annex C), some questions were targeted towards specific categories of respondent, for example, individuals, organisations, employers, or employment agencies. However, these questions were not restricted to respondents identifying as a member of those categories, and all respondents could answer them and provide free text feedback. The analysis of these questions is based on all respondents that answered unless specified.

### ‘About you’ questions

Q1: What is your name?

Q2: What is your email address?

Q3: Are you happy to be contacted directly about your response?

Q4: Would you like your responses to be kept confidential?

Q5: Are you responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Q6: Which option best describes how you are taking part in this consultation?

- I’m in a school support staff role
- I’m an agency worker
- I’m a senior leader in a school, multi-academy trust, or local authority (for example, a headteacher or chief executive) - responding as an individual, not on behalf of the organisation
- I’m a senior leader at an employment agency
- I represent an employer or a business representative group or association
- I represent a trade union
- I work or volunteer for a charity, membership body, or other organisation with an interest in education or employment
- Other

Q7: [For individual respondents] Which category best describes your role?

- Teaching assistants (for example, teaching assistant (TA), higher level TA, SEND assistants, minority ethnic support staff, or other classroom-based support)
- Auxiliary staff (for example, catering staff, midday supervisors, cleaners, maintenance staff)

- Administrative staff (for example, office staff, secretaries, central support staff)
- Other school support staff (Not classroom based, for example, matrons, nurses, medical staff, librarians, invigilators, pastoral support and attendance staff)
- School business professionals (for example, bursar, business manager, finance officer, office manager, premises manager, ICT network manager)
- Technicians (for example, supporting science, design and technology, craft, or ICT)
- Leadership - non-teacher (for example, members of the school's senior leadership team who are not teachers)
- Not listed or unsure

Q8: [For individual respondents] What is your age?

Q9: [For individual respondents] Which of the following best describes your gender?

- Female
- Male
- I identify in another way
- Prefer not to say

Q10: [For individual respondents] What is your ethnicity?

- White - English, Welsh, Scottish, Northern Irish, British
- White - Irish
- White - Gypsy or Irish Traveller
- White - Roma
- White - Any other White background
- Mixed or multiple ethnic groups - White and Black Caribbean
- Mixed or multiple ethnic groups - White and Black African
- Mixed or multiple ethnic groups - White and Asian
- Mixed or multiple ethnic groups - Other
- Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi
- Asian or Asian British - Chinese
- Asian or Asian British - Indian
- Asian or Asian British - Pakistani

- Asian or Asian British - Other
- Black, Black British, Caribbean or African - Caribbean
- Black, Black British, Caribbean or African - African
- Black, Black British, Caribbean or African - Other
- Other Ethnic Group - Arab
- Other Ethnic Group - Other
- Prefer not to say

Q11: [For individual respondents] Which of the following descriptions do you identify with?

- Disabled
- Neurodivergent
- Having one or more physical or mental health conditions or illnesses lasting or expected to last for 12 months or more
- None of the above
- Other
- Prefer not to say

Q12: [For individual respondents] Do you identify as having conditions or illnesses that affect you in any of the following areas?

- Vision (for example, blindness or partial sight)
- Hearing (for example, deafness or partial hearing)
- Mobility (for example, walking short distances or climbing stairs)
- Dexterity (for example, lifting and carrying objects, using a keyboard)
- Learning or understanding or concentrating
- Memory
- Mental health (for example, depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder)
- Stamina or breathing or fatigue
- Socially or behaviourally (for example, autism, or attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD))
- Other
- None of the above
- Prefer not to say

Q13: [For organisations] What type of organisation do you represent?

- A maintained school or federation (for example, headteacher, governor or school business manager)
- An academy or free school (for example, principal or local governor)
- An academy trust (for example, HR, finance or executive leader)
- A local authority (as an employer or oversight body for maintained schools)
- An employment agency
- A trade union
- An employer or business representative organisation
- A membership body or professional association for school staff or education professionals
- A charity or voluntary organisation working in education or employment
- A research or academic institution
- A public body
- Another stakeholder or representative organisation
- Other

Q14: [For organisations] What is the name of your organisation?

