



House of Commons
Education and Skills Committee

Citizenship Education

Second Report of Session 2006–07

EMBARGOED ADVANCE COPY

Not to be published

In full, or in part, in any form before

00.01 am on Thursday 8 March 2007



House of Commons
Education and Skills Committee

Citizenship Education

Second Report of Session 2006–07

Report, together with formal minutes, oral and written evidence

*Ordered by The House of Commons
to be printed 21 February 2007*

HC 147
Incorporating HC 581–i to vii, Session 2005–06
Published on 8 March 2007
by authority of the House of Commons
London: The Stationery Office Limited
£0.00

The Education and Skills Committee

The Education and Skills Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration and policy of the Department for Education and Skills and its associated public bodies.

Membership at time Report agreed

Mr Barry Sheerman MP (*Labour, Huddersfield*) (Chairman)

Mr Douglas Carswell MP (*Conservative, Harwich*)

Mr David Chaytor MP (*Labour, Bury North*)

Jeff Ennis MP (*Labour, Barnsley East & Mexborough*)

Paul Holmes MP (*Liberal Democrat, Chesterfield*)

Helen Jones MP (*Labour, Warrington North*)

Fiona Mactaggart MP (*Labour, Slough*)

Mr Gordon Marsden MP (*Labour, Blackpool South*)

Mr Andrew Pelling MP (*Conservative, Croydon Central*)

Stephen Williams MP (*Liberal Democrat, Bristol West*)

Mr Rob Wilson MP (*Conservative, Reading East*)

Powers

The committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No 152. These are available on the Internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publications

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the Internet at www.parliament.uk/edskills/

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are David Lloyd (Clerk), Jyoti Chandola, (Second Clerk), Libby Aston (Committee Specialist), Nerys Roberts (Committee Specialist), Lisa Wrobel/Susan Monaghan (Committee Assistant), and Susan Ramsay (Committee Secretary).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Education and Skills Committee, House of Commons, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 6181; the Committee's e-mail address is edskillscom@parliament.uk

Contents

Report	<i>Page</i>
Summary	3
1 Preface	5
2 Introduction	6
The Crick Report	6
Motivations	6
What <i>is</i> citizenship education?	7
The value of citizenship education	9
Belonging and integration in the spotlight	11
Curriculum review—British history and diversity	12
3 Implementation	17
Quality and reach of citizenship education	17
Modes of delivery	19
Embedded and discrete provision	19
Participation and “whole school” citizenship	20
School councils and active citizenship	21
School councils as a statutory requirement?	23
Student training for school councils	24
The role of local authorities	25
Continuity across phases—a life-long citizenship education strategy?	26
Primary	26
Post-16	28
Training—teachers and leaders	29
Secondary initial teacher training and CPD	29
Primary initial teacher training	32
Leaders	33
The teaching of “controversial” issues	34
4 The Role of the DfES and Ministers	36
A “light touch” curriculum?	36
Policy coherence and intradepartmental working	36
Priority, leadership and clarity from Ministers	38
Specialist subject status	40
Conclusions and recommendations	42
Formal Minutes	48
Witnesses	51
List of written evidence	53

List of unprinted written evidence	55
Reports from the Education and Skills Committee, Session 2006–07	56

Summary

During our inquiry, we took evidence from many who were clearly convinced of the potential value of citizenship education to young people and to the communities they are part of. Yet, while inspiring programmes exist, and progress is being made, the quality and extent of citizenship education is still inconsistent across the country. This patchiness needs to be tackled head-on, and progress accelerated. This will require action from those on the ground, but also demands strong support from the DfES and Ministers.

When done well, citizenship education motivates and inspires young people, because it is relevant to their everyday lives and concerns. Sir Keith Ajegbo has recently recommended that the citizenship curriculum be amended to have a closer focus on issues of identity, diversity and belonging—and the Government has accepted his recommendations. We support this move. There is a good case for increasing the level of attention paid to such issues. As the Government takes forward the recommendations of the Ajegbo report, it will be crucial that it develops concrete plans as to how it will equip those teachers and lecturers to deal with the teaching of often challenging issues on the ground.

The approach to citizenship education to date has been a “light touch” one, allowing schools and other settings a very high degree of freedom in terms of delivery. More needs to be done to communicate with leaders, teachers and lecturers—especially in settings which have not made much progress to date—about the approaches that are working in other institutions. This is particularly true in respect of information on ‘whole-school’ (or college) approaches, and building in opportunities for active citizenship. In so doing, the Government has a difficult balance to strike between promoting and sharing successful models, while at the same time avoiding the suggestion that “one size fits all”—it is essential that programmes are locally-owned and relevant to the particular context.

Development of the workforce is crucially important to the success of citizenship education. The subject is still new, and as such a specialist citizenship education cadre is still developing. The expansion of the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) citizenship certificate programme to which Ministers have committed, is welcome, but CPD should not be considered as a substitute for the more extensive training gained during a one-year PGCE course. The number of initial teacher training places for citizenship education needs to be protected from any further reductions, and in the medium term, numbers on these programmes should be increased in tandem with efforts to ensure that trainees are employed in teaching roles that fully use their skills.

School Councils

School—or student—councils often play a central part in citizenship education. The Government has been supportive of them to date, and we welcome this. Currently, they are not statutory, but the Government should consider making them so, while at the same time avoiding tight prescription of the form they should take, or the ways in which they should operate. There should also be advice on the importance of situating councils within the wider citizenship education programme, and on ensuring participation and ownership

among the whole school population—not just an elite group.

Departmental focus on citizenship education

Improving the quality and spread of citizenship education is also dependent on it being given sufficient priority at the departmental and Ministerial level. At the time of its introduction, citizenship education enjoyed strong personal support from within Government. This was crucial to its establishment and acceptance as a discipline. Four years have passed since then however, and we are concerned about the possibility of a waning of interest at a stage when much of the hard work in terms of implementation still remains to be done. To some, citizenship education's aims, objectives and methods remain opaque, and difficult to grasp. There is a need for a clear public narrative from Ministers on what citizenship education is setting out to achieve, and why it is considered important. Additionally, the DfES needs to send a clear signal that citizenship education is valued as much as other national curriculum subjects—one way of doing this would be to allow schools to apply for a first specialism in citizenship education.

Citizenship education strategy

Currently, there is an absence at the national level of a truly lifelong citizenship education strategy—which joins up primary, secondary, tertiary, adult education and training. Worthwhile citizenship education is taking place in all phases of education, yet it is hard to see these activities—particularly those in further, higher and adult education - as belonging to a coherent programme, with common aims and purposes. Such a strategy needs to be developed by the DfES in co-operation with other Government departments active in the citizenship arena—for example, the Home Office, the Department for Constitutional Affairs, and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

1 Preface

1. The Committee began its inquiry into Citizenship Education in October 2005. We took evidence from a wide range of organisations and individuals involved in developing and implementing citizenship education programmes across a wide range of settings—including schools and further and higher education.

2. In the course of this inquiry, we took evidence from Professor Sir Bernard Crick; Ofsted; Keith Ajegbo, then Head teacher of Deptford Green School; Hampshire County Council; the then- Learning and Skills Development Agency (now Learning and Skills Network); the Citizenship Foundation; the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority; the Association for Citizenship Teaching; the Carnegie Young People’s Initiative; School Councils UK; the National Youth Agency; the British Youth Council; the United Synagogue Agency for Jewish Education; the Church of England Board of Education; the Association of Muslim Schools UK; the Catholic Education Service; the Commission for Racial Equality; Professor Linda Colley; Professor David Conway; Dr Dina Kiwan; Lord Andrew Adonis, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department for Education and Skills; Archbishop Vincent Nichols; the Muslim Council of Britain; the Jewish Free School, Brent; Grey Coat Hospital School, Westminster; Guru Nanak Sikh School, Hillingdon.

3. In the course of the inquiry we were very fortunate to be able to visit three schools: the Blue School in Wells, Nailsea Community School, and Gatton Primary School in Tooting. We learned a great deal from these visits, and would like to extend our thanks to our hosts. We are grateful for assistance with this inquiry from our Specialist Adviser, Professor Geoff Whitty, Director of the Institute of Education.

2 Introduction

4. Citizenship education was introduced into the school curriculum in 2002. This inquiry was motivated by a desire to assess progress four years on—and six years on from the point where schools were encouraged to begin planning for its introduction. During the inquiry, many of those who gave evidence to us were clearly convinced of the potential value of citizenship education both to young people themselves, and to the communities they grow up in. Our principal aim and intention has been to examine the barriers that exist to successful implementation, and to suggest what needs to happen to ensure that the inspiring experiences enjoyed by what is probably still a minority of young people can become a realistic expectation for all.

The Crick Report

5. In July 1997, the Labour Government pledged in the White Paper, *Excellence in Schools* to strengthen education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy. Following this, an Advisory Group on Citizenship was established, which Professor Sir Bernard Crick was asked to head. The final report of the Advisory Group—*Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools*—was published in September 1998. The report advocated a three-pronged approach to citizenship education, covering: knowledge and understanding; skills of enquiry and communication; and participation and responsible action. The Advisory Group’s detailed proposals on the form and content of a National Curriculum for citizenship were largely adopted by the Government and the subject became compulsory in September 2002 for secondary schools, at which time it also became part of the non-statutory framework for primary schools.

Motivations

6. Along with greater engagement with the formal processes of democracy, many hoped the introduction of citizenship education would lead to positive changes in young people’s attitudes, behaviours and dispositions—leading for example to lower levels of disengagement and anti-social behaviour, as well as increased participation in the formal and informal institutions of society. Some also suggested that it would play a role in bringing about improvements in the life of the school—for example, less bullying—as well as higher attainment levels.

