



House of Commons
Committee of Public Accounts

The higher education market

Forty-Fifth Report of Session 2017–19

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

*Ordered by the House of Commons
to be printed 6 June 2018*

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 MP](#) (*Labour (Co-op), Hackney South and Shoreditch*) (Chair)

[Bim Afolami MP](#) (*Conservative, Hitchin and Harpenden*)

[Sir Geoffrey Clifton-Brown MP](#) (*Conservative, The Cotswolds*)

[Martyn Day MP](#) (*Scottish National Party, Linlithgow and East Falkirk*)

[Chris Evans MP](#) (*Labour (Co-op), Islwyn*)

[Caroline Flint MP](#) (*Labour, Don Valley*)

[Luke Graham MP](#) (*Conservative, Ochil and South Perthshire*)

[Robert Jenrick MP](#) (*Conservative, Newark*)

[Gillian Keegan MP](#) (*Conservative, Chichester*)

[Shabana Mahmood MP](#) (*Labour, Birmingham, Ladywood*)

[Layla Moran MP](#) (*Liberal Democrat, Oxford West and Abingdon*)

[Stephen Morgan MP](#) (*Labour, Portsmouth South*)

[Anne Marie Morris MP](#) (*Conservative, Newton Abbot*)

[Bridget Phillipson MP](#) (*Labour, Houghton and Sunderland South*)

[Lee Rowley MP](#) (*Conservative, North East Derbyshire*)

[Gareth Snell MP](#) (*Labour (Co-op), Stoke-on-Trent Central*)

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](#) and in print by Order of the House.

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

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Richard Cooke (Clerk), Dominic Stockbridge (Second Clerk), Hannah Wentworth (Chair Support), Zainab Balogun, Carolyn Bowes and Kutumya Kibedi (Committee Assistants), and Tim Bowden (Media Officer).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Committee of Public Accounts, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 6593; the Committee's email address is pubaccom@parliament.uk.

Contents

Summary	3
Introduction	4
Conclusions and recommendations	5
1 Choice and access in the higher education market	8
Student Choice	8
Widening Participation	10
2 Ensuring value for money in the higher education market	12
On Redress available to students	12
Value for money	12
Formal Minutes	15
Witnesses	16
Published written evidence	16
Published correspondence	16
List of Reports from the Committee during the current session	17

Summary

The Government has recently introduced changes to the regulation of higher education to address concerns that students were not always getting a good service.

The original aim of introducing a market into higher education was that student choice and competition between providers would improve quality and value for money. In reality the planned for competition did not emerge.

Most students are teenagers when they apply and are too often not getting the right advice and support they need. Decisions made in year 9 can have a serious impact on the choices young people are able to make when applying to universities and yet we were not convinced that the myriad of careers initiatives generated by Government are leading to demonstrably better advice for individual pupils.

Shorter degree courses and part-time courses have also not emerged. A number of Government policies are aimed at widening participation in higher education and this has to be a focus if the Government is serious about delivering its social mobility agenda. Experience shows that it cannot rely on the sector alone to deliver.

We spoke to the Office for Students at its inception and hope that it will set a clear marker that it really is acting in the interests of students from day one. It is still unclear how it will gauge the real concerns of students and ensure that institutions are delivering and sanctioned when they let students down.

It will be important to get right the change in the ease with which students are able to transfer institutions. This will not only be critical to the life chances of tens of thousands of young people, but also to creating the foundations for the UK to face the many challenges ahead.

Introduction

Over 2 million people are students at higher education institutions in England, mostly at universities. The Department for Education (the Department) provides £9 billion of up-front funding each year for higher education in England in the form of grants and tuition fees, equivalent to £7,903 per student, up from £6 billion in 2007/08. Some 85% of up-front funding now directly follows student choice (up from 23% in 2007/08) via tuition fee loans, which the government increased from £3,000 per year to a maximum of £9,000 in 2012. The government also removed caps on the number of students institutions could accept from 2015/16 to allow popular providers to expand and more young people to access higher education.

