



House of Commons
Committee of Public Accounts

Funding for disadvantaged pupils

Third Report of Session 2015–16

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

*Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed
14 September 2015*

The Committee of Public Accounts

The Committee of Public Accounts is appointed by the House of Commons to examine “the accounts showing the appropriation of the sums granted by Parliament to meet the public expenditure, and of such other accounts laid before Parliament as the committee may think fit” (Standing Order No 148).

Current membership

[Meg Hillier](#) (*Labour/Co-op, Hackney South and Shoreditch*) (Chair)

[Mr Richard Bacon](#) (*Conservative, South Norfolk*)

[Harriet Baldwin](#) (*Conservative, West Worcestershire*)

[Deidre Brock](#) (*Scottish National Party, Edinburgh North and Leith*)

[Kevin Foster](#) (*Conservative, Torbay*)

[Mr Stewart Jackson](#) (*Conservative, Peterborough*)

[Clive Lewis](#) (*Labour, Norwich South*)

[Nigel Mills](#) (*Conservative, Amber Valley*)

[David Mowat](#) (*Conservative, Warrington South*)

[Teresa Pearce](#) (*Labour, Erith and Thamesmead*)

[Stephen Phillips QC](#) (*Conservative, Sleaford and North Hykeham*)

[John Pugh](#) (*Liberal Democrat, Southport*)

[Nick Smith](#) (*Labour, Blaenau Gwent*)

[Karin Smyth](#) (*Labour, Bristol South*)

[Mrs Anne-Marie Trevelyan](#) (*Conservative, Berwick-upon-Tweed*)

Powers

Powers of the Committee of Public Accounts are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No 148. These are available on the Internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publication

Committee reports are published on the Committee’s website at www.parliament.uk/pac and by The Stationery Office by Order of the House.

Evidence relating to this report is published on the [inquiry page](#) of the Committee’s website.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Sarah Petit (Clerk), Claire Cozens (Committee Specialist), James McQuade (Senior Committee Assistant), Sue Alexander and Jamie Mordue (Committee Assistants) and Tim Bowden (Media Officer).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Public Accounts Committee, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 4099; the Committee’s email address is pubacom@parliament.uk

Contents

Summary	3
Introduction	4
Conclusions and recommendations	5
1 Impact	8
2 Funding	13
Formal Minutes	15
Witnesses	16
List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament	17

Summary

Since the introduction of the Pupil Premium in 2011, there is some evidence that the attainment gap between disadvantaged pupils and their peers has started to narrow. Head teachers have increased their focus on tackling this obdurate issue and there are many examples of schools using the Pupil Premium on interventions that work. The work of the Education Endowment Foundation has also been important in developing the evidence base for what works best, and so helping schools to choose the best interventions for their own circumstances. However, the Department for Education needs to be better at supporting schools to share and use best practice more consistently so that more schools use the Pupil Premium effectively. In addition, there remain inequalities in the core funding received by schools with very similar levels of disadvantage. As the impact of the Pupil Premium will take a long time to be fully realised, the Department needs to do more to demonstrate its emerging benefits in the meantime. We also urge the Department to carry out an early review of the effectiveness of the Early Years Pupil Premium.

Introduction

Around 2 million (29%) of the 7 million children aged between 4 and 16 in publicly-funded schools in England come from disadvantaged backgrounds. Such pupils tend to perform poorly in public examinations relative to other pupils. As poor academic performance is associated with lower wages and higher unemployment in adulthood, this ‘attainment gap’ for disadvantaged pupils is a key way in which poverty is transmitted from one generation to the next. In 2011, the Department for Education (the Department) announced new funding for schools, the Pupil Premium, which specifically aims to improve outcomes for disadvantaged children. Between 2011-12 and the end of 2014-15, the Department had distributed some £6.0 billion of Pupil Premium funding to schools. Since the introduction of the Pupil Premium, the attainment gap has closed overall by 4.7 percentage points in primary schools and by 1.6 percentage points in secondary schools. Besides Pupil Premium funding, the Department requires local authorities to use deprivation as a factor when allocating core funding to schools.