7. Dr Dina Kiwan of Birkbeck College, University of London, told us that her research suggested those who were involved in the introduction of citizenship education saw the move as motivated by a number of factors. These were, in decreasing order of importance: the political apathy of young people; society in moral crisis; democratic crisis/low voter turnout; legal changes (eg Europe and the Human Rights Act); diversity and immigration issues; a move away from a “standards-driven” approach to education; and finally, a renegotiation between “citizen” and “state”.¹

What is citizenship education?

8. Citizenship education during the compulsory phase of education has a clear basis in the statutory National Curriculum for citizenship at secondary level, and the non-statutory guidelines for citizenship and Personal, social and health education at primary level. There are three key strands to the National Curriculum for Citizenship. They are:

- *Knowledge and understanding about becoming informed citizens.* This includes coverage of issues including: legal and human rights; national, regional, ethnic and religious differences in the UK; key characteristics of parliamentary and other forms of democracy; the world as a global community (including information about the role of supranational organisations such as the EU);
- *Developing skills of enquiry and communication:* This includes learning to think about topical political, spiritual, moral, social and cultural issues, problems and events by analysing information and its sources; learning to take part in discussions and debates; and
- *Developing skills of participation and responsible action:* This includes negotiating, deciding and taking part responsibly in school or community activities; reflecting on the process of participating.²

9. The DfES further describes three key aptitudes and behaviours that citizenship education is designed to encourage. These are:

“Social and Moral Responsibility: Learning self-confidence and socially and morally responsible behaviour both in and beyond the classroom, both towards those in authority and each other;

“Community Involvement: Learning about and becoming helpfully involved in the life and concerns of their communities, including learning through community involvement and service; and

“Political Literacy: Learning about the institutions, problems and practices of our democracy and how to make themselves effective in the life of the nation, locally, regionally and nationally through skills and values as well as knowledge”.³

10. From the outset, the DfES has deliberately adopted a “light touch” approach to citizenship education, allowing schools a very high degree of freedom in terms of delivery, avoiding prescriptive models. For example, when the curriculum was launched, guidance stressed that citizenship could be delivered as discrete units, during special “citizenship days” where the regular timetable was suspended, in an embedded form through other subjects such as history, geography or even maths, or any combination of these methods. Additionally, provision could take the form of organised activities which encouraged active participation; for example, working with local community organisations to achieve an identified goal, such as the improvement of local play facilities or other community services.

2 Adapted from National Curriculum Online Key Stage 3 Curriculum, www.nt.uk.net/

11. To a large extent, the principle of this guidance stands, although subject reports on citizenship from Ofsted and from other sources now frequently suggest that an approach that chooses one method only is likely to be less successful than one that takes a more comprehensive approach. The “light touch” approach has led to a wide variety of practice on the ground. We say more about the consequences of this approach in section three of this report, which focuses on implementation, and in section four, which focuses on the responsibilities of the DfES, its associated bodies, and ministers.

12. At the post-16 level, citizenship education is not defined by a National Curriculum as such. The impetus for post-16 work was the second Crick report, *Citizenship for 16–19-year-olds in Education and Training*, which was commissioned by the Government in 1999 and was published in 2000.⁴ While supported at the national level by a co-ordination and development unit run by the Learning and Skills Network (LSN), and curriculum guidance from the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, programmes in the post-16 phase are by nature voluntary and highly flexible, with a strong emphasis on responding to the local context.

13. During our inquiry into Citizenship Education, the discipline often seemed quite difficult to define. There are three main reasons for this: firstly, citizenship in itself is a complex and contested concept—with many different perspectives on what is most important for its effective development and expression; secondly, and as discussed above, schools, colleges and others have been allowed a greater degree of freedom in developing their citizenship education programmes than is the case with any other subject. In consequence, this has meant that different institutions have legitimately (and some would argue, necessarily) taken very different approaches to delivery, so “citizenship education” in one context can look very different than in another.

14. Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, citizenship education is often described as a “subject plus”—an indication that it differs in important ways from other curriculum subjects. Chris Waller of the Association for Citizenship Teaching offered his own perspective on what this meant in practice:

“I think there has been a realisation that the goal of citizenship is something that is different, as indeed [Sir] Bernard [Crick] set out in his original intent about a massive change in the way in which society functions and how young people particularly engage with society. The realisation set within that is that this is not just another subject that is to be taught, like a different version of maths or science or English, but something that impinges upon the whole way in which schools function and it is about a bridge between young people, their schools, their families and their communities and that means there needs to be a much more sophisticated response to this.”⁵

15. As has been argued by many during the course of our inquiry, citizenship education is about more than knowledge—it is a skill which can be developed and applied only

4 Further Education Funding Council/Department for Education and Employment, *Citizenship for 16–19-year-olds in Education and Training: Report of the Advisory Group to the Secretary of State for Education and Employment*, 2000.

5 Q 83

through active participation. At their best, good citizenship education programmes clearly involve whole school action—including engagement with local, national and global communities, and the exploration of new, more participative forms of school or college management. We say more about this in section three, on implementation, below.

The value of citizenship education

16. At the beginning of our inquiry, we asked Professor Sir Bernard Crick whether he thought the introduction of citizenship education was producing tangible benefits. He told us that he thought it was “too early to judge” the relative success or otherwise of citizenship against the original aims, noting that no cohort had experienced citizenship education throughout an entire school career—or even through an entire secondary school career.⁶ This seems to us a crucial point.

17. Throughout evidence-taking, we have heard inspiring accounts of cases where citizenship education is making a positive difference to individuals, the life of the school, or to the wider community. Most of this evidence has been based on personal experience. Dr Dina Kiwan spoke for many of those of whom we asked similar questions when she said:

“I do not think there is any strong empirical evidence which says that if we introduce citizenship education into schools we will get these certain educational or societal outcomes. My belief in citizenship education, which I guess is not based on research evidence, is the sense that it gives people a sense of empowerment and that they are connected with their larger community and they are empowered to make a change and contribution to their society. I would say, yes, I do think citizenship education has a place in our educational system, but, I am afraid, that cannot be supported by research evidence at this point.”⁷

18. One area where witnesses have reported benefits is behaviour and attendance. Early on in our inquiry, we took evidence on an approach to citizenship education which had been taken in the Hampshire local authority area. John Clarke, representing the council, explained that the introduction of a Unicef-supported programme called Rights, Respect and Responsibilities had been associated with improved behaviour and fewer instances of bullying.^{8,9} Similarly, the Nuffield Foundation point to case-study evidence suggesting that citizenship education programmes can be used a ‘hook’ to attract and retain young people at the post-16 level:

“In the post-compulsory phase, citizenship has been used effectively as a core for courses which aim to attract young people, who have failed at school for a wide range of reasons, back into education. Kingston College’s Pathfinder course is one example of the use of citizenship to restore young people’s confidence particularly through

6 Q 17

7 Q 397

8 Q 65

9 In written evidence, John Clarke notes that academic evaluation of the Rights, Respect and Responsibility (RRR) programme has been carried out by Canadian academics. This showed that where schools had implemented the work seriously, a range of improved outcomes had followed, including better behaviour, less bullying and fewer exclusions (see Ev 12).

active participation. These students are often following a GCSE course in the subject.”¹⁰

19. Others have told us that they suspect quality citizenship education provision can have a positive impact on overall attainment. Keith Ajegbo, then Head Teacher of Deptford Green School, told us that in his opinion, the two were most probably positively linked:

“The bottom line was we felt that by giving children a greater sense of their rights, their self-esteem and hopefully making them more responsible, we would raise achievement. We have done insofar as over the four years we have moved from 33% to 54%, five As–Cs. While you cannot say it is only through citizenship, it is some evidence that we have more participation in good learning in the school. There was also a lot of evidence that those pupils are committing less crime out of school. There is a lot of evidence to suggest that if you are working towards good exam results, because you feel that is going to further empower you, then you are less likely to get involved in things out of school. I think there will be a correlation”.¹¹ [...] “My personal view is that providing children with a voice, certainly at Key Stage 4, engaging them in what they are doing and making education relevant, is the way to break the plateau of achievement which we are beginning to arrive at.”¹²

20. It is apparent that an academically rigorous and truly conclusive body of evidence on the effects of the introduction of national curriculum citizenship education is still some way off. Currently, the National Foundation for Educational Research is contracted by the DfES to monitor the long-term impacts of the introduction of citizenship education, through its Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study project. The aims of this study, which began in 2001 and will run until 2009, are to “assess the short-term and long-term effects of citizenship education on the knowledge, skills and attitudes of young people”.¹³ It will follow a cohort of 18,000 young people from the ages of 11 through to 18 and will also survey their teachers.

21. It is too early to say with any degree of confidence whether citizenship education is producing the wide range of impacts originally hoped for. Initial evidence from small-scale studies and the experience of individual institutions is promising but on its own not enough. A large-scale study is being undertaken by the National Foundation for Educational Research to look specifically at this issue. This project needs continued strong support from the Government and a sustained involvement and progress reports from Ofsted.

22. We have heard anecdotal evidence of cases where citizenship education programmes appear to have been positively correlated with raising attainment. We are clear that citizenship education has value in and of itself, and recognise the risks of seeing it as ‘just another school improvement strategy’. There is nevertheless a strong case for more systematic research into the link between the quality of provision and attainment levels in

10 Ev 215

11 Q 68

12 Q 81

13 Ev 254

general, the results of which may prove an effective way of selling citizenship education to the small proportion of school leaders who still see it as an optional extra. **As far as we are aware, there is currently no research underway to examine the links between citizenship education and general attainment; we recommend that the DfES should remedy this.**

Belonging and integration in the spotlight

23. Since the publication of the Crick report and the introduction of National Curriculum citizenship education, several tragic events have occurred—including the terrorist bombings on London’s transport network on the 7 July 2005—which have in some quarters been interpreted as a sign that society is coming unstuck at the edges and is increasingly lacking ties that bind all citizens together.