Q15: [For organisations] How many permanent and fixed term support staff does your organisation employ in total?

Q16: [For organisations] How many agency workers are working in support staff roles in your organisation today (or on the last working day)?

Q17: [For organisations] Would you say this number of agency workers in support staff roles is typical for your organisation?

Q18: [For organisations] How many workers do you currently have on your books?

Q19: [For organisations] How many workers have you placed in schools in the last 6 months?

## Consultation questions

Unless shown:

- the multiple-choice questions were intended for all respondents
- for each question, respondents were asked to state whether they agreed, disagreed, or were unsure

## **Topic 1: Definition of school support staff**

Q20: Do you agree with our proposal to exclude staff from the SSSNB whose pay and conditions are determined through existing pay and negotiating bodies (other than the NJC)?

Q21: Do you agree with our proposal to include academy trust employees in support staff roles who work from locations other than academies?

Q22: Do you agree with our proposal to exclude executive leaders of academy trusts from the SSSNB?

Q23: Do you agree with how we have defined 'staff covered by the named existing pay and negotiating bodies'?

Q24: Do you agree with how we have defined central academy trust staff?

Q25: Do you agree with how we have defined executive leaders of academy trusts?

Q26: Are there any other staff who, under the broad definition of 'school support staff' in the Employment Rights Bill, would still be included (after the proposed exclusions above) — but who you think should not be?

Q27: Are there any other staff working centrally for academy trusts who you think should be included (but would not be under our current proposal)?

## **Topic 2: Evidence on current pay and terms and conditions**

Q28: [For employers] Do you use the NJC for Local Government Services National Agreement on Pay and Conditions of Service (the Green Book) for school support staff?

Q29: [For employers] Do you pay school support staff based on the pay points in the NJC pay spine?

Q30: [For employers] How do you decide where to put support staff (that is, at which pay point) on the pay structure that you use? [Free text only]

Q31: [For employers] Are there any parts of contracts with your staff that you would be concerned about changing under the SSSNB?

Q32: [For employees] Are there any parts of your current contract that you would be concerned about changing under the SSSNB?

## **Topic 3: Agency workers**

Q33: [For employment agencies] Have you placed any individual workers in both school support staff roles and other types of roles not related to schools (outside of schools, academies, or academy trust offices)?

Q34: [For employment agencies] Do you use the NJC agreements to help set pay and conditions for agency workers in school support staff roles?

Q35: [For employment agencies] Do you place staff in school support staff roles in England only?

Q36: [For employment agencies] Does hourly pay differ between school-based roles and non-school roles?

Q37: [For employment agencies] Do the worker's terms and conditions differ between school-based roles and non-school roles?

Q38: [For agency workers] Do you only work in school settings in England (including academies or for academy trusts), or do you also work in schools elsewhere in the UK or abroad? [Yes – England only; No – Elsewhere; Unsure].

Q39: [For agency workers] Have any of your individual placements in schools or academies lasted more than 12 weeks?

Q40: [For agency workers] In your placement(s) lasting more than 12 weeks, did you receive the same pay and conditions as directly employed staff doing the same or a similar role — after the 12-week point?

Q41: [For employers] What are your main reasons for hiring temporary agency staff in school support staff roles?

- To address recruitment difficulties
- To meet a short-term need for specific skills
- To cover short-term absence
- To cover long-term absence
- Because it is more cost-effective
- Other - please state
- N/A

Q42: Do you think agency workers should be included in the SSSNB in the future?

Q43: If agency workers were included in the SSSNB, do you think they would need to have contracts to work only in school settings?

Q44: Are there any other conditions you think would need to be met for agency workers to be included in the SSSNB?