Conclusions and recommendations

1. **The Department has demonstrated the potential of the Pupil Premium, but it has not yet set out how it will judge success.** The attainment gap between disadvantaged pupils and their peers has narrowed since 2011 at both primary and secondary school level, but the gap remains large and progress has been uneven across the country. It is clear that the full impact will not be seen for a number of years. But in a time of continuing austerity, the Department will need to be constantly ready to demonstrate the policy's emerging impact in terms that are as specific and clear as possible. The Department needs to be a stronger champion of the policy, as value for money and effectiveness are measured over longer time periods than for some other policy areas. Recording the destinations of children after school may be a useful contribution to the measurement of impact but this will depend on how and when the Department decides to do this.

Recommendation: *In line with its original objective to obtain significant impact in primary schools by 2015 and in secondary schools by 2020, the Department should urgently define what "significant" means, setting out its timetable for action as soon as possible. It should also set out how it will track and report on the post-school destinations of pupils.*

2. **While the evidence base for what works is growing, the Department does not do enough to make sure this good practice is adopted in weaker schools.** Schools have the autonomy to use the Pupil Premium in whatever way they feel will have the biggest impact, which is welcomed by head teachers. To date, the Department has supported schools to use the Pupil Premium effectively primarily by funding the Education Endowment Foundation to carry out research into the evidence base for what works. However, it has done less to incentivise schools to use best practice and only recommends, rather than mandating, Pupil Premium Reviews for schools that do not use funding well. This is particularly worrying given concerns expressed to us that schools that perform poorly are less likely to seek out advice for themselves.

Recommendation: *As the evidence base grows, the Department should develop the necessary mechanisms to make sure schools use effective interventions with disadvantaged pupils. In addition, the Department should make Pupil Premium Reviews mandatory for those schools identified as using the Pupil Premium ineffectively. The Department should ensure that schools share best practice on how to use the pupil premium effectively. It should consider how best to encourage weaker schools to participate and set out its action plan and timetable to achieve this.*

3. **The Department and the Education Endowment Foundation do not understand enough about the reasons why disadvantaged pupils from some backgrounds do markedly better at school than others.** Pupils from some geographical areas seem to face more challenges than others. For example, some deprived rural and coastal areas have entrenched social problems that appear to impact adversely on schools' ability to help disadvantaged pupils to progress quickly. In contrast, pupils from some cultural backgrounds tend to attain well, most strikingly Chinese pupils, whose attainment is very high irrespective of their level of disadvantage. The Education Endowment Foundation and others have done work on raising the attainment of disadvantaged pupils with specific characteristics, such as those with English as a second language.

However, there is clearly an opportunity to learn from groups, ethnic or otherwise, in which only small gaps exist between disadvantaged and other children.

Recommendation: *The Education Endowment Foundation should carry out and then disseminate research into the reasons why disadvantaged pupils from certain communities do better at school than others.*

4. **Parental engagement is important if a child is to do well at school but some schools are struggling to challenge disengaged parents effectively.** Almost all school leaders identify parental engagement as a barrier to closing the attainment gap but many schools do not use the Pupil Premium to address this concern. This is partly due to a debate within the schools sector about whether support for pupils should extend beyond the school gates. While there is good practice in some schools, poor parental engagement remains an issue that is both under-researched and, too often, unaddressed.

Recommendation: *The Department should clarify the circumstances in which it expects schools to challenge parental disengagement and, in collaboration with the Education Endowment Foundation, should improve guidance about what schools should do. It should also set out what work could be done to join up other public and third sector groups to ensure that parental support, or lack of it, is addressed across the board.*

5. **The Department has not yet resolved the potentially destabilising impact that Universal Credit may have on its ability to identify disadvantaged pupils.** Universal Credit, which will see five benefits combined into one, means the end of the current basis for determining free school meals and therefore Pupil Premium eligibility. The Department does not yet know how it will identify disadvantaged pupils following Universal Credit's introduction, and there is relatively little time to find an answer. There has also been substantial variation in the level of under-claiming between local authorities. In 2013, in some areas more than 30% of eligible pupils did not take up their free school meals entitlement compared to 0% in other areas. The Department told us that it wanted to target local authorities where under-claiming was high, so that schools do not miss out on funding because parents fail to claim.