24. Allied to this, there has been renewed public and political scrutiny of the concept of “Britishness”, and debate on the issue of whether a shared British identity and British values should be more vigorously promoted as a “uniting force” for society. Inevitably, this has led to equally intense debates about what constitutes “Britishness” and what British values really are. In 2006, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gordon Brown, made two speeches calling for the promotion of a reinvigorated British identity, based on common values. Speaking to the Fabian Society in January 2006, he said:

“[...] it is to our benefit to be more explicit about what we stand for and what are our objectives and that we will meet and master all challenges best by finding shared purpose as a country in our enduring British ideals that I would summarise as—in addition to our qualities of creativity, inventiveness, enterprise and our internationalism, our central beliefs are a commitment to—liberty for all, responsibility by all and fairness to all.”¹⁴

25. In parallel there has been much controversy over the concept of multiculturalism, with some—notably Trevor Philips of the Commission for Racial Equality—arguing that multiculturalism as commonly understood is not always helpful because it privileges cultural difference and underplays the shared values which cut across Britain’s ethnic and religious groups. Most recently, the Archbishop of York, John Sentamu, has called for a more nuanced approach to shared values and difference:

“Our cultural identity and difference must be balanced with a clear understanding of a shared humanity and membership of one world. [...] We need other human beings to help us be human. We are made for interdependence, for complementarity. Our commitment as communities to promote understanding and justice will create harmony longed for by all [...]. Multi-ethnic harmony isn’t the absence of conflict between different ethnic groups in the UK.”¹⁵

26. The DfES say in written evidence that:

14 Speech by Gordon Brown to the Fabian Society, *The Future of Britishness*, 14 January 2006. See also speech to the Labour Party Annual Conference, 25 September 2006.

15 Quoted in Newsquest Media Group Newspapers press notice “*Saris ‘not way to harmony’*”, 1 February 2007.

“Citizenship education is key to building a modern, cohesive British society. Never has it been more important for us to teach our young people about our shared values of fairness, civic responsibility, respect for democracy and respect for ethnic and cultural diversity. [...] [it] remains a dynamic subject which responds to issues concerning society and how these come about.”¹⁶

27. It is hard to disagree with this statement. While we recognise that citizenship education is about more than issues of integration and social cohesion, it does have at its heart a commitment to enabling young people to participate fully in a democracy, and ultimately, securing a cohesive and inclusive society. In particular, it has a role to play in developing the skills for effective community relations, in developing shared identities, and safe ways in which to express difference. We explore this issue further in the following section on the curriculum review of British history and diversity, and in section three with regard to teacher training.

Curriculum review—British history and diversity

28. On 15 May 2006, Bill Rammell, Minister of State for Higher Education and Lifelong Learning, announced that the DfES was commissioning a review of National Curriculum citizenship’s coverage of diversity issues and how modern British cultural and social history might be incorporated into the citizenship curriculum. At the same time, he also announced a review of university teaching of Islam. These announcements were made during a speech to London South Bank University about action the Government was planning to take based on the review of the events leading up to the July 2005 London terrorist attacks.¹⁷

29. The Minister subsequently announced that he had invited Keith Ajegbo, then head of Deptford Green School, to carry out the review, which would look at:

“[...] how the National Curriculum is covering diversity issues to meet the needs of all pupils. It will also look at how we can incorporate modern British cultural and social history into the citizenship curriculum within our secondary schools.”¹⁸

The review group’s report was published on 25 January 2007. It made a range of recommendations relating to the teaching of diversity across the curriculum. Specifically with regard to the proposals to incorporate more British social and cultural history into the curriculum, it concluded that:

“A fourth “strand” should be explicitly developed, entitled *Identity and Diversity: Living Together in the UK*. This strand will bring together three conceptual components:

- Critical thinking about ethnicity, religion and race.
- An explicit link to political issues and values.

16 Ev 157

17 Speech by Bill Rammell to London South Bank University, *Community Cohesion*, 15 May 2006, <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/speeches>

18 *Ibid.*

- The use of contemporary history in teachers' pedagogy to illuminate thinking about contemporary issues relating to citizenship.¹⁹

30. We took evidence throughout our inquiry, which ran concurrently with the Ajegbo review, on the proposals as we understood them—namely, that the citizenship curriculum may be augmented to include more elements of British cultural and social history, in the context of a concern to strengthen a shared sense of belonging; and that diversity issues may need to be covered more adequately in the school curriculum, including in citizenship education. Broadly speaking, our findings support those of Sir Keith Ajegbo.

31. Witnesses often expressed passionate views when we asked them whether they would support changing the curriculum so that it had more of a focus on British cultural and social history—particularly if this was used as means of engendering a sense of national belonging. Raji Hunjan of Carnegie Young People Initiative, argued that a focus on Britishness *per se* may be misplaced and unhelpful, risked isolating some young people who may not define themselves principally as “British”, and would also obfuscate the current worthwhile focus on experiential learning and participation:

“It is then more experiential learning, which I completely agree with, it is about ensuring that the views of young people can positively feed into decision-making. I think that the Government would be better off supporting that and supporting young people to understand their rights and responsibilities as active citizens, rather than forcing them to think about issues of Britishness, which conflicts with other ways in which they might see themselves.”²⁰

Others stressed practical concerns as well as ideological ones. For example, the Association for Citizenship Teaching wrote to us after the announcement by the Secretary of State, saying that adding a “fourth pillar” of British social and cultural history was unnecessary and risked overburdening teachers:

“Careful study of the Citizenship Programme of Study at Key Stages 3 and 4 and also the Crick report would support the contention that there is already enough flexibility in the current curriculum to address the concerns of ministers. The current curriculum was clearly designed to address matters of justice, human rights, fairness and also to enable discussion about identity, rights, respect and responsibility. As such an additional leg is not required—especially one that would require another set of complex and as yet undefined information to be learned by the citizenship teacher and imparted to the pupil. Things are not as simple as Bill Rammell implied in his speech [...] in terms of diversity and identity ACT would contend that Citizenship is already enabling discussion about being a citizen in Britain without imposing definitions of Britishness”.²¹

32. Some took a more positive view on the proposal to focus more closely on British social and cultural history in the curriculum but showed variation in respect of whether they thought the citizenship curriculum in particular was the correct place for this. Also, they

19 Sir Keith Ajegbo *et. al.*, *Curriculum Review: Diversity and Citizenship*, January 2007, DfES, p 12

20 Q 206

21 Letter from Association for Citizenship Teaching to Lord Andrew Adonis, copied to the Committee, not printed.

differed in respect of what they saw as the ultimate aims of such a move. Professor Linda Colley of Princeton University told us:

“It seems to me that what we are dealing with is not just a matter for schools. People in all societies, at all times, tend to need a narrative, I think, a story to tell themselves which puts their short, individual life in a wider, more meaningful context, and the need for such a narrative is enhanced if you come from a disruptive background, or if you live in a time of immense change. In the past, in this country, we had a very strong narrative [...]. A lot of these modes of implanting a narrative in the people of these islands either no longer work or they do not operate very powerfully, if at all. [...] if we do not think about tailoring a [new] narrative that works, that can encompass the many different peoples that live in these islands then the danger is, of course, that they may go out and find their own narrative which is not one we will find very happy.”²²

Professor David Conway of Civitas told us he was in favour of reintroducing a strong, narrative version of history into the school curriculum, which did not shy away from emphasising the historical achievements of Britain and which would provide a common source of identity for all students:

“[T]here is a deeper commonality, a commonality of interest, and a nation, a political society, [it] is one where the common ground and the common good and the common interest take primacy. This is what needs to be purveyed by means of citizenship education. This historically was what was done through British narrative history until it got deconstructed and swept aside in the 1960s through progressive education. I am glad to see that the Government has woken up to the need to remarry its concerns about civics and civility and citizenship with the teaching, and proper teaching, of British narrative history.”²³

33. The Government has indicated that it accepts Sir Keith Ajegbo’s recommendation for the development of a fourth strand of the citizenship curriculum. We support his proposals that many different aspects of British social, cultural and indeed political history should be used as points of entry in the citizenship curriculum to engage students in discussing the nature of citizenship and its responsibility in 21st century Britain.

34. Such coverage should rightly touch on what is distinctive in the inheritance and experience of contemporary Britain and the values of our society today. But it should not be taken to imply an endorsement of any single explanation of British values or history. Indeed, it should emphasise the way in which those values connect to universal human rights, and recognise that critical and divergent perspectives, as well as the potential to have alternative and different layers of identity, are a central part of what contemporary Britishness is.