Q45: What impact do you think including agency workers in the remit SSSNB would have on the following groups: [Positive, neutral, negative, and unsure options]

- Agency workers?
- Employment agencies?
- School and academy employers?

- Permanent or fixed-term employees?
- The SSSNB?

Q46: [For employment agencies] If agency workers were included in the SSSNB, what impact do you think this would have on demand for temporary labour?  
[Increased demand; Decreased demand; Unsure]

Q47: [For employment agencies] If your agency operates outside England, do you think the SSSNB including agency workers in England only would have any impacts?

Q48: [For employment agencies] If you think including agency workers in the SSSNB could have negative impacts on agency workers or employment agencies, what steps do you think your agency would need to take to manage or reduce those impacts?  
[Free text option]

Q49: [For employment agencies] Do you have a view on which organisation(s) should represent employment agencies on the SSSNB? [Yes; No]

Q50: [For school support staff] Would you be more or less likely to work through an agency if agency workers were included in the SSSNB? [More likely; Neutral; Less likely]

Q51: [For school employers] Would you be more or less likely to hire agency workers if they were included in the SSSNB? [More likely; Neutral; Less likely]

## Equalities

Q52: Could any of the proposals have an impact - positive or negative - on people with any of the following protected characteristics?

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Marriage and civil partnership
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race
- Religion or belief
- Sex
- Sexual orientation

Q53: What action could help reduce any negative impacts you identified in the previous question? [Select any protected characteristics]

Q54: Are there any other equality-related impacts you think we should consider?  
[Free text]

## General question

Q55: Do you have any other comments on any of the topics covered in this consultation?

## Annex C: Methodology

### Consultation questions

The consultation included a total of 55 questions (summarised in the table below and set out in full in annex B). Most responses were submitted online via Citizen Space<sup>17</sup>, with a small number received by email. Responses received by email that directly answered the consultation questions have been manually added to Citizen Space and are included in the quantitative analysis. Responses that did not directly answer the consultation questions have been considered in the qualitative analysis only.

**Table 63: Questions included in the consultation**

Question type	Number of questions
About you: Respondent information and demographics	19
Topic 1: Definition of school support staff	8
Topic 2: Call for evidence on pay and conditions	5
Topic 3: Agency workers	19
Equalities impacts	3
Any other comments	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>

All respondents completed some mandatory, introductory ‘about you’ questions, which included personal information, whether they were responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation, and privacy-related questions on confidentiality.

Individual respondents were asked to provide demographic information. Those responding on behalf of organisations were asked to provide information on the organisations they were representing and were assumed to be responding on behalf of the organisations that they had specified.

After completing the introductory questions, respondents were asked to complete the consultation questions. All questions in the three topics and equalities sections were optional, and respondents were able to skip questions, or answer not applicable (N/A).

Some questions were targeted at specified respondent types, for example employers or employees, and this was set out at the start of these questions. However, all

---

<sup>17</sup> [Department for Education - Citizen Space](#).

respondents, including those who were not the specified respondent types, were able to respond to all of the consultation questions.

For most consultation questions, respondents were asked to select from a range of multiple-choice options. The data from the responses to these questions are presented in this report as the quantitative analysis. Following most of the multiple-choice questions, respondents who answered 'no' or were 'unsure' were asked to provide further information in free text, although all respondents could provide free text to any question if they chose to do so. A small number of questions were free text only, and for these there is only a qualitative analysis. A summary of the main themes from the free text responses is presented in this report as qualitative findings.

The specific methodologies used for the quantitative and qualitative analysis sections are outlined in more detail below.

## Segmented analysis

Organisations like representative bodies and trade unions account for a very small number of consultation respondents, but they represent much higher numbers of individuals or other members than the numbers that responded directly to the consultation. For example, one of the main trade unions for school support staff represents around 250,000 school support staff members<sup>18</sup>. A segmented analysis of the responses, which is a standard method in consultation reporting, was therefore utilised.