The Department introduced further reforms to the higher education market through the Higher Education and Research Act 2017. The Department's objectives for the reforms included introducing more competition and wider variety of options (for example, two-year accelerated degrees or online courses) into the higher education market. The Department also intended for the reforms to foster excellent teaching, ensure students could make informed choices, and increase access to higher education among students from disadvantaged backgrounds. The reforms included setting up a new market regulator, the Office for Students (OfS), whose remit is to support a competitive environment, promote choice, quality and value for money in the interests of students and the taxpayer.

Conclusions and recommendations

1. **The Department treats the higher education sector as a market, but it is not a market that is working in the interests of students or taxpayers.** There is greater competition for students between higher education providers, but no evidence that this will improve the quality of the education they provide. Higher education providers have increased their marketing budgets in order to attract students rather than compete by charging different tuition fees. However, the amount of funding for higher education (primarily via tuition fees) has increased by 50% since 2007/08. It is therefore critical that the higher education market is delivering value for money, both for individual students and the taxpayer. The new sector regulator, the OfS, has a primary objective that students “receive value for money”. But neither the OfS nor the Department has articulated well enough what value for money means in higher education, or how they will seek to monitor and improve it.

Recommendation: *The Department should write to the committee by October 2018 to explain what it expects a successful higher education market to look like.*

2. **Young people are not being properly supported in making decisions on higher education, due in large part to insufficient and inconsistent careers advice.** The substantial financial commitment required and wide variation in outcomes from higher education mean prospective students need high-quality advice and support to make decisions that are right for them. The complexity of the market and the volume of information available makes it difficult for prospective students, most of whom are teenagers, to assess the quality and suitability of higher education institutions, raising questions over whether student choice alone will drive up the quality of provision. A wide range of other factors influence students’ decisions, such as marketing by higher education providers, the reputation of institutions and their perceived prestige, a student’s family background, as well as the location and costs of travel and accommodation. High-quality, impartial careers advice is critically important, but the support available to students in schools is not good enough. The Department acknowledged that it needs to improve the quality of careers advice for young people. It told us that its Careers Strategy, published in December 2017, will have a “real impact” on young people’s lives and help students make choices which best fit their own aptitude, skills and preferences, but it is not clear how or whether the department will ensure high quality careers advice at school level. It is too early to judge its success, but action is needed quickly and the strategy should be robustly evaluated to ensure it is achieving its aims.

Recommendation: *The Department should write to the Committee by October 2018 with details of progress it has made with its careers strategy and the impact it is having. It should set up an evaluation framework to enable it to assess progress.*

3. **The Department does not have enough of a grip on actions to widen participation in higher education, and is over-reliant on the actions of some universities.** The Department’s reforms are designed in part to ensure equal access to higher education, regardless of a student’s background. However, students from disadvantaged backgrounds are still far less likely to enter into higher education than those from more advantaged backgrounds. There have also been substantial drops in part-time and lifelong learning, which are critical to social mobility. The Department told us

that it has introduced a Social Mobility Action Plan to address inequalities across the education system, and one of the roles of the OfS will be to ensure best practice in reaching out to students from disadvantaged background is being applied across the higher education sector. However, we are concerned that the incentives in the higher education market do not sufficiently support widening participation. Outreach activities are primarily conducted by universities and while there are areas of good practice, some universities who find it easy to recruit students are not pulling their weight. The OfS told us that each higher education provider will set targets for widening participation and improving outcomes for disadvantaged groups, and it will oversee these Access and Participation Plans, which will be a condition of registration. But it remains to be seen whether the plans to improve performance will have an impact on the life chances for disadvantaged groups.

Recommendation: *The Department should provide us with evidence of how it is widening participation and opening higher education to students from disadvantaged backgrounds. The Department should demonstrate how they will maintain pressure on providers to measure success.*

4. **Students have limited means of redress if they are unhappy with the quality of their course, even if they drop out.** The relationship between students and higher education institutions has changed substantially since tuition fees were introduced, with a much greater emphasis on whether a course or institution offers value for money. An effective market requires empowered consumers who can switch provider if they are dissatisfied, but this is not the case in the higher education market. Across the sector, only 2% of students transfer provider each year, and students are more likely to drop-out altogether if they are dissatisfied with their course rather than switch provider. When students do switch providers or drop out, they are unlikely to get any of their fees back unless they can demonstrate that they were misled in some way. The OfS will require universities to demonstrate what arrangements they have in place for facilitating transfers, and it will have a responsibility to make sure there is better use of transfers where appropriate. However, given the relative weakness of students as consumers, it is vital that the OfS uses its full powers actively, and works effectively with other regulators, such as the Advertising Standards Authority and the Competition and Markets Authority, to ensure the market functions in the interests of students.