22 Q 392

23 Sir Keith Ajegbo et. al., *Curriculum Review: Diversity and Citizenship*, January 2007, DfES, p 7.

35. If such changes are to work in practice, Government must recognise its responsibilities to resource teachers and school leaders and to clarify the curriculum. Citizenship is still a young subject very much in the process of “bedding down” and gaining support among teachers and school leaders. We agree with Sir Keith Ajegbo that it will be crucially important for the Government to communicate clearly with the teaching profession about what it is doing and why, and about how any new material fits with what is already there. Care also needs to be taken that the introduction of more knowledge-based content does not reduce space for active learning and the ‘participative’ strand of citizenship education. The proper resourcing of ITT and CPD in citizenship for teachers will be central to the success of these new elements. **We recommend that the National College of School Leadership be more closely involved in engaging with these changes and in incorporating the challenges of citizenship education in its training programmes and other initiatives.**

36. The question of strengthening the curriculum’s focus on diversity—of allegiances, identifications and opinions—is of course intimately linked to the debate above about British history and belonging. As both Sir Keith Ajegbo’s report and the DfES note, the citizenship curriculum already provides some scope for teaching about the cultural diversity of the UK; however, it is unclear to what extent this is translated into practice in schools. Scott Harrison of Ofsted told us:

“What we are finding is more teaching of what you might perceive as the central political literacy/government/voting/law area than, for example, the diversity of the UK, the EU, the Commonwealth, which are somewhat neglected, I think, because some of them are perceived to be dull and some of them are particularly sensitive areas that some teachers go to with great reluctance. I am talking about, for example, the diversity of the UK, which in the Order says, the ‘regional, national, religious, ethnic diversity of Britain’. Some people find that difficult to teach.”²⁴

This accords with the findings of the Ajegbo review, which states:

“Issues of identity and diversity are more often than not neglected in citizenship education. When these issues are referred to, coverage is often unsatisfactory and lacks contextual depth.”²⁵

37. Bernadette Joslin, of the Learning and Skills Network said that in order to discuss difficult or sensitive issues related to identity, religious and ethnic diversity, staff needed support on how to manage those discussions: “that is a priority, I am sure, for pre-16 colleagues as well as post-16 colleagues. Staff feel quite anxious about it and lacking in confidence.”²⁶ Similarly, Chris Waller, Association for Citizenship Teaching, argued that he thought “Citizenship [provided] an opportunity to think about lots of different issues, controversial issues, the grey areas in life, but these require the right skills and time for the

24 Q 25

25 Sir Keith Ajegbo et. al. *Curriculum Review: Diversity and Citizenship*, 25 January 2007

26 Q 106

teacher to explore them in a meaningful way”.²⁷ Tom Wylie of the National Youth Agency echoed these concerns:

“I do raise the question, do we think that in the most challenging circumstances we have sufficient teachers with sufficient competence to handle those issues of identity and value, and to do so in such a way as protects what may be, in some circumstances, a pretty small minority of children in that particular classroom, who, for whatever reason, may not be part of the majority? That was why I paused, about how far one should push some of these things into our system.”²⁸

38. The issue of identities and belonging can be challenging and sensitive for students and teachers alike; meaningful and productive discussions are more likely to take place if teachers have appropriate training in this area. As the Government takes forward the recommendations of the Ajegbo report, it will be crucial that it develops concrete plans as to how it will equip those teachers and lecturers to deal with the teaching of these often challenging issues on the ground.

39. Teachers in training spend a large proportion of their time in schools. If there is not good practice in those particular schools, there may be little opportunity to develop the skills and confidence needed to lead constructive discussions about identity and difference. Teaching diversity, belonging and place in society without relating it to the daily life experiences or observations of students risks at best apathy and at worse a rejection of those key elements of the curriculum. **We recommend that far more use is made of the opportunities provided by activities outside the classroom—as well as discrete events such as Holocaust Memorial Day or this year’s commemorations of the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the slave trade—to stimulate this.**²⁹

27 Q 107

28 Q 222

29 This includes greater use of and linkage with the resources provided by organisations such as the Holocaust Educational Trust who gave a good example in their written evidence to us of how these connections can be made:

“The theme for Holocaust Memorial Day 2007 is ‘The Dignity of Difference’ which will emphasise the other victims of the Holocaust as well as the Jews. This will provide an excellent opportunity within a citizenship framework for students to consider the diversity of identities [...] schools will be able to encourage mutual respect amongst their students and to challenge inequality and discrimination.” (Ev 281)

3 Implementation

Quality and reach of citizenship education

40. The vast majority of the evidence we have received on the quality of citizenship education as currently delivered in schools and other settings describes a field that is patchy at best. While there is evidence of good—and sometimes excellent—practice on the ground, viewed nationally the situation is profoundly uneven. And, in a minority of cases, it is clear that students are missing out on their entitlement entirely. Mick Waters of the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority summed up what many other told us during the course of our inquiry, saying:

“[...] the pace of development is very variable. There are plenty of schools that are taking citizenship enormously seriously and achieving incredibly well. Equally, there are many that are still in the foothills waiting to go up the big slopes and they are touching on citizenship without making enormous strides forward.”³⁰

41. Written evidence from the National Foundation for Educational Research—which is conducting a wide-ranging national review of the implementation process—describes four dominant models of practice: progressive schools, which are “developing citizenship education in the curriculum, school and wider community; the most advanced type of provision”; implicit schools, which are “not yet focusing on citizenship education in the curriculum, but with a range of active citizenship opportunities”; “focused schools” which are “concentrating on citizenship education in the curriculum, with few opportunities for active citizenship in the school and wider community”; and lastly, “minimalist schools”, which are “at an early stage of development, with a limited range of delivery approaches and few extra-curricular activities on offer”. The NFER goes on to say that:

“In a nationally representative sample of schools about one quarter of the schools surveyed fall into each category. This suggests that citizenship education provision in schools in England is currently uneven and patchy, with one quarter of schools offering only a minimal level of provision: a finding that concurs with recent Ofsted conclusions. In addition, many schools are still to develop a holistic and coherent approach to citizenship education”³¹

As the NFER imply, Ofsted has played a key role in that it has produced regular subject reviews of citizenship education since it became part of the curriculum in 2002. In January 2005, they described it as the “worst taught” National Curriculum subject at secondary level.³² We asked Miriam Rosen of Ofsted for further quantification of this statement, and she seemed keen to stress that this had been a somewhat bald characterisation:

“[citizenship education] is still a new subject but it has improved since it was introduced in 2002 and what we are saying now is that teaching is now good in over

30 Q 84

31 Ev 254–255

32 “New Ofsted evidence shows citizenship is worst taught subject at secondary level”, Ofsted press release, 2005-07, 17 January 2005

half of schools. That has to be set against the fact that it takes time to develop the expertise. We appreciate that it is still less well embedded than other subjects of the curriculum and less well taught than other subjects of the curriculum, but I think we should look at the fact that there has been a steady improvement.”³³

42. Although significant progress has been made toward the implementation of citizenship education, quality is currently inconsistent across the country. This is not altogether surprising given the subject’s relatively recent introduction into the school curriculum. **The imperative now is to ensure that patchiness is not allowed to remain, that high quality provision becomes the norm, and that progress is accelerated. This will require action from those on the ground, but also needs strong support from the DfES and Ministers.** We make recommendations in regard to the latter in the final section of our Report.

43. Many schools are undertaking (and may have been doing so for many years) activities or lessons that fit with the aims and objectives of citizenship education—although often they have not been doing so in a systematic way, nor have they necessarily labelled their activities “citizenship education”. Some of those submitting evidence to our inquiry said that this applied particularly to faith schools which, they argued, often have long histories of both community involvement and implicit or explicit “values education”. We were therefore particularly keen to explore with representatives from this sector whether they saw “added value” in the Government’s current approach to citizenship education.

44. Some of those we spoke to about this issue seemed to suggest that National Curriculum citizenship education’s introduction in 2002 had merely formalised and made explicit aspects of some schools’ work which had been central anyway. Simon Goulden, of the Agency for Jewish Education, told us:

“[I]t does seem, certainly from my point of view, that we have tried to find a subject heading for something which, certainly for a faith school, is the warp and the weft of everything we do [...]. It just means that we have to re-focus and re-compartmentalise the work we do so that it fits nicely into the citizenship curriculum and the curriculum headings and outcomes et cetera, but it is not new territory for us. I think it is new territory for a number of non-faith schools, or rather state schools.”³⁴

45. However, others from the faith-based schooling sector were clear that the formalised introduction of citizenship education had brought added value to their schools. Rachel Allard, Head Teacher of Grey Coat Hospital School, told us:

“I think perhaps we have been challenged to be more specific about the sorts of things that children might learn about the way democracy is organised in this country, for example. We would say that they are learning to think about democracy and how to do things in the way that we do things in the school, the school councils and so on, but we make sure now that we do have some experience, like a model United Nations, every year. We do not do it some years, we do it every year, there are

33 Q 3

34 Q 270

things that we do every year and with all the students, which before might have been left more to chance, I think.”³⁵

There is an enduring risk that in a minority of cases, schools could be adopting a passive approach to citizenship education, believing no action needs to be taken as they are doing it anyway. The DfES has a role to play here in driving home the message that what is important is a systematic and explicit—as well as comprehensive—approach to citizenship education. This can incorporate existing activities, but also needs to consider the existence of any gaps; in short, it demands planning for citizenship activity in a strategic way across an institution.

46. We believe it is very important that faith schools recognise their specific responsibility to make space in their studies for the discussion of what citizenship means in a diverse and pluralist 21st century Britain and to examine openly the differences and differing views that come with this, in the context of mutual respect and human rights, and that it requires a more explicit approach than simply asserting that an overall ethos of citizenship permeates the school and its curriculum.

Modes of delivery

Embedded and discrete provision

47. At the time of its introduction, concerns were expressed about how time and space would be found for citizenship education in an already crowded curriculum. Time pressures were explicitly addressed in both the Crick report and in the DfES’s subsequent guidance to schools, which encouraged heads and subject leaders to ‘audit’ what they were currently doing, identifying areas where citizenship-related learning was already taking place and/or opportunities whereby lessons could be adapted to have a citizenship focus. For example, one way of doing this would be the designation of a maths lesson to focus on the use and misuse of statistics in supporting arguments—which is covered in the citizenship curriculum at Key Stage 4.

48. One argument commonly made in much of the evidence we received—and especially from organisations monitoring and supporting school delivery of citizenship education—was that while delivering citizenship “through” other subjects could be an extremely useful and practical method, on its own such an embedded approach was often insufficient: dedicated curriculum time was also needed for discrete teaching. In addition, there were a number of risks in adopting a solely cross-curricular approach to citizenship education, which Tony Breslin of the Citizenship Foundation, summed up particularly well:

“We know that citizenship can be delivered very well through other subjects [...]. We also know from the experience of citizenship in a cross curricular theme for almost a decade that everywhere often can be nowhere, and therefore we propose a kind of subject-plus model where there is a citizenship core programme; but what we find is, where there is a strong citizenship core, the citizenship teaching in geography and history and in science is strengthened. So it is not an either/or, it is about giving

status and profile to citizenship within the school and working both specifically and across the curriculum.”³⁶

We note that under a cross-curricular approach, some important topics included in the secondary citizenship curriculum do not easily find a home—for example, basic knowledge about local and national democratic structures and processes, as well as about organisations such as the European Union and the United Nations.