For each question (where relevant data is available), the overall quantitative data from all respondents is presented, along with segmented data which shows numbers of responses from individuals and from organisations. Where relevant and possible, a similar segmented approach was also undertaken in the qualitative analysis of findings from the free text responses.

The segmented analysis involved:

- **separately analysing responses from individuals and organisations**, to ensure that the views of each group were considered in their own right
- **giving particular attention to views of representative organisations**, such as trade unions, associations, and membership bodies

As the consultation is not a representative sample, it is not possible to complete a formal weighting of respondent types. However, this segmented approach ensures that the consultation findings appropriately reflect the views of both individuals and organisations, who may represent a large number of staff or other types of members.

---

<sup>18</sup> [Schools - UNISON National](#)

## Quantitative analysis

The quantitative analysis summarises overall responses to each of the multiple-choice questions with available data. It draws upon raw data exported from Citizen Space, which includes all emailed responses that directly answered the consultation questions. The data tables in the report also show the segmented responses from individuals and organisations.

As explained above, some of the questions were aimed at specific groups of respondent types, for example, employers, employees, support staff or agency staff. As respondents could choose to answer all of the consultation questions, skip the question, or select N/A, we have presented the findings from all respondents that answered the questions and have not attempted to present the responses of the intended respondent types separately.

As not every respondent responded to every question, the number of responses analysed varies from question to question. The N/A responses were excluded from the data, so that only the views of those who responded were captured.

Throughout the analysis, answers to multiple-choice questions have been displayed as numbers of responses, and as percentages which are expressed as a measure of those answering each question, not as a measure of the total number of respondents to the consultation. For example, in a hypothetical scenario assume 100 people responded to the consultation – if 80 responded to a question and 40 of those responded ‘Yes’ to that question, this would show that 50% responded ‘Yes’ (50% of 80, not 40% of 100). Due to rounding, the percentage figures may not always add up to 100%.

## Qualitative analysis

For most multiple-choice questions, where relevant, respondents who disagreed with the question, or who were unsure how to respond, were asked to provide additional free text information to supplement their answers. However, all respondents, including those who agreed with the questions, and those who were not in the specific groups of respondent types for the targeted questions, could provide free text information.

The qualitative findings in the report are from analysis of the free text information provided for each question and is based on all responses received to each question.

Where themes arising from different respondent types were clearly distinct, this has also been presented.

Quotations from different respondent types are also sometimes included, where considered to be helpful to illustrate the feedback received.

The qualitative analysis does not cover any issues raised which were outside the scope of the consultation.

## Use of AI in the qualitative analysis

As is becoming more common across government, to improve efficiency, free text responses to the consultation were analysed with the assistance of AI. The analysis was fully validated by a team of data science professionals.

While all responses were read by DfE officials, the responses to the free-text questions (from Q20 onwards) were analysed using AI. With the exception of a few questions where only a small number of responses were received, this approach produced a thematic output for each question. Additionally, the same method was applied to specific subgroups of respondents to explore differences in responses.

The key themes presented are based on the qualitative AI analysis of all free text responses from all respondents. However, for questions that were intended for specific respondent types, or where the themes from all respondents and respondent types differ, the key themes from the respondent types are also highlighted.

## AI analysis

For each of the 45 free-text questions, an iterative and zero-shot prompting approach with Azure OpenAI's GPT-4o Large Language Model (LLM) was utilised to:

- identify key themes in the responses
- refine those themes
- determine which themes were discussed in each response

This enabled the frequency of each theme that appeared per question to be calculated.

Zero-shot means the model does not require prior training or subject-specific knowledge to generate insights the prompts. The prompts were refined through iteration to optimise the output. Access to the LLM was provided via Microsoft's Azure OpenAI Service, which does not share data with third parties. The analysis was conducted using DfE computers.