Recommendation: *In developing the new regulatory framework, the Department and OfS must ensure students' interests are protected. The OfS should include clear guidelines to enable students to shift courses or institutions more easily.*

5. **The new Office for Students has not yet articulated how it will support the varied and complex interests of students.** It told us that, as the sector regulator, its role is to regulate universities and colleges “on behalf of students”. However, it is clear that these interests are varied, complex and often competing. The OfS told us that it has established a student panel, although it has chosen not to work with the National Union of Students, to inform how it makes decisions and to ensure that its definition of the student interest is defined by students themselves. It also told us that it plans to develop a student engagement strategy to clarify what the interests of students are so that it can feed these into its regulatory framework, which would include quality of teaching, feedback and graduate outcomes as key areas of focus. But until the

OfS has sufficient clarity over what it is trying to achieve in the interests of students, it will not be able to effectively monitor and evaluate the success of its regulatory approach.

Recommendation: *The Office for Students should report back in six months to set out in detail how it will measure and report on its performance in regulating for students, and be clear about what its priorities are in protecting student interests.*

1 Choice and access in the higher education market

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 new higher education regulator the Office for Students on the functioning of the higher education market.¹ We also took evidence from the National Union of Students, University Alliance and the Oxford Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies.

2. Over 2 million people are students at higher education institutions in England, mostly at universities. The Department provides £9 billion of up-front funding each year for higher education in England in the form of grants and tuition fees, equivalent to £7,903 per student, up from £6 billion in 2007/08. Some 85% of up-front funding now directly follows student choice (up from 23% in 2007/08) via tuition fee loans, which the government increased from £3,000 per year to a maximum of £9,000 in 2012. The government also removed caps on the number of students institutions could accept from 2015/16 to allow popular providers to expand and more young people to access higher education.²

3. In 2017, the Department introduced further reforms to the higher education market through the Higher Education and Research Act. The Department's objectives for the reforms included introducing more competition and variety of options, for example two-year accelerated degrees or online courses, into the higher education market. The Department also intended for the reforms to foster excellent teaching, ensure students could make informed choices, and increase access to higher education among students from disadvantaged backgrounds. The reforms included setting up a new market regulator, the Office for Students (OfS), whose remit is to support a competitive environment, promote choice, quality and value for money in the interests of students and the taxpayer.³

Student Choice

4. Participation in higher education represents a significant financial commitment for students, with average student debt of £50,000 from a three-year course. On average graduates earn 42% more than non-graduates, although the earnings of individual graduates can vary widely by subject, provider and family background.⁴ A wide range of factors influence student's higher education choices including the perceived prestige of institutions, location and family background and, for some, choices are constrained by cost (for example, travel and accommodation) and caring responsibilities.⁵

5. In light of these substantial costs and wide variation in outcomes, we asked witnesses whether prospective students are properly supported to make informed decisions about what and where to study. The NUS and University Alliance told us that universities have responded to an increasingly competitive market by investing more in marketing. The NUS told us that this has led to misleading information being given to prospective students

1 Report by the Comptroller and Auditor General, [The higher education market](#), Session 2017–19, HC 629, 8 December 2017

2 [C&AG's Report](#), paras 1.1, 1.4

3 [C&AG's Report](#), para 1.10–1.11

4 [C&AG's Report](#), paras 2.6–2.7

5 Qq 4, 19

in a number of cases and the Advertising Standards Authority has had to intervene as a result.⁶ University Alliance also told us that the diversity of the higher education market (for example, in terms of course content and learning styles) makes it very difficult for students to work out what would suit them best without face-to-face advice from an informed independent source.⁷ We also received written evidence from Professor Roger Brown, Professor Emeritus of Higher Education Policy and former Vice Chancellor of Southampton Solent University, who told us that providing good information to students to inform their choice was an “insuperable problem” in the higher education market. He told us that this was in part because it is impossible to ensure valid, reliable, comparable and tailored information. In the absence of this information, Professor Brown asserted that students use “institutional prestige” as a substitute which is mainly based on an institution’s age, resources and research performance.⁸