49. Most witnesses agreed that solely cross-curricular approaches to citizenship education are likely to be insufficient—as one of our witnesses pointed out, “everywhere often can be nowhere”.³⁷ Ofsted makes this clear in their subject reports, but stops short of prescribing one particular delivery model. We understand schools’ concerns about where time is to be found in the curriculum. The case for more overt prescription in terms of models of provision has not yet been made, but this does not preclude sending a clear message to schools about what is working best on the ground, and why. Ofsted should continue to monitor closely the development of citizenship studies in schools and particularly in the light of the implementation of the Ajegbo recommendations and their resource and teaching implications.

Participation and “whole school” citizenship

50. Many of those who have given evidence to us have been most animated when discussing the ‘active’ and participative aspects of the curriculum. However, it is also clear that this is the area in which many schools have difficulty providing meaningful opportunities for students. *Towards Consensus*, Ofsted’s report on citizenship education in secondary schools published in September 2006 noted:

“A problem for teachers from the outset has been developing pupils’ skills of participation and responsible action, especially in fulfilling the requirement to ‘negotiate, decide and take part responsibly in both school and community-based activities’.”³⁸

51. Some of the most inspiring examples we have come across are where citizenship education’s principles permeate the life of the school itself. Trevor Phillips, of the Commission for Racial Equality told us:

“[...] it is not just about what you learn in period three on a Wednesday, it is about how you position yourself relative to other people, what consideration you have for them, how you understand the way you settle disputes, violent or not violent, for example; and that is why, I think, the whole school approach has to be the way to deal with this, because you cannot in period three on Wednesday say one thing and then at lunch-time the school teaches you something different by the way it acts. It

36 Q 108

37 Q 108 (Tony Breslin, Citizenship Foundation)

38 Ofsted, *Toward Consensus: citizenship in secondary schools*, HMI 2666, September 2006, para 37.

seems to me, if we are serious about this, if we are genuine about it, there is no other way”³⁹

52. A whole-school approach implies that the democratic, participative attitude and skills which citizenship education seeks to develop are also put into practice in the school context; that is to say, young people participate in, comment on, and more importantly, change their learning environments. It also implies that schools foster an ethos whereby individuals are respected and there are clear expectations as to behaviour and treatment of others. This was aptly summed up by John Clarke of Hampshire County Council:

“[...] for me the essential word which people have been talking about is participation, which is fundamentally an issue of the whole school and it is not an issue just for citizenship lessons [...]. I think we are talking here about the essence of schools, not just about a subject on the curriculum.”⁴⁰

For its part, the DfES seems to recognise this, saying:

“Young people’s participation in the civic and democratic life of their home and school communities provides a valuable context in which citizenship can be practised. Empowering children and young people to effect change directly in their schools and local areas will help them develop self-belief in their ability to influence outcomes and can help them to develop the skills, confidence and self-esteem they will need for the future. The Government supports young people to become active citizens in their home and school communities by supporting initiatives that contribute to young people’s development around the three interrelated themes.”⁴¹

However, it is clear that some schools are currently very far away from such an approach—and need considerable support to move toward it.

53. Some of the most inspiring approaches to citizenship education we have come across are those where young people have a real say in the running of their school, and are able to affect change on issues that matter most to them. This is new and difficult territory for many schools. **In respect of the active, participative dimensions of citizenship education, and adopting a “whole school” approach, we think there is a greater role for the DfES to play in disseminating best practice examples and case-studies. This should capitalise on the experience of those schools which have found space in the curriculum for creating “active” citizenship opportunities, and those which have allowed young people a real say in institutional management. The links with *Every Child Matters*’ focus on designing services around the needs of young people, with their input, should be stressed.**

School councils and active citizenship

54. During our inquiry, we paid special attention to school councils and the role that they were playing in terms of citizenship education. Although not part of the defined citizenship

39 Q 444

40 Q 42

41 Ev 162

“curriculum”, many schools see their councils as closely allied to their programmes—as well as to school improvement plans, the implementation of *Every Child Matters* and in some cases, the Healthy Schools initiative. Well-run school councils offer students opportunities both to participate in democratic, representative practices—such as elections, and to effect change in their school environments.

55. Our visits to schools were particularly valuable in allowing us to witness participation in action. At the Blue School in Wells, over 250 students were involved with the school council, which was divided into over 20 separate “teams” each focusing on a particular area— examples included energy usage, management support, fair trade and “Africa link”. Students self-elected to the council, and received training in a range of skills to help them participate effectively. Each team met weekly to plan their activities, and most had brought about significant changes in their school and wider communities—for example, securing funds to rebuild bike sheds, and reducing the school’s energy expenditure. Additionally, all students on the council met to discuss wider issues; these meetings were open to all students of the school.

56. At Nailsea School, council members described how they had taken part in an “enjoyment audit” of lessons, which provided feedback to teaching staff about the content and nature of lessons. This we felt was particularly significant, because it indicated the potential for truly effective and meaningful participation in an area which has perhaps the most significant impact on students, but in which they often have little or no say—the effectiveness of teaching and learning. Keith Ajegbo, then head of Deptford Green School, told us that a similar programme was in place at his school.⁴² It is therefore clear that in some instances school councils are working to democratise school life and give students real experience of participatory activity leading to meaningful change.

57. One issue we have sought to explore with witnesses has been the extent to which school councils typically engage the full range of students in a setting—including for example, those who are achieving less well in academic respects, or those who may lack the confidence to “put themselves forward”. Tony Breslin of the Citizenship Foundation appeared to share our concerns, saying “What we find is that if we take participation in school councils, for instance, one is more likely to see the more able engaged, academically involved, and therefore benefiting even further than the less [engaged and able pupils].”⁴³

58. Some witnesses stressed that school councils, while important, were not adequate to serve as citizenship provision in and of themselves. John Clarke of Hampshire local authority, told us:

“[...] school councils are essential but by no means sufficient. There is almost a bible, on participation now, a publication called, *Hear by Right*, which talks about a graduated approach to participation where consultation is at the bottom followed by representation and ends up at the top level in initiation. I think in our best primary schools in Hampshire we would see examples of pupils, sometimes quite young,

42 Q 57

43 Q 113

initiating things in schools. I think school's councils are at the level of representation in most schools at the moment.”⁴⁴

59. We see this point entirely; as we make clear in other parts of this report, we strongly believe that a multi-faceted approach to citizenship education—including taught content, participative activities, and a whole-school approach—is the most likely to bear fruit.

60. The DfES and Ministers have been supportive of school councils to date—most visibly in terms of grants to organisations such as School Councils UK, which help schools and other settings to establish effective practices. In 2005 the Government asked Professor Geoff Whitty of the Institute of Education to undertake a review of the role of school councils in England. The aims of this review were to “provide recommendations for updating the current DfES guidance on pupil participation [...] in terms of the role that school councils play as a vehicle for involving pupils in school decision making and school improvement”.⁴⁵

61. We warmly welcome the Government’s practical support for school councils to date, including through the funding it provides to School Councils UK for the provision of materials and other development work. There is scope for information about schools with effective, innovative councils to be made more widely known. As in other respects concerning the sharing of best practice on citizenship education, supporting organisations (including the DfES) have a fine balance to maintain between the potential merits of offering “replicable models” to assist schools who have perhaps made little progress to date, and the potential risk of implying “one size fits all” approaches that may be entirely inappropriate in certain contexts. It would be undesirable to give the impression that a certain “model” could just be adopted and implemented in a school, giving end-users (students) little say in the design of the council. This needs to be stressed alongside any support materials or exemplars that are offered. It is important to situate councils within the wider citizenship education programme, and to ensure participation and ownership among the whole school population—not just an elite group.

School councils as a statutory requirement?

62. In Wales, school councils have recently been made compulsory. We asked witnesses whether they thought that there was any evidence they were likely to be better as a result, and whether there was any merit in creating similar arrangements for England. Jessica Gold of School Councils UK seemed unconvinced:

“I do not think that school councils are better in Wales, I do not think there is any evidence of that at all, although it will be interesting, in a year or two’s time, to see whether that changes. In effect, school councils are almost statutory here, inasmuch as Ofsted has to look for participation. Ofsted is meant to send a letter to the school

44 Q 58

45 Private communication from Prof. Geoff Whitty.

council after they have done an inspection; so schools clearly are being very strongly encouraged to have school councils here.”⁴⁶

However, Jules Mason of the British Youth Council was more categorical, feeling there was definite merit in some element of statutory compulsion, but that this would need to promote participation, rather than just the creation of structures:

“[The] fact that both Scotland and Wales have some statutory duty is something that England should look to follow, along with organisations like ESSA, the English Secondary Students Association, and CRAE, the Children’s Rights Alliance for England, they are calling for statutory provision for pupils’ involvement and voice within the Education Bill.”⁴⁷

63. We see a case for making school councils compulsory as this would make them the norm, and send a clear message about the importance of meaningful involvement for students in the running of schools and other settings. However, there are clear risks in a prescriptive approach, which would have to be carefully managed: for example, the potential for stifling real creativity in terms of organic development, and ensuring continued grass-roots “ownership”. **Subject to the findings of the Institute of Education review, we recommend that the Government makes school councils compulsory. The Government should, however, resist the temptation to define tightly what form they should take—as this is likely to add little and may even be counter-productive.**

Student training for school councils

64. At the Blue School in Wells, students were offered skills training to give them the tools necessary to participate meaningfully—for example, in representing others and in negotiation. This was fundamental to the success of their school council model.⁴⁸ We asked witnesses whether they thought such training was beneficial in preparing students to take an active role in school councils and other participatory fora. Jessica Gold of School Councils UK told us that she thought students could benefit greatly from these approaches, and what was needed was for settings to provide dedicated funding for this purpose:

“It is a bottom-up structure, through form councils, through class councils, and schools should have a specific part of their budget which every year can be spent on developing young people’s skills in participation and leadership.”⁴⁹

Lord Adonis seemed to indicate specific training for student participation was not something that the DfES was prioritising. He told us:

“[...] when it comes to helping schools councils to develop the skills they need to be able to interact with the senior management of the school to conduct interviews and

46 Q 202

47 Q 202

⁴⁸ The Blue School council was developed using a programme called *Learning to Lead*, which is now being used with other schools in the local area, and also in other parts of the country (see www.itol.org).