Recommendation: *The Department should write to the Committee, within 6 months, to update us on its plans to mitigate the risk that Universal Credit will make it harder to identify all genuinely disadvantaged pupils. In addition, the Department should ensure local authorities encourage all eligible parents to register for free school meals. The Department should also be clear about how it intends to incentivise local authorities to do this well.*

6. **It will be important to monitor the impact of spending on the recently introduced Early Years Pupil Premium.** Some children from disadvantaged backgrounds are starting school under-prepared and developing more slowly than their peers. Evidence shows that there may be more that can be done to tackle the impact of deprivation on a child's progress in the years before starting school. Given the Education Endowment Foundation's concerns that disseminating best practice will be harder in primary and secondary schools, it is vital that the Department address this issue early on. The Early Years Pupil Premium was introduced earlier this year to try and address this issue. Spending more in the early years is likely to have great economic benefits at a later date, but the likely impact of the Early Years Pupil Premium, worth up to £300 per child, is

not yet known as it is in its first year of operation. We intend to return to the subject of Early Years provision in future.

Recommendation: *The Department should review the level and effectiveness of the Early Years Pupil Premium after its first year of operation.*

7. **There continues to be wide variation in the funding given to schools, even those dealing with similar levels of disadvantage.** Pupil Premium is funded on a rational per capita basis but the Department does not have a similarly rational basis for setting overall funding for disadvantaged pupils. This leads to unexplained variations in school funding, with some schools receiving around £3,000 a year more than others for each disadvantaged pupil. The £390 million given to 69 local authority areas with the lowest levels of school funding is a step in the right direction but there is much more to do. The Department recognises that the funding formula for schools is outdated, and the Government has committed itself to reviewing the distribution of funding to schools so it becomes fairer.

Recommendation: *The Department should set out a clear timetable for completing its review of the schools funding formula and should make sure this review leads to a more structured and evidence-based approach to setting overall funding for schools with similar levels of disadvantage.*

1 Impact

1. On the basis of a report by the Comptroller and Auditor General, we took evidence from the Department for Education (the Department) and the Education Endowment Foundation.¹ We also took evidence from two head teachers, one from the Charter Academy, Portsmouth, and the other from the Berwick Academy, Berwick-upon-Tweed.

2. The Department is responsible for educating almost 7.0 million children aged between 4 and 16 who attend publicly-funded schools in England. Some 2.0 million (29%) of these pupils come from disadvantaged backgrounds. Such pupils tend to perform poorly in public examinations relative to other pupils. The Department aims to raise disadvantaged pupils' attainment and reduce the gap between these children and their peers. In 2011, the Department announced new funding for schools, the Pupil Premium, which specifically aims to improve outcomes for disadvantaged children.²

3. In 2014-15, the Department distributed £2.5 billion of Pupil Premium funding to schools based on the number of disadvantaged pupils that are on each school's roll. The Department expects schools to use the funding to support disadvantaged pupils to achieve more, but schools are free to decide what to spend the money on. To help schools use the Pupil Premium well, the Department encourages school leaders and teachers to use robust evidence of what works and has funded a new charity, the Education Endowment Foundation, to improve the evidence base.³

4. At the time of our evidence session, the Pupil Premium had been in operation for four years. Initial results show the attainment gap is starting to close in some schools, but it is clear that the full impact of the Pupil Premium will only be seen in the longer term.⁴ Since the introduction of the Pupil Premium, the gap has closed overall by 4.7 percentage points in primary schools and 1.6 percentage points in secondary schools (Figure 1). However, the overall gap remains large: in 2014-15 there was a 13.7 percentage point gap at primary level between the number of disadvantaged pupils and their peers who achieve level 4 or above in reading and maths. In secondary schools, the equivalent gap—in the numbers achieving five or more GCSEs at A*-C including English and maths—was 27.4 percentage points. The attainment gap reduced most between 2011 and 2012, with smaller changes since. The Department expects the gap to close at an increasing rate up to 2023—the year when eligible pupils will have been funded for their entire education.⁵