Because LLMs can only process a limited number of words at a time, responses were split into equal-sized chunks. Each chunk was passed into the LLM to identify all the themes discussed in the responses. These themes were compiled into a single list, which was then condensed into 20 distinct themes through further iterative processing. Finally, the responses for each question were re-analysed in chunks to determine which themes were present in each response, allowing the themes for each question to be ranked by frequency.

## Validation of AI analysis

All AI-generated themes were reviewed by a team of data science professionals to ensure they accurately reflected the consultation responses. They also performed quality assurance on the theme rankings.

Once the AI analysis was complete, policy professionals conducted a validation step by comparing the themes against a representative sample of responses. This cross-check confirmed the relevance and accuracy of the themes and ensured that key insights were not missed.

## Differences between respondent types

As noted earlier, respondents were asked to specify whether they were responding as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation.

All free-text questions were analysed for all respondents. To explore differences between respondent types, there was an examination of whether individuals working in specific settings responded differently compared to the overall group, and whether individuals responded differently than organisations.

To identify respondent types, the following questions were used:

- **Q5:** 'Are you responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?'
- **Q6:** 'Which option best describes how you are taking part in this consultation?' (Role – individuals)
- **Q7:** 'Which category best describes your role?' (Support staff role)
- **Q13:** 'What type of organisation do you represent?' (Organisation type)

## Strengths and limitations

While the above measures were put in place, the inherent risks in using AI should be acknowledged:

- **Hallucinations:** The LLM may misinterpret responses and present incorrect information confidently. While the data science team have put measures in place to minimise the risk of hallucinations, such occurrences remain possible due to the probabilistic nature of LLMs
- **Spelling errors:** If consultation responses contain misspellings, the model may not correct them, especially if the misspelling could be a proper noun (for example, a company name)

## Annex D: Organisations that responded to the consultation

The following organisations responded to the consultation<sup>19</sup>:

**Table 64: Organisations that responded to the consultation**

Name of organisation	Type of organisation
Achievement through Collaboration	Academy Trust
Ad Astra Academy Trust	Academy Trust
Affinity Learning Partnership	Academy Trust
Alpha Academies Trust	Academy Trust
Ascendancy Partnership Trust	Academy Trust
ASSET Education	Academy Trust
Association of Professional Staffing Companies (Global) Ltd	Employer of Business Representative Organisation
Association of School and College Leaders	Membership Body or Professional Association
Auriga Academy Trust	Academy Trust
Barmston Village Primary School	Maintained School or Federation
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Local Authority
Bedford Borough Council	Local Authority
Bishop Bewick Catholic Education Trust	Academy Trust
Bishop Hogarth Catholic Education Trust	Academy Trust
Blackminster Middle School	Maintained School or Federation
Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council	Local Authority
Brentry Primary School	Maintained School or Federation
Bristol City Council	Local Authority
Brockhurst Primary School	Maintained School or Federation
Bury Council	Local Authority
Central Bedfordshire Council	Local Authority
Chatham & Clarendon Grammar School	Academy or Free School

<sup>19</sup> The 23 organisations that wanted their responses to remain confidential are not included in this list.

<b>Name of organisation</b>	<b>Type of organisation</b>
Christ The King Catholic Collegiate	Academy Trust
City of Doncaster Council	Local Authority
City of Wolverhampton Council	Local Authority
City of York Council	Local Authority
Community	Trade Union
Confederation of School Trusts	Membership Body or Professional Association
Co-op Academies Trust	Academy Trust
Cornwall Council	Local Authority
Court Lane Junior Academy	Academy Trust
Cranmer Education Trust	Academy Trust
Creative Education Trust	Academy Trust
Derbyshire County Council	Local Authority
Devon County Council	Local Authority
Diamond Learning Partnership Trust	Academy Trust
Diocese Of St Albans Multi Academy Trust	Academy Trust
Dorset Council	Local Authority
DRB Ignite	Academy Trust
Durham and Newcastle Diocesan Learning Trust	Academy Trust
Durham County Council	Local Authority
Ealing Council	Local Authority
East Midlands Academy Trust	Academy Trust
East Riding of Yorkshire Council	Local Authority
East Sussex County Council	Local Authority
Eden Primary	Academy or Free School
Education Trailblazers	Another Stakeholder or Representative Organisation
Emmanuel Schools Foundation	Academy Trust
Empower Learning Academy Trust	Academy Trust
Enfield Council	Local Authority
Equitas Academies Trust	Academy Trust