49 Q 263

so on, it should not require specific training for school staff to be able to pass on those skills.”⁵⁰

The idea that teachers already have skills in leadership, communication skills and negotiating, that they can pass on to students, is no doubt absolutely true in principle. However, it is not clear that this happens widely in practice—nor even that the desirability of such training is widely understood.

65. We saw examples of how training for students, specifically in the skills of chairing meetings and in representation, had made the work of school councils more effective. Training for students in leadership, communication skills and negotiation is one of the areas where there are real opportunities for the Government to offer support. We recognise that with the devolution of budgets to schools there is limited opportunity to ring-fence funding for specific purposes—and broadly speaking we support the presumption that schools should be able to decide what they spend their funds on. **The Government should look at how training for students can best be supported to give them the skills to participate fully.**

The role of local authorities

66. Local authorities, Professor Sir Bernard Crick told us, had “been very mixed in the amount of support they give. Some are absolutely excellent on backing citizenship, some, subject to correction, scarcely at all. The future looks rather bleak as of today or tomorrow in respect of the back-up advice that will come from there.”⁵¹ This was reinforced by Tony Breslin, Citizenship Foundation, who told us that “in terms of local authorities, provision is very uneven”.⁵² This, he suggested, was for similar reasons found in schools themselves—for example, citizenship co-ordinators having responsibilities for several subjects, of which citizenship education was the most recently added. Likewise, the National Foundation for Educational Research say in written evidence that:

“There is some evidence of local authority involvement in CPD training and support for schools. However, such support is inconsistent across the country with LA staff having limited capacity to support schools because of competing priorities for their time and lack of funds.”⁵³

67. Local authority support for citizenship education seems to date to have been patchy. Aside from the benefits that could accrue simply in terms of the development of the subject itself, we see strategic reasons for this situation to be remedied. On the one hand, there is clearly a strong fit between the objectives of citizenship education programmes, and those of the *Every Child Matters* programme of reform; both, for example, stress the need for young people to play an active part in society. It seems to us that local authorities—who bear the strategic responsibility for implementing *Every Child Matters*—could get added

50 Q 553

51 Q 6

52 Q 102

53 Ev 256

benefit by providing more consistent support for schools and colleges in respect of citizenship education.

68. The emerging evidence available currently on the implementation of *Every Child Matters* suggests that Children’s Trusts—which oversee all children’s services in an area, and which local authorities lead—are still struggling to develop opportunities for young people to be meaningfully involved in the design of services which affect them.⁵⁴ Tom Wylie, of the National Youth Agency, told us:

“[...] young people spend only nine minutes of every waking hour in school, so the question is what happens in the other 51 minutes, and I would urge the Committee to concern itself with the 51 minutes, what is going on in the democratic process, the engagement by councils in ensuring that young people have scope for having a voice or an influence, in service, and so on.”⁵⁵

69. We do not see this as an “either/or” issue: there are clearly opportunities for synergies insofar as “active” citizenship programmes delivered from within schools and other settings can and do focus on effecting change in terms of local services—for example, upgrading local play facilities or improving access to services that young people value.

70. It is currently not clear that local authorities are consistently providing high levels of support on citizenship education to schools and other services in their area. This is partly for the same reasons schools and others sometimes have not prioritized citizenship—namely, pressure on time and resources, and the relative newness of the subject. **The DfES needs to issue further guidance to local authorities about citizenship education.** Emphasis could usefully be placed on the potential for “added value”, given that successful citizenship education, particularly the participatory dimension, is likely to help young people achieve one of the *Every Child Matters* key outcomes: that of making a positive contribution to society.

Continuity across phases—a life-long citizenship education strategy?

Primary

71. Currently, primary schools deliver citizenship as part of the non-statutory framework, alongside Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE). It is intended to provide the foundation for citizenship, introducing important concepts such as equal rights, as well as encouraging the development of skills essential for participative citizenship—for example, listening to others and understanding others’ perspectives.

72. One key issue is transition from primary to secondary education—and what this means in terms of children’s experiences of citizenship provision. John Clarke of Hampshire County Council explained the challenges he was seeing in his area in this regard:

“It is probably our major issue in Hampshire. You can imagine the situation of children in Year 6 being used to dialogue negotiation and seeking consensus between

54 University of East Anglia and the National Children’s Bureau, *Child, youth and parent participation in children’s trust settings*, April 2006.

55 Q 196

each other and with teachers, and they arrive at a secondary school which is not quite so sympathetic to those kinds of things happening in classrooms or some of the teachers in Year 7 might be, but other teachers not in Year 7 might not. We think that all the good work which has been done in primary schools probably disappears by about the November of Year 7 because of the issues about culture sometimes but huge issues with organisations”⁵⁶

73. Here, the problem seems to be a disjuncture between practice across the two main phases of compulsory education—caused at least in part by failure of staff in different settings to communicate effectively about children’s experiences to date and what this might mean as they settle into their new environment. We asked Lord Adonis what the Government and the DfES was doing to improve the transition between primary and secondary citizenship education. He replied that he thought this was:

“[...] an important area. For example, in the specialist schools programme it is now possible, through the humanities specialism, to major in citizenship and, of course, that involves developing links with feeder primary schools and neighbouring secondary schools also.”⁵⁷

74. He went on to say that the Specialist Schools and Academies Trust were developing guidance on citizenship as a subject specialism and that he hoped this guidance would include information on developing primary-secondary links around citizenship. We agree that this is important; however, the question remains of what happens in areas where there is currently no school with a citizenship specialism to give the subject priority in its liaison with feeder primaries; at the time of submitting evidence to this inquiry, the DfES told us that there were just 18 secondary schools with a subject specialism in citizenship education—and that in all these cases, citizenship was a secondary specialism. In contrast, there are currently 596 schools with either a primary, joint or secondary specialism in technology.

75. Citizenship education at the primary level is currently dealt with in non-statutory guidance, and is treated as one with Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE). The Nuffield Foundation sees these two factors as having a bearing on continuity across phases, saying: “There is a lack of coherence from stage to stage, partly because the subject is not statutory in primary schools and is integrated into PSHE rather than made distinct.”⁵⁸

Similarly, the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority told us in written evidence:

“There continues to be confusion in some schools about the relationship of citizenship with other national curriculum subjects and PSHE and the distinctive contribution to other subjects that citizenship can provide when properly planned. A declining but significant number (74%) indicate citizenship is taught part of the time within programmes of PSHE. About half (51%) state this is their main form of provision. Worryingly 22% said their main form of provision was teaching

56 Q 59

57 Q 546

58 Ev 215

citizenship in combination with PSHE where no distinction is made between the two subjects.”⁵⁹

76. One area of considerable agreement in the evidence we have received has been the need to disaggregate PSHE and citizenship education at the conceptual level, even if it often makes sense for citizenship education and PSHE to be delivered in tandem, particularly at the primary stage.⁶⁰ Schools do best when they see citizenship as a separate subject.

Post-16

77. Provision at the post-16 level is supported by a co-ordination and development unit run by the Learning and Skills Network, which produces extensive best-practice materials. However, programmes in this phase are by definition voluntary and are not driven by a national curriculum as such (as is the case during secondary schooling). A dominant feature of work in the 16–19 age group is its focus on active, participatory citizenship. This follows the recommendations of the second Crick report, *Citizenship for 16–19-year-olds in Education and Training*, published in 2000.

78. We asked Bernadette Joslin of the then-Learning and Skills Development Agency how she saw provision in the post-16 sector developing. She replied:

“I would say over the five years there has been a groundswell of interest and enthusiasm [...]. I think there is growing interest in this area. Lots and lots of people are asking me what is happening beyond the development phase of the process, but it is very difficult to pin down”.

79. She continued:

“[...] citizenship education development is a lifelong experience, and I am very pleased to say that beyond the development programme, which is actually focused on 16–19, there is a strong movement within the Home Office for adult citizenship education and learning. We do some work with them. I think it is really important and I would like to see stronger emphasis on 16–19 citizenship and beyond that as well.”⁶¹

80. Since we took evidence, the DfES has confirmed that it will continue to provide funding for the post-16 citizenship support programme. We welcome this commitment and hope that DfES will look at how further developments, including the Ajegbo recommendations, can be integrated into this programme.

81. At Universities and Colleges of Higher Education, citizenship education programmes, at least self-consciously defined as such, appear to be in their infancy. One example is

59 Ev 31

60 It may sometimes make sense for PSHE and citizenship education to be delivered alongside each other at the primary stage but there is much evidence, including that from Ajegbo, that in terms of subject matter and teaching experience and background, it may be better regarded as sitting alongside humanities subjects at secondary and later stages.

61 Q 87, Q 159

Roehampton University's Crucible programme, which has been developed partly in response to a perceived need to create active "communities" on campus in an institution where many students continue to live at home. Another aim of the programme is to develop links with local community organisations. Additionally, HEFCE is currently funding a pilot programme called *Teaching Citizenship in Higher Education*, which is being led by the University of Southampton, in partnership with Keele University and Liverpool John Moores University.⁶² Although we have not taken extensive evidence during our inquiry on practice in the higher education sector, we would contend that this is an area which merits further exploration.