1 [C&AG's Report](#), Funding for Disadvantaged Pupils, Session 2015-16, HC 90, 30 June 2015

2 [C&AG's Report](#), paras 1-2

3 [C&AG's Report](#), paras 3, 5

4 [Qq 41, 81](#)

5 [C&AG's Report](#), paras 20, 3.7

Figure 1: Changes in the attainment gap between 2011 and 2014

Year	Primary pupils achieving level 4 or above in reading and maths		Secondary pupils achieving five or more GCSEs at A*-C grades including English and Maths	
	2011	2014	2011	2014
Pupils eligible for Pupil Premium (%)	62.2	73.0	36.1	36.5
All other pupils (%)	80.6	86.7	65.1	64.0
Gap (percentage points)	18.4	13.7	29.0	27.4

Figures may not sum due to rounding

Source: C&AG's report, Figure 11, based on Department for Education's attainment data

5. When the Department implemented the Pupil Premium it said that it expected the policy to have a significant positive impact on the attainment gap; in primary schools by 2015 and in secondary schools by 2020. But the Department has not yet defined the level of impact that it would see as 'significant'. The Department told us that it was a fair challenge in the NAO report for it to be clearer on how long-term progress will be measured. It said that the previous government was wary of setting targets in this area and that the approach now being discussed with Ministers was not to set targets but to look at benchmarking against international comparators, with a view to "being as good as the best in the world". The Department told us that performance was currently around the OECD average in terms of the gap between disadvantaged and average performance.⁶ The Education Endowment Foundation also explained that it had developed a tool for schools to compare their own performance against that of schools with similar characteristics. It told us that its 'families of schools' database, designed to put schools in touch with others that have similar characteristics, was proving hugely popular.⁷

6. The attainment gap is a limited measure and the head teacher witnesses told us that there were other important measures they employed in order to know that they were having an impact. They informed us, for example, that they were also interested in interventions which improved attendance and raised the aspirations of disadvantaged pupils.⁸ The Department explained that these characteristics were pre-requisites for good attainment, but said that it intended to continue to focus on attainment as its principal metric in future. We also heard that the Department was funding the Education Endowment Foundation to research interventions that have an impact on resilience, self-regulation, and confidence, in order to understand more about how these best support improved attainment.⁹

7. We asked the Department what the scope was for widening the measurement of success of the Pupil Premium. The Department responded that it had so far focused unashamedly on exam performance. But it added that it would be looking increasingly at destination measures; to judge the whole education system, and particularly those interventions supporting disadvantaged pupils. The Department said it would, in future be able to look at, for example, whether interventions resulted in higher employment and less chance of being NEET.¹⁰ We also asked the Department for an update on progress in

6 [Qq 40-41; C&AG's Report](#), paras 21, 1.7

7 [Q 38](#)

8 [Q 2](#)

9 [Qq 58, 59](#)

10 [Q 56](#)

improving the quality of careers advice, following this Committee's recommendation in January 2015.¹¹ The Department told us that it had launched a new careers and enterprise company, which would be working alongside schools to create a network of enterprise advisers in every local enterprise partnership area. The Department told us that these advisers' role would be to support schools to have strong and relevant careers programmes for young people aged between 12 and 18.¹²

8. We also heard from head teachers that they welcome the autonomy to use the Pupil Premium where they feel it will have the biggest impact, and they cited the contrasting examples of, in one case buying a bicycle to help a young carer get to school, and in another providing music tuition to encourage a pupil to persevere with his GCSEs.¹³ The Department commented that "there was a balance to be struck between the freedoms that we want to give individual schools to deal with the challenges of individual pupils and what we require nationally". In the absence of clear trends or a clear sense of what it would be reasonable to expect schools to achieve in terms of closing the attainment gap, we challenged the Department to explain how it could hold schools to account effectively for their use of the Pupil Premium. It explained that the accountability system was based on comparative performance data and Ofsted's judgements of effectiveness.¹⁴ The head teachers we spoke to said they felt that the system held them to account sufficiently for their use of the Pupil Premium, particularly through the annual report they were expected to produce about its use. However, the National Audit Office found that there was weak compliance with this method of reporting, with only one third of schools fully adhering to requirements.¹⁵