6. The Department accepted that it needed to improve the quality and reliability of information available to young people and ensure that 16 and 17-year-olds have access to much more information than they currently have in order to make an informed choice about their education. It told us that it is launching a new website in 2019 that will include information on what graduates have earned, searchable by course and provider. It has also introduced a new transparency duty as part of the new regulatory framework, whereby higher education providers will be required to provide information on admissions, completion rates and outcomes to prospective students, including how these may vary by gender, ethnicity and socio-economic background.⁹ The Department confirmed that this information will be made available on the new website.¹⁰ The Department also told us that the Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework (TEF) is intended to provide students with information on the teaching quality of institutions. In comparison, the NUS told us that it does not believe TEF accurately measures teaching quality and asserted that the Department’s plans to introduce subject-level TEF ratings from next academic year will further confuse students.¹¹

7. Students can receive careers advice and support from a range of sources, including in schools. The NAO found that only 60% of 13- to 14-year-olds had access to an external careers advisor, and the support available does not always reach those who need it most.¹² The Department accepted that the level and quality of careers advice that students receive was “nothing like as consistent as it should be”.¹³ It told us that its new Careers Strategy is intended to address this and have a real impact on the lives of young people, with a full-time dedicated Careers Leader established in every school.¹⁴ We asked what it was doing to support older entrants to higher education. The Department told us that careers advice is available through the National Careers Service, and the Careers & Enterprise Company is establishing career hubs to enhance career information in the most deprived parts of the country.¹⁵

6 Qq 1–2

7 Qq 4, 33

8 Professor Roger Brown ([HEM0002](#)) paras 5–11

9 Qq 45, 47, 78

10 Qq 47; Office for Students, [Securing student success: Regulatory framework for higher education in England](#), 2018.01, p124

11 Qq 1, 36–40

12 [C&AG’s Report](#), para 2.14–2.15

13 Qq 46

14 Qq 45; Department for Education, [Careers strategy: making the most of everyone’s skills and talents](#), 2017, p22–24

15 Qq 47–51

Widening Participation

8. The Department’s reforms of the higher education sector are designed in part to ensure equal access to higher education, regardless of an individual’s background. The percentage of 18-year-olds entering higher education from the lowest participation areas of the country—those with low levels of higher education participation and strongly correlated with areas of social deprivation—has improved in recent years, but there remains a substantial gap with higher participation areas (26% compared to 59% from the highest participation areas). As most of this gap is explained by differences in how well students do at school, we questioned the Department on what action it is taking to reduce the inequality in school attainment between children from disadvantaged and more affluent backgrounds.¹⁶ The Department recognised the scale of this challenge and told us it was a “huge priority”. The Department told us that it had developed a Social Mobility Action Plan to address inequalities across the education system, which included specific measurable outcomes that it planned to track.¹⁷

9. Since 2011, the number of part-time students has fallen 55% by and the number of mature students has fallen by 39%. The number of students studying non-degree undergraduate qualifications has also fallen.¹⁸ In its written evidence, the Open University called the decline in part-time higher education “catastrophic” and described it as a symptom of a “broken market”.¹⁹ As lifelong learning is critical for social mobility, we asked the Department what it was doing to address these worrying trends. The Department acknowledged that these declines were in part an unintended consequence of the new tuition fee regime, but asserted that other factors had also contributed to the decline. It told us that addressing this issue is a key question for the review of post-18 education and funding that the government is currently carrying out and which will be concluded in early 2019. The Department told us that in the meantime it had introduced maintenance loans for part-time students from 2018–19 and was working to ensuring that there were attractive degree options for part-time students, such as accelerated degrees and online courses.²⁰