82. What is currently absent at the national level is a truly lifelong citizenship education strategy—which joins up primary, secondary, tertiary, adult education and training. Worthwhile activity is happening in all these phases of education yet it is hard to see these activities—particularly those in further, higher and adult education—as belonging to a coherent programme, with common aims and purposes. It will be vital that the lifelong strategy is developed in co-operation with other Government departments active in the citizenship arena—and in particular, the Home Office and the Department for Constitutional Affairs.

Training—teachers and leaders

Secondary initial teacher training and CPD

83. During our inquiry, the one area that has stood out quite clearly as critical to the future development of citizenship education is the adequate training of teachers, lecturers and leaders. When we took evidence from Lord Adonis, it became apparent that he likewise saw training as key:

“My view of how we will actually get to good citizenship education as a subject in school, by which I mean the teaching of the citizenship curriculum, is that it is going to be difficult to do that until you have a trained citizenship teacher in every secondary school and, in fact, the very existence of a trained citizenship teacher is a declaration by the leadership of the school that they take it sufficiently seriously as a subject that they want teachers who actually have accredited expertise in the subject teaching it. You would not think of having science or history or geography, saying that these are important to the life of the school, if you did not have a properly trained teacher.”⁶³

In tandem with the introduction of the citizenship curriculum in 2002, bids were invited for the establishment of Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) initial teacher training courses, to provide a new specialist 'cadre' of staff for secondary education. However, the number of places on initial teacher training (ITT) citizenship courses, in line with those for other subjects, is decreasing year on year. While 250 places were available in 2003–04 and 2004–05, this number has been progressively reduced to 220 places for courses taking place in 2007–08. The reductions in citizenship are proportionately smaller

62 See <http://www.soton.ac.uk/citizened/index.html>.

63 Q 515

than for other subjects. However, many of those submitting evidence on this issue to us have contended that even the current level of provision is inadequate, and further cuts inappropriate, given the novelty of the subject and the fact that it is still establishing its place in the school curriculum. Chris Waller of the Association for Citizenship Teaching told us:

“I would maintain that there are too few teachers, too few trainees getting on to the courses that are available. I know, for example, that one of the HEI providers in the south-west of England was allocated 15 places for 2006–07 and had 60 applicants. Each one of those 60 applicants wanted to train to be a citizenship teacher, but they were turned away. They are possibly lost to the profession; certainly they are lost in terms of that training institution to citizenship training courses; so the demand is there, the interest is there.”⁶⁴

84. A similar point was foreshadowed at the start of our inquiry by Professor Sir Bernard Crick, who told us that the new cadre of citizenship teachers tended to be very able—moreover, there was a latent body of potential recruits who were being turned away:

“Very many of those who have done their teaching practice in a school have been appointed by that same school when they have come to look for a job. That means they are very able people. In the past good graduates in politics, economics or sociology could not get into teaching because of, as you know, the National Curriculum requirement. Now it is a National Curriculum requirement there is not merely an annual intake; I think there is quite a backlog of those kinds of graduates who want to get into teaching.”⁶⁵

85. Of course, a crucial issue is what happens to those who do complete citizenship ITT courses, and we have received some worrying evidence which suggests that even the small number of recruits exiting existing programmes are often not able to find positions where their skills are fully utilised. Chris Waller, Association for Citizenship Teaching, told us:

“[...] they [citizenship specialists] are tremendous assets to school, and schools recognise that, but they often employ them in a context which is away from citizenship [...]. That often leads to those newly qualified teachers being disenchanted and leaving the profession altogether [...]. This is where we come back to this issue about how citizenship manifests itself in individual schools, and we need to try and ensure that schools are much clearer about, ring-fencing is too simplistic a term, but ensuring that citizenship is identified clearly within the curriculum, that responsibility is given as such and that students really do receive a proper entitlement, not a newly qualified teacher who is put in charge of Uncle Tom Cobbley and all who devotes 20 minutes a week to citizenship. That is what kills it and it kills them as teachers.”⁶⁶

Ongoing informal monitoring of advertised vacancies in the national press suggests that the number of citizenship teachers sought for the teaching year starting September 07–08 is

64 Q 135

65 Q2

66 Q 150

very low compared to other subjects—even Religious Education—which although compulsory is not actually part of the National Curriculum.⁶⁷

86. In the medium term there is a very strong case for increasing substantially the number of Initial Teacher Training (ITT) places for those who want to specialise in citizenship education. In the short term, no further cuts in the annual number of places available should be made. These actions would send a strong signal about the seriousness with which citizenship education is viewed. In tandem, there needs to be a campaign to encourage schools and colleges to employ ITT graduates in citizenship posts. This campaign needs to convey the expectation that all secondary schools should have a fully trained citizenship teacher in post. Consideration should be given to what incentives and support need to be offered so that schools are willing and able to fulfil this expectation.

87. The DfES's main strategy for developing citizenship expertise is through the roll-out of the continuing professional development (CPD) course in citizenship for existing teachers.⁶⁸ In March 2006, it was announced that an extra 600 places on the CPD course would be provided each year for the next two years. The courses would entail the equivalent of 5 days' training, and would be certificate-bearing. The number of places, Lord Adonis told us, had been decided on an assessment of likely demand from teachers and leaders.⁶⁹

88. It is clear that there is strong support for the roll-out of the citizenship CPD programme from within the citizenship education community. Indeed, the national co-ordination of a development programme was something that many had advocated in written evidence. Scott Harrison of Ofsted told us:

“I think as time has gone on we have found that pedagogically, and in terms of the issues which teachers have to deal with, handling 25 fifteen-year-olds and whatever else, teaching citizenship is difficult. I agree with [Sir] Bernard [Crick] that we need substantial training for teachers in service who are signed up to doing this day on day.”⁷⁰

Similarly, CitizED, an organisation funded by the Training and Development Agency to support workforce development, told us:

“We welcome the recent announcement that the DfES will fund 1,200 teachers on a CPD citizenship course costing nearly £600,000 over two years. However, we see no strategy for delivering such courses. Nor do we see a clear policy that will ensure the best use of expertise within and beyond higher education so that there can be fruitful collaboration with government departments and agencies and NGOs.”⁷¹

67 Private communication from Jonathan Hayward, Institute of Education.

68 Additionally, in April 2006, the Citizenship Foundation published a CPD handbook entitled *Making Sense of Citizenship*. This was in association with the DfES, the Association for Citizenship Teaching, QCA, Ofsted, the then-LSDA and Citized.

69 Q 526

70 Q 39

71 Ev 218

89. **We welcome the expansion of the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) citizenship certificate programme, which responds to a clear need from within the existing school workforce, and seems to indicate the start of a more co-ordinated, national strategy. Our main concern is that the level of skill and knowledge that can be gained through the equivalent of five days' training is in no way comparable to that likely to be gained in the course of a full-year ITT course. A primarily CPD-based approach would not be considered as appropriate for teachers of other statutory secondary subjects (such as maths) and we cannot see why it should be so in the case of citizenship. While CPD is crucial, it should not be allowed to serve as the main developmental route for citizenship education.**

90. During our inquiry, we received evidence from a range of professional associations, foundations and charitable trusts whose main purpose is to promote and support the development of citizenship education—particularly in respect of developing the workforce. These include organisations such as the Association for Citizenship Teaching, the Citizenship Foundation and many others. These organisations are an essential part of the framework, and are particularly valuable in that they create and sustain professional networks for the sharing of best practice, resources, and teaching methods.

Primary initial teacher training

91. Currently, the majority of primary teachers enter the profession after completing one-year Postgraduate Certification in Education (PGCE) courses. Some of the evidence we have received questions whether such courses are providing adequate coverage of citizenship education, given the plethora of other topics which have to be considered and the limited time available. CitizED told us:

“The positive remarks about citizenship education for the secondary sector cannot be echoed for primary [...] PGCE courses for primary trainees are forced to marginalise citizenship education, or make only token gestures, due to the pressure on their time. The non statutory nature of citizenship education and the fact that it is combined in the guidance with PSHE only exacerbates this situation. The result is that very few primary trainees are adequately equipped to take on citizenship teaching when they qualify. Despite some good practice in primary schools, the absence of training for the new generation of primary teachers means that opportunities to develop citizenship education in schools through new blood are missed, and transition into the secondary sector is not supported.”⁷²

92. **We have received evidence of some effective practice in primary schools—for example, in Hampshire. We are nevertheless concerned that trainee primary teachers following the PGCE route may not have the opportunity to cover citizenship education in adequate depth, given the intensiveness of the course and the number of other areas which have to be covered. If this is indeed the case, there is a risk that new teachers entering the profession are starting out with only limited awareness of what it means and what it can offer. More generally, there is a risk that an opportunity to make citizenship education an integral part of the curriculum in all primary schools is being**

missed. The DfES, working with the Training and Development Agency and Ofsted (which inspects teacher training), needs to assess the priority currently being given to citizenship education on primary PGCE courses, and to consider whether any remedial action is needed in this regard.