9. The Education Endowment Foundation described to us how it was supporting schools to use the Pupil Premium more effectively by building the evidence base for what works. We were told that the Foundation was initially allocated £125 million of government funding but that it would end up spending more like £220 million on its activities thanks to fundraising. It explained that much more needed to be done because the evidence base for helping disadvantaged pupils had been very small to begin with. However, it also accepted that it needed to do more to present and share evidence in ways that schools could easily use.¹⁶ Some 64% of school leaders were now using the Foundation's toolkit to inform decisions about Pupil Premium funding. But we heard that some schools did not use evidence effectively, for example not changing the way they use teaching assistants to help disadvantaged pupils in line with the Foundation's recommendations.¹⁷

10. We were concerned that there were no consequences for schools that failed to use the Pupil Premium effectively. Where it has been identified that a school has failed to use the Pupil Premium well and a Pupil Premium review has been recommended, the review is not mandatory. In the experience of our head teacher witnesses, it was the schools that perform poorly who were less willing to seek out advice and one said "I cannot understand why any head teacher would not want to use that audit". They were in favour of more compulsion for schools to have such a review—in 2014, only 37% of schools that had been recommended a review had one. Also, in some areas, there were insufficient experienced

11 [Q 97; Committee of Public Accounts, 16- to 18-year-old participation in education and training](#), Thirty-first Report of Session 2014–15, 22 January 2015

12 [Qq 97-102](#)

13 [Qq 2, 15](#)

14 [Q 36](#)

15 [Qq 21-22; C&AG's Report](#), para 17

16 [Q 39](#)

17 [Q 65; C&AG's Report](#), para 12

and accredited Pupil Premium reviewers to carry out such work. The reviews are an important part of helping weak schools to learn from good practice elsewhere.¹⁸

11. We asked the Department about its plans to make sure that there were good-quality teachers in deprived areas. It told us that it has a number of initiatives in place to attract teachers to schools in such places, particularly in shortage subjects like maths and physics. The Department explained that, as well as Teach First, there were other programmes that sought to get good teachers into schools where they could make the biggest difference. It has started a talented leaders' programme which aims to get the best school leaders to work in the most challenging schools, and is considering the development of a national teaching service to get the best teachers to work in the most challenging places. The Department did not want to speculate on why so few schools had used their pay freedoms to pay higher salaries to attract better teachers.¹⁹

12. We asked the Department about how the Pupil Premium compared to other programmes that had been used in the past to increase attainment in disadvantaged areas, for example the "Excellence in Cities" programme. The Department explained that the main difference was that the Pupil Premium supported disadvantaged children wherever they were, while other programmes had tended to focus on parts of the country where they were present in large concentrations.²⁰

13. We heard evidence that disadvantaged pupils from some geographical areas continue to face greater challenges than others. We heard that deprived rural and coastal areas can have especially entrenched social problems that impact on the ability of schools to help pupils progress quickly.²¹ We were also told that in certain circumstances some similarly disadvantaged children do better than others, for example disadvantaged children do better in schools where they are present in very low or very high numbers.²² The Education Endowment Foundation has done work on, for example, raising the attainment of disadvantaged pupils who have English as a second language. But it also made clear that there was more work to do. Pupils from some backgrounds attain very well, most strikingly Chinese pupils. We identified that there could be an opportunity to learn from particular groups, ethnic or otherwise, in which smaller gaps exist between disadvantaged and other children.²³ In terms of social mobility it is important that this is properly investigated, rather than just being accepted.