10. Higher education providers have a responsibility to take action to widen participation and carry out the majority of outreach activities, funded from their tuition fee income. University Alliance told us that universities can do a lot to widen participation, including: building up relationships with schools and colleges; assessing applicants on their potential not just their grades; providing additional support; and putting in place measures to reduce isolation and foster a sense of belonging and participation.²¹ University Alliance and the NUS told us that not all universities are doing enough to support widening participation, and that some universities are doing more of the “heavy lifting” in relation to widening participation.²² Universities that are able to attract a lot of applicants because of their perceived prestige have less incentive to work hard to widen participation.²³

16 Qq 63; [C&AG’s Report](#), paras 2.16–2.18

17 Q 63–67; Department for Education, [Unlocking talent, fulfilling potential: a plan for improving social mobility through education](#), Cm 9541, December 2017

18 [C&AG’s Report](#), para 3.33

19 Open University ([HEM0004](#)) para 6–7

20 Qq 90, 124

21 Qq 16

22 Qq 17

23 University Alliance ([HEM0006](#)) para 4

11. The Department acknowledged that good practice across the sector in relation to widening participation is not consistent, and that the OfS will have an important role in ensuring good practice is being applied across the sector. The OfS told us it will make Access and Participation Plans a condition of institutions registering to access public funding for higher education. These plans will specify targets for each provider to improve both access and outcomes for disadvantaged groups, and the OfS will monitor progress against these plans. It told us it will have a range of sanctions it can impose if a provider is failing to make progress, describing these as a “more nuanced range of responses” than were available under the previous regulatory regime. OfS will be able to impose fines if it felt it were necessary, but the level of these is still to be determined and is currently being consulted on.²⁴

2 Ensuring value for money in the higher education market

On Redress available to students

12. The relationship between students and higher education institutions has changed substantially since tuition fees were introduced, with a much greater emphasis on whether a course or institution offers value for money. Dennis Farington told us that the current higher education market has transformed the relationship between students and universities to one of “business-to-consumer”, and yet students have limited enforceable rights. He described this model as “retrogressive”, and argued that a standard contract should be put in place for students entering university, so that all students are placed on a level playing field and understand their rights.²⁵

13. For a market to operate effectively, it needs empowered consumers who can switch provider if they are dissatisfied, but this is not currently the case in the higher education market. Across the sector, only 2% of students transfer provider each year, and students are more likely to drop-out altogether if they are dissatisfied with their course rather than switch.²⁶ We asked the Department and the OfS what they were doing to facilitate switching, and how they plan to address the perverse incentive universities might have to limit student transfers so they do not lose tuition fee income. The OfS accepted that if students have made the wrong decision about their course or institution, then both it and the higher education provider have a responsibility to make it easier for students to transfer. It told us that one of its conditions of registration for higher education providers is to demonstrate what arrangements they have in place to allow students to transfer. As the new regulator, OfS will have a responsibility to make sure there is better use of transfers where appropriate.²⁷

14. When students do switch providers or drop out, they are unlikely to get any of their fees back unless they can demonstrate that they were misled in some way. The OfS told us that if students had been misled in some way by their provider, they may be able to reclaim some of their fees, but if they were dissatisfied because they had made a bad choice, then it would be more difficult.²⁸ While some students have to start their higher education again if they move institutions, many can move straight into the second year of their course, but this is not well understood or communicated.²⁹

Value for money

15. Since 2012, the proportion of students who considered their courses value for money has dropped from over 50% to 32% in 2017. The Department’s reforms to the higher education sector, including the increase in tuition fees to £9,000 in 2012 and the lifting of the cap on student numbers from 2015/16, have led to an increase in funding within the sector. The Department provided £9 billion of up-front funding for undergraduate higher education teaching in England in 2015/16 (equivalent to £7,903 per student), up 50% from

25 Qq 5, 18, 21

26 Q 74

27 Qq 75, 113

28 Qq 76

29 Q 77

£6 billion in 2007/8. However, the NAO found that there has been no meaningful price competition in the sector to drive down prices for the benefit of the student and taxpayer. When it introduced £9,000 fees, government expected that price competition would drive fees to an average of £7,500. But in 2016, 87 of the top 90 universities charged the maximum £9,000 fee for all courses.³⁰