<b>Name of organisation</b>	<b>Type of organisation</b>
Federation of St Helen's and St Mary's	Maintained School or Federation
Gateshead Council	Local Authority
GMB	Trade Union
Gosforth Federated Academies Limited	Academy Trust
Great Massingham and Harpley CofE VC Federation of Primary Schools	Maintained School or Federation
Greenshaw Learning Trust	Academy Trust
Hadrian Learning Trust	Academy Trust
Hampshire County Council	Local Authority
Haringey UNISON	Trade Union
Harlington Upper School	Academy or Free School
Harrow NEU	Trade Union
Hasland Junior School	Maintained School or Federation
Hatton Academies Trust	Academy Trust
Haybrook College Trust	Academy Trust
Hazelmere Junior School	Maintained School or Federation
Heathlands School	Maintained School or Federation
Hertfordshire County Council	Local Authority
Hillshott Infant School and Nursery	Maintained School or Federation
Hinchley Wood Learning Partnership	Academy Trust
Impact Education Multi Academy Trust	Academy Trust
Institute of School Business Leadership	Membership Body or Professional Association
Invictus Education Trust	Academy Trust
Isle of Wight Council	Local Authority
Kape HR Limited	Other (HR Consultancy)
Lancashire County Council	Local Authority
Ledbury Primary School	Maintained School or Federation
Leeds City Council	Local Authority
Leicestershire County Council	Local Authority
Leodis Academies Trust	Academy Trust

<b>Name of organisation</b>	<b>Type of organisation</b>
Lincolnshire County Council	Local Authority
Local Government Association	Membership Body or Professional Association
London Borough of Brent	Local Authority
London Borough of Croydon	Local Authority
London Borough of Islington	Local Authority
London Borough of Sutton	Local Authority
Mana Education	Employment Agency
Manchester City Council	Local Authority
Mayflower High School	Maintained School or Federation
Metropolitan Borough of Solihull Council	Local Authority
Minerva Learning Trust	Academy Trust
Minster Trust for Education	Academy Trust
Mosaic Schools Learning Trust	Academy Trust
National Association of Examinations Officers	Membership Body or Professional Association
National Association of Head Teachers	Trade Union
National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers	Trade Union
National Association of Special Schools	Another Stakeholder or Representative Organisation
National Governance Association	Charity or Voluntary Organisation
NEU at Sandhurst School	Trade Union
New College Durham Academies Trust	Academy Trust
Nexus Multi Academy Trust	Academy Trust
North East Lincolnshire Council	Local Authority
North Lincolnshire Council	Local Authority
North Northamptonshire Council	Local Authority
North Yorkshire Council	Local Authority
Nottinghamshire County Council	Local Authority
Oakley School	Maintained School or Federation
Orchard Hill College & Academy Trust	Academy Trust