14. The Education Endowment Foundation told us that research shows family engagement and family motivation is highly correlated with attainment at school. The National Audit Office similarly found that 91% of school leaders saw parental engagement as a barrier to closing the attainment gap of some disadvantaged pupils. However, only 57% of these leaders had an intervention in place to address this concern.²⁴ The Department said that there was an ongoing debate within the schools sector about whether supporting pupils 'beyond the school gates' was an appropriate job for schools. However, it acknowledged the importance of the NAO's finding and said that it wanted to look at it further because what successful parental engagement actually looks like is under-researched.²⁵ The Department

18 [Qq 6-10; C&AG's Report](#), paras 18, 2.31

19 [Qq 77, 78](#)

20 [Qq 51-54](#)

21 [Qq 1, 11](#)

22 [Q 49](#)

23 [Qq 83-87](#)

24 [Q 83; C&AG's Report](#), para 2.7

25 [Qq 90-92](#)

also told us that successive governments have put considerable resources into intervening earlier, a lot of which was about tackling the root causes of poor outcomes.²⁶

15. The Education Endowment Foundation also told us that it had a number of studies looking at different ways of promoting parental engagement to see which approach works best. Both the Foundation and the head teacher witnesses told us about innovative practices to get parents more involved, for example parenting classes and sending text messages to parents informing them about positive or interesting things that their children had done.²⁷

26 [Q 29](#)

27 [Qq 27, 93-95](#)

2 Funding

16. We asked how the Department had determined how much to spend on the Pupil Premium. It told us that this had not been derived in a scientific way but was based on the result of negotiations in the 2010 Spending Review.²⁸ However, the Department has weighted the Pupil Premium towards primary schools to reflect evidence demonstrating the importance of earlier intervention. In 2014-15, it gave primary schools £1,320 per pupil compared to £935 in secondary schools.²⁹

17. The Department uses pupils' free school meal eligibility to allocate the Pupil Premium to schools. In 2013, it estimated that up to 11% of children who were eligible for free school meals did not receive it because their parents had not registered them. According to the Department's research, there was substantial variation in the level of under-claiming between local authorities. In some areas it estimated that more than 30% of eligible pupils did not claim free school meals, compared to none at all elsewhere. Furthermore, in 2014, the Department introduced Universal Infant Free School Meals, removing the most obvious incentive for their parents to register in pupils' first two years of school.³⁰ The Department told us that it remained concerned about under-claiming and that it would open a dialogue with local authorities and schools where there was a particularly high non-claimant rate. It also said that it had requested data from the Department for Work & Pensions and HM Revenue & Customs so that it could look at claimant rates against its school census, identify variations or anomalies, and target its work to reduce under-claiming. The Department explained that the problem of identifying and addressing where Pupil Premium is under-claimed affected the distribution of available funds, but not the overall amount of funding.³¹

18. We also received written evidence from the Carers Trust which highlighted that many children with caring responsibilities may not be eligible for the Pupil Premium.³² The Department recognises that the use of free school meals as its main measure of disadvantage is imperfect. It explained that this was why it implemented the 'ever 6' policy, meaning that children who had been eligible for free school meals at any point in the past six years receive the Pupil Premium.³³

19. Free school meal eligibility is currently based on whether a child's parents receive certain means-tested benefits. Government is currently reforming the benefits system, combining five benefits into one under Universal Credit, which means that from 2016 it will be impossible to identify disadvantaged pupils consistently with previous years.³⁴ The Department has not yet solved how it will identify disadvantaged pupils following the introduction of Universal Credit. It told us that it would need to agree and identify a new earnings threshold against which free school meals eligibility would be identified, and that it was working on it with the Department for Work & Pensions. In response to our concerns that the Universal Credit change could put extra pressure on head teachers to identify pupils, the Department told us that "how eligibility works in the future needs to be the Government's problem, not the problem of head teachers."³⁵

28 [Qq 43-45](#)

29 [Qq 75-76](#)

30 [Q 31](#); [C&AG's report](#), paras 1.13-1.14

31 [Qq 32-34](#)

32 [Written evidence from Carers Trust](#), 20 July 2015

33 [Qq 34-35](#)

34 [C&AG's report](#), para 1.11

35 [Qq 28, 35](#)