16. In light of the lack of price competition and students' declining perceptions of value for money, we asked both the Department and the OfS how they would ensure value for money in the higher education sector in future, both for students and the taxpayer. The Department told us that the value of the sector to the taxpayer is based on increased economic productivity. It told us that a 10% increase in the number of students doing degrees leads to an increase in productivity of between 2% and 5%. From the student's perspective, the value for the higher education sector is based on the fact that graduates on average receive higher wages than non-graduates. It also told us that degrees that may not lead to an economic return in the form of higher future earnings can offer a wide range of social returns and this is another component of value for money. The Department told us that the OfS will have a responsibility to ensure individual institutions are using their resources wisely; the TEF will assess the quality of individual courses; and improvements to the information available to students will enable them to weigh up the economic and social returns to a particular course so they can make an informed choice.³¹

17. As the new regulator for the higher education market, the OfS' remit is to support a competitive environment, promote choice, quality and value in the interests of students and the taxpayer. The OfS told us that its role is to regulate the sector "on behalf of students" and in the interests of current and future students. It told us that it has commissioned research from a consortium of student unions to identify how students define "value for money", to help it fulfil this obligation. It found that there is wide variation in how students think of value for money, and that going forward it would need to be responsive to the range of concerns students have.³² In its written evidence, Universities UK, the representative organisation for the UK's universities, told us it is right to expect universities to demonstrate value for money in a wide range of contexts: for the taxpayer, students, employers, communities and regions. It also highlighted the complex range of factors that need to be considered in these assessments and told us that universities will need to work with the OfS in defining value for money.³³

18. Given the challenge of regulating in the interests of a diverse group, we asked the OfS how it intends to do this. It told us that it has established a student panel to inform its decisions and to ensure that its definition of the student interest is defined by students themselves. It also plans to develop a student engagement strategy to help clarify what the student interest is, and then feed this into how it implements its regulatory framework. It acknowledged that it is a difficult task, but highlighted particular categories of concerns student have in relation to the quality of teaching, feedback and graduate outcomes as key areas of focus.³⁴ It told us it has a range of measures it can take to regulate the sector in the interests of students including enhanced monitoring, fines and in extreme cases

30 [C&AG's Report](#), paras 1.2, 3.3–3.5

31 Qq 121–122

32 Qq 128–130

33 Universities UK ([HEM0003](#)) paras 2, 14

34 Qq 126, 129–131

de-registering providers.³⁵ The OfS is also not the only regulatory body with oversight of the sector. For example, although it has a role to promote competition, it does not have enforcement powers, which are held by the Competition and Markets Authority.³⁶ There is also the Advertising Standards Agency, which has taken action against universities for misleading advertising.³⁷

35 Qq 132–134

36 [C&AG's Report](#), para 3.13

37 Qq 1–2

Formal Minutes

Wednesday 6 June 2018

Members present:

Meg Hillier (in the Chair)

Sir Geoffrey Clifton-Brown	Shabana Mahmood
Chris Evans	Anne Marie Morris
Gillian Keegan	

Draft Report (*The higher education market*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

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

Paragraphs 1 to 18 read and agreed to.

Introduction agreed to.

Conclusions and recommendations agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Forty-fifth 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 Monday 11 June at 3.30 pm

Witnesses

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

Monday 12 March 2018

Question number

Maddalaine Ansell, Chief Executive, University Alliance, **Amatey Doku**, Vice President (Higher Education), National Union of Students, and **Dennis Farrington**, Visiting Fellow, Oxford Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies

[Q1–34](#)

Jonathan Slater, Permanent Secretary, **Dr Philippa Lloyd**, Director General, Higher and Further Education, Department for Education, and **Nicola Dandridge**, Chief Executive, Office for Students

[Q35–78](#)

Wednesday 28 March 2018

Jonathan Slater, Permanent Secretary, **Dr Philippa Lloyd**, Director General, Higher and Further Education, Department for Education and **Nicola Dandridge**, Chief Executive, Office for Students

[Q79–146](#)

Published written evidence

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

HEM numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

- 1 GuildHE (HEM0005)
- 2 Open University (HEM0004)
- 3 Professor Ali Eftekhari (HEM0001)
- 4 Professor Roger Brown (HEM0002)
- 5 Universities UK (HEM0003)
- 6 University Alliance (HEM0006)

Published correspondence

The following correspondence was received and can be viewed on the inquiry publications page of the Committee's website.