<b>Name of organisation</b>	<b>Type of organisation</b>
Our Lady of Lourdes Catholic Primary School, Kingswood Bristol	Maintained School or Federation
Our Lady of the Assumption Primary School	Maintained School or Federation
Oxford Diocesan Schools Trust	Academy Trust
Partnership Learning	Academy Trust
Penwortham Girls' High School	Maintained School or Federation
Peterborough City Council	Local Authority
Pikes Lane Primary School	Maintained School or Federation
Plymouth CAST	Academy Trust
Plymouth in UNISON	Trade Union
Primitas Learning Partnership	Academy Trust
Recruitment and Employment Confederation	Membership Body or Professional Association
Reed Education	Employment Agency
River Learning Trust	Academy Trust
Robert Piggott Infant and Junior Federation	Maintained School or Federation
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Local Authority
Royal Borough of Kingston	Local Authority
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Local Authority
Sandbach School	Academy Trust
Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council	Local Authority
School Resource Management Network	Another Stakeholder or Representative Organisation
Sefton UNISON	Trade Union
Sheffield City Council	Local Authority
Sidney Stringer Multi Academy Trust	Academy Trust
Sixth Form Colleges' Association	Membership Body or Professional Association
South Downs Education Trust	Academy Trust
South Pennine Academies	Academy Trust
South Tyneside Council	Local Authority
Southend East Community Academy Trust	Academy Trust

<b>Name of organisation</b>	<b>Type of organisation</b>
Southwark Council	Local Authority
St Ann's Heath Junior School	Maintained School or Federation
St Bede's RC High School	Maintained School or Federation
St Edward's C of E VA Primary School	Maintained School or Federation
St Joseph and St Theresa RC Primary School	Maintained School or Federation
St Joseph's Specialist Trust	Other (Non-Maintained SEN School)
St Pauls Nursery School	Maintained School or Federation
St Peter and St Paul CE Primary School	Maintained School or Federation
St Thomas and St Anne's CE Primary	Maintained School or Federation
Staffordshire County Council	Local Authority
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	Local Authority
Sutton Grammar School Trust	Academy Trust
Telford and Wrekin Council	Local Authority
Terling Church of England (Voluntary Aided) Primary School	Maintained School or Federation
The Arthur Terry Learning Partnership	Academy Trust
The Bishop Wheeler Catholic Academy Trust	Academy Trust
The Blessed Edward Bamber Catholic Multi Academy Trust	Academy Trust
The Creative Learning Partnership Trust	Academy Trust
The Dean Trust	Academy Trust
The Dunstan Catholic Educational Trust	Academy Trust
The Girls' Learning Trust	Academy Trust
The Joseph Rowntree School	Maintained School or Federation
The Kemnal Academies Trust - TKAT	Academy Trust
The Malling School	Maintained School or Federation
The Misbourne	Academy or Free School
The Oak Trust	Academy Trust
The Sovereign Trust	Academy Trust
The Thinking Schools Academy Trust	Academy Trust

<b>Name of organisation</b>	<b>Type of organisation</b>
The Trades Union Congress	Another Stakeholder or Representative Organisation
The Wherry School	Academy Trust
TIB Services Ltd	Employment Agency
Together for Children Sunderland	Local Authority
Trafford Council	Local Authority
Trailblazer Group for the Level 5 Specialist Teaching Assistant Apprenticeship	Other (Unspecified)
Transform Trust	Academy Trust
Trinity	Academy Trust
Tyne Coast Academy Trust	Academy Trust
UNISON	Trade Union
Unite the Union	Trade Union
United Learning	Academy Trust
Unity Schools Partnership	Academy Trust
Urmston Grammar	Academy Trust
Wade Deacon Trust	Academy Trust
Wakefield Council	Local Authority
Warwickshire Council	Local Authority
West Green Primary School	Maintained School or Federation
West Midlands Employers	Employer of Business Representative Organisation
West Northants Council	Local Authority
Wigan Council	Local Authority
Wiltshire Council	Local Authority
Wimbledon College	Maintained School or Federation
Windsor Academy Trust	Academy Trust



Department  
for Education

© Crown copyright 2026

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0, except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit:

[nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](https://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3).

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information, you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

About this publication:

enquiries <https://www.gov.uk/contact-dfe>

download [www.gov.uk/government/publications](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications)

Follow us on X: [@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)

Connect with us on Facebook: [facebook.com/educationgovuk](https://facebook.com/educationgovuk)