20. In April 2015 the Government also introduced an Early Years Pupil Premium, at up to £300 a year for each disadvantaged child, designed to ensure children are better prepared for starting primary school. For example, ensuring that younger children from the most disadvantaged families are still developing language skills and playing with toys that help develop numeracy. In addition to the weighting of existing funding more towards primary schools relative to secondary schools, the Education Endowment Foundation considered that the move to put money into early years was supported by evidence and was a really positive step forward in the use of the Pupil Premium.³⁶

21. The Department reiterated that early intervention helps to ensure that the factors that act as barriers to being ready to learn and ready to go to school can be targeted. In response to our concern about understanding whether the new early years premium was proving effective and being well used, the Department told us that it would be monitoring it closely and that it was very aware of ensuring best practice across the system. The Education Endowment Foundation added that the task of disseminating knowledge on best practice in early years provision would be even more difficult than it is for the schools sector.³⁷

22. Besides Pupil Premium funding, the Department requires local authorities to use deprivation as a factor when allocating 'core' funding to primary and secondary schools. Local authorities distribute the money to schools based on pupil numbers and local circumstances, and the Department requires local authorities to use deprivation as a factor in this distribution. In 2014-15, local authorities allocated £2.4 billion of the total £41.5 billion of revenue funding to schools on the basis of deprivation. However, the Department distributes core funding to local authorities on the basis of an old formula that gives some parts of the country more than others.³⁸

23. The National Audit Office found much unexplained variation in the amount schools receive, particularly between London and the rest of the country. In 2014-15 some schools received £3,000 a year more than others for each disadvantaged pupil. Variation exists even between schools with very similar proportions of disadvantaged pupils and cannot be fully explained due to differences in the cost of living.³⁹ Our Education Endowment Foundation witness commented that in his experience of teaching in both London and Yorkshire "it always struck me as odd that we got so much more in East London".⁴⁰

24. The Department told us that the school core funding formula had remained basically the same since 2005. It confirmed that Government was committed to fairer funding in future, but that decisions on what fairer funding means in practice, and how it would be done, would be for the spending review. The Department added that, as a first step, the Government had announced an extra £390 million in total for the 69 local authority areas it calculates to be the most underfunded.⁴¹ The Department described the Pupil Premium as a 'bolt-on' to the existing school funding formula. On the question of whether the Pupil Premium was more effective because it was separate ring-fenced money, the Education Endowment Foundation told us that "The very fact this is separated out has, in my view, clearly sharpened the conversation and focus around this group of children."⁴²

36 [Qq 75, 109](#)

37 [Qq 109-110](#)

38 [C&AG's Report](#), paras 4, 10

39 [C&AG's Report](#), paras 1.20-1.22

40 [Q 75](#)

41 [Qq 60-61, 71](#); [C&AG's report](#), para 1.24

42 [Q 62](#)

Formal Minutes

Monday 14 September 2015

Members present:

Meg Hillier, in the Chair

Mr Richard Bacon
Kevin Foster
Nigel Mills
David Mowat
Teresa Pearce

Stephen Phillips
John Pugh
Nick Smith
Karin Smyth
Mrs Anne-Marie Trevelyan

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

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

Paragraphs 1 to 24 read and agreed to.

Conclusions and recommendations agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Third Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 134.

[Adjourned till Wednesday 16 September at 2.00 pm

Witnesses

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

Tuesday 21 July 2015

Question number

Dame Sharon Hollows, Headteacher, Charter Academy, and **Alexis Widdowson**, Principal, Berwick Academy

[Q1-28](#)

Juliet Chua, Director, Post 16 and Disadvantaged Group, Department for Education, **Sir Kevan Collins**, Chief Executive, Education Endowment Foundation, and **Chris Wormald**, Permanent Secretary, Department for Education

[Q29-111](#)

Published written evidence

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the Committee's [inquiry web page](#). FDP numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

- 1 Carers Trust ([FDP0001](#))
- 2 Department for Education ([FDP0003](#))
- 3 The Education Endowment Foundation ([FDP0002](#))

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the Committee's website at www.parliament.uk/pac

The reference number of the Government's response to each Report is printed in brackets after the HC printing number.

Session 2015-16

First Report	Financial sustainability of police forces in England and Wales	HC 288
Second Report	Disposal of public land for new homes	HC 289