- 1 [Correspondence with the Department for Education dated 27 March 2018](#)

List of Reports from the Committee during the current session

All publications from the Committee are available on the [publications page](#) of the Committee's website. The reference number of the Government's response to each Report is printed in brackets after the HC printing number.

Session 2017–19

First Report	Tackling online VAT fraud and error	HC 312 (Cm 9549)
Second Report	Brexit and the future of Customs	HC 401 (Cm 9565)
Third Report	Hinkley Point C	HC 393 (Cm 9565)
Fourth Report	Clinical correspondence handling at NHS Shared Business Services	HC 396 (Cm 9575)
Fifth Report	Managing the costs of clinical negligence in hospital trusts	HC 397 (Cm 9575)
Sixth Report	The growing threat of online fraud	HC 399 (Cm 9575)
Seventh Report	Brexit and the UK border	HC 558 (Cm 9575)
Eighth Report	Mental health in prisons	HC 400 (Cm 9575) (Cm 9596)
Ninth Report	Sheffield to Rotherham tram-trains	HC 453 (Cm 9575)
Tenth Report	High Speed 2 Annual Report and Accounts	HC 454 (Cm 9575)
Eleventh Report	Homeless households	HC 462 (Cm 9575) (Cm 9618)
Twelfth Report	HMRC's Performance in 2016–17	HC 456 (Cm 9596)
Thirteenth Report	NHS continuing healthcare funding	HC 455 (Cm 9596)
Fourteenth Report	Delivering Carrier Strike	HC 394 (Cm 9596)
Fifteenth Report	Offender-monitoring tags	HC 458 (Cm 9596)
Sixteenth Report	Government borrowing and the Whole of Government Accounts	HC 463 (Cm 9596)
Seventeenth Report	Retaining and developing the teaching workforce	HC 460 (Cm 9596)

Eighteenth Report	Exiting the European Union	HC 467 (Cm 9596)
Nineteenth Report	Excess Votes 2016–17	HC 806 (Cm 9596)
Twentieth Report	Update on the Thameslink Programme	HC 466 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-First Report	The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority's Magnox	HC 461 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-Second Report	The monitoring, inspection and funding of Learndirect Ltd.	HC 875 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-Third Report	Alternative Higher Education Providers	HC 736 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-Fourth Report	Care Quality Commission: regulating health and social care	HC 468 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-Fifth Report	The sale of the Green Investment Bank	HC 468 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-Sixth Report	Governance and departmental oversight of the Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership	HC 896 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-Seventh Report	Government contracts for Community Rehabilitation Companies	HC 897 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-Eighth Report	Ministry of Defence: Acquisition and support of defence equipment	HC 724 (Cm 9618)
Twenty-Ninth Report	Sustainability and transformation in the NHS	HC 793 (Cm 9618)
Thirtieth Report	Academy schools' finances	HC 760 (Cm 9618)
Thirty-First Report	The future of the National Lottery	HC 898
Thirty-Second Report	Cyber-attack on the NHS	HC 787
Thirty-Third Report	Research and Development funding across government	HC 668
Thirty-Fourth Report	Exiting the European Union: The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy	HC 687
Thirty-Fifth Report	Rail franchising in the UK	HC 689
Thirty-Sixth Report	Reducing modern slavery	HC 886
Thirty-Seventh Report	Exiting the European Union: The Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs and the Department for International Trade	HC 699
Thirty-Eighth Report	The adult social care workforce in England	HC 690
Thirty-Ninth Report	The Defence Equipment Plan 2017–2027	HC 880

Fortieth Report	Renewable Heat Incentive in Great Britain	HC 696
Forty-First Report	Government risk assessments relating to Carillion	HC 1045
Forty-Second Report	Modernising the Disclosure and Barring Service	HC 695
Forty-Third Report	Clinical correspondence handling in the NHS	HC 929
Forty-Fourth Report	Reducing emergency admissions	HC 795
First Special Report	Chair of the Public Accounts Committee's Second Annual Report	HC 347