Leaders

93. As is the case with most curricular reforms and new initiatives, it is clear that the success or otherwise of an institution's citizenship provision depends critically on the attitudes, abilities and decisions of an institution's leadership. Scott Harrison of Ofsted, told us:

“[...] the fact is that the schools which have done best have been operating on all [...] fronts, whereas those who are still not off the starting block have not begun to see the senior management decisions which are needed in order to move forward.”⁷³

Currently, the National College for School Leadership (NCSL) is the primary provider of continuing professional development to school leaders. We asked witnesses whether they were doing enough to promote awareness of citizenship education through their courses. Tony Breslin of the Citizenship Foundation said:

“We are convinced that the National College could do much more here. My understanding is that the discussions between the department and other bodies in the National College, in terms of equipping heads to support and lead on citizenship, has essentially been that the NCSL does school management and school leadership, it does not do subjects; and this is precisely the space where we say, ‘Yes, but citizenship is not just a subject, it is a way of doing schooling’, and leading the citizenship, which is school, community involved, active participation, etcetera, is a very different thing. We are seeking to lobby the National College for a revision of the national professional qualification for headship, and their leading from the middle programmes, to ensure that there is an input specifically around citizenship and citizenship as a way of doing schooling rather than simply narrowly as a subject, but it is insufficient currently.”⁷⁴

94. There is a clear case for ensuring that heads and other school leaders receive information about whole-school approaches to citizenship education during training or CPD, where appropriate. It appears that one problem in the past has been a lack of clarity about whose responsibility this is, with the National College for School Leadership saying its remit does not allow it to focus on particular “subjects”. However, as we have argued elsewhere, effective citizenship education concerns whole-school issues that are fundamentally in the hands of management, and are to some extent, therefore, ‘beyond the curriculum’. **We would welcome a clear statement from the National College for School Leadership on what it is currently doing to ensure heads are sufficiently aware of citizenship’s whole school implications, and specifically through its ‘Leading from the Middle’ and ‘National Professional Qualification for Headship’ training courses.**

73 Q 40

74 Q 140

The teaching of “controversial” issues

95. During our inquiry, we have been particularly keen to explore whether teaching across the full range of schools prepares young people adequately for life in a diverse society. In particular, we sought to test the contention that some schools may be dealing inadequately with (or simply avoiding) certain topics seen as “sensitive” or “problematic”—for example, homosexuality or abortion.⁷⁵ In particular, we were concerned to look at whether faith schools, where a specific value system dominates, may be failing to address issues adequately, appropriately, and in an unbiased way. Tony Breslin of the Citizenship Foundation told us: “[O]ur sense is that it might not be so much that faith schools are not dealing with controversial issues, it might be an issue about how those issues are dealt with, and we need to understand more about that.”⁷⁶ He went on to add that many faith schools had strong traditions of participation and community involvement.

96. We asked faith schooling representatives whether they saw any conflict between the necessity to cover certain issues in an unbiased and appropriate manner, and the teachings of their particular faith. The Archbishop of Birmingham, Vincent Nichols, strongly denied any such conflict:

“On homosexuality, I think the Catholic Church makes a very clear distinction, which I can elaborate on if you like, between the orientation of a person and their sexual behaviour. The Catholic Church would stand very firmly for the equal dignity and right of a person, no matter their homosexual orientation, and would argue very strongly that it is a real foreshortening of human dignity to identify somebody by their sexual orientation, which, unfortunately, I think our society does. As to the moral codes concerning sexual behaviour, there is a single principle on this, which is that sexual intercourse belongs within marriage, and that is the principal teaching of the Catholic Church [...]. We have just developed, with the full co-operation of the Teenage Pregnancy Unit, a programme All That I Am, which is to do with personal and sexual education and it deals with all those issues and it does so in a very mature and proper fashion. Yes, they are dealt with, and we do not need citizenship education to deal with them.”⁷⁷

Similarly, Mohammed Mukadam of the Association of Muslim Schools told us:

“In terms of the debates which you mentioned, specifically about the attitude to women, homosexuality, et cetera, these pose no problems at all for faith schools where they are well-run and have a broader understanding of Islam. Of course Islam has its clear views about homosexuality and those are discussed in schools, but it would be wrong to translate that as homophobic, or whatever you want to call it. Although the Koran is very clear that homosexuality as an act is sinful and so forth, I do not think the Koran teaches that they should go around beating up any homosexuals, so there is a difference. There is room for holding one’s own views

75 While sexuality and abortion might ordinarily be understood to fall within the remit of PSHE or RE, we consider them relevant to citizenship insofar as they are inherently political matters, tied to issues of human rights, equality and the law.

76 Q 158

77 Qq 654–57

and to discuss this, and to uphold them. It is equally important to make sure that they respect their fellow human beings and do not go around doing things which are illegal.”⁷⁸

97. Currently, there is little concrete evidence about the consistency or scale of teaching on issues—such as homosexuality or abortion—which are considered problematic or controversial by some. Schools should be positively encouraged and supported in looking at ways to incorporate such discussion both into their lessons and other out-of-lesson citizenship activities as part of the acknowledgement and acceptance of diversity and difference. The DfES needs to make this expectation clear—and look at the support and guidance it provides to enable teachers to meet it.

4 The Role of the DfES and Ministers

A “light touch” curriculum?

98. From the beginning, the DfES has adopted a “light touch” approach to citizenship education, allowing schools a high degree of latitude in terms of how they choose to implement it in their schools. They told us in written evidence:

“Schools are encouraged to use a number of ways of providing citizenship which may include a combination of discrete provision, explicit opportunities in a range of other subjects, whole school and suspended timetable activities and pupils’ involvement in the life of the school and the wider community. There is no specified amount of teaching time for citizenship education. Schools are free to teach the subject in the way(s) which best suits their school and pupils’ circumstances. However, guidance in the KS3 strategy suggests that schools should spend about 1 hour a week on citizenship.”⁷⁹

99. We understand the reasons for this approach—particularly the idea that in the beginning, schools, already pressed to deliver a full curriculum, needed to fit citizenship “flexibly” around existing timetables and other non-curricular activities. However, we were concerned about whether, given the uneven development of citizenship education programmes to date, this “light touch” approach should still be considered appropriate. Views on the need for more prescriptive guidance on the form citizenship education should take were varied—but many were cautious about too exacting a framework. Tom Wylie of the National Youth Agency told us:

“Probably we do not have to worry about the lively teacher, we have to worry about maybe the school which is a bit uncertain where to go, and I can see the point of frameworks in that context, but cautiously so.”⁸⁰

Balancing the need to ensure faster progress with the need to avoid overt prescription, thus risking stifling innovation and local appropriateness, is very difficult. Too prescriptive an approach on citizenship education could result in schools and other settings being formulaic and box-ticking, but Government should look seriously at how QCA and others speed development. As we have noted throughout this report, we see a much greater role for the DfES—along with partner agencies—in terms of sharing best practice on what other schools have found to work; of particular use would be access to whole-school “case studies” explaining the approach that other institutions have taken, and the reasons they have pursued that approach.

Policy coherence and intradepartmental working

100. Citizenship—or aspects of it—is of course highly relevant to the work of several government departments, aside from the DfES. This is particularly true of the Home Office, many strands of whose work is closely allied to the concerns of citizenship

79 Ev 160

80 Q 207

education—most recently, and most notably, in the case of the “Respect” agenda. We asked Professor Sir Bernard Crick at the start of our inquiry for his perspectives on the level of joined-up working on issues surrounding citizenship. He told us:

“I was quite startled that some senior officials in the Home Office had virtually no knowledge of the Citizenship Order or that an order—and after all this is a legal order, it is part of the National Curriculum—could be drafted in such broad terms. Whereas the lawyers in the Home Office tend to think that the Citizenship [naturalisation] Order, for what the ESOL [English for speakers of other languages] teachers shall teach, has got to be very, very precise indeed rather than leaving it to the professionalism and common sense of the teachers teaching very different people in very different parts of the country. There is a tremendous cultural difference between these two departments.”⁸¹

Tony Breslin of the Citizenship Foundation suggested that more co-ordination was necessary, and gave an example of what this might mean in practice:

“We welcome the fact that the Home Office, DCA [Department for Constitutional Affairs], DfES and other areas in government are interested in this area, but there is a real issue about bringing those approaches together in a much more joined up and coherent way. Sometimes we find that the agencies that work with the different departments are always trying to do that linking or point that link out, and so there is a real role there for a more joined up practice. For instance, we know through the Home Office naturalisation related education programme that the parents of some of the children that Chris’s members teach will be going through a citizenship education programme of one design and their children may be going through an education programme of another design, and so on. There is a real challenge, and this is really difficult ground, but actually trying to draw those initiatives together is very important.”⁸²

He went on to urge that more joint working with the Home Office was needed in respect of “issues around diversity, community-cohesion and those matters but they have also been key movers in terms of the Russell Commission outcomes around volunteering and charitable-giving.”⁸³ That whole aspect of the citizenship agenda is important to look at.⁸⁴

101. In written evidence to us, the DfES emphasised the fit between policies in different departments, giving as an example current work on the Respect agenda, saying: “the aims of citizenship education are complemented by the Respect Action Plan which was launched by the Prime Minister earlier this year”.⁸⁵ However, while it may be true that the aims of the two policy strands are complementary, in fact the Government’s action plan for Respect—a Home Office-led project—contains no obvious mention of citizenship

81 Q 29

82 Q 161

83 The Russell Commission was established in May 2004 by the Home Secretary and the Chancellor. Its aims were to develop a national framework for youth volunteering and participation. Its final report was published in May 2005.

84 Q 193

85 Ev 157

education programmes in schools, colleges and other settings.⁸⁶ There is also scant reference to pre- and post-16 citizenship education programmes in the recently published discussion paper launching the HM Treasury-led *Policy Review of Children and Young People*. This is despite the fact that the latter is explicitly concerned with ensuring vulnerable young people have opportunities to participate in positive activities and to play an active part in their communities.⁸⁷

102. Several government departments have legitimate interests in citizenship education, broadly defined. However, it is not always clear that they are working to the same ends, nor that they are working in a truly collaborative way. Rather than just issuing a commitment to work together, we ask the Government to tell us what practical steps it intends to take to ensure greater co-ordination between the departments with responsibilities in this area—and in particular, between the DfES, Home Office, the Department for Constitutional Affairs and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. We would also like the Government to undertake a review to explicitly identify areas of overlap and complementarity in existing policies across departments.

Priority, leadership and clarity from Ministers

103. At the time of the introduction of formalised citizenship education, our evidence suggests there was strong ministerial and departmental support for the initiative. We have explored the extent to which this enthusiasm has been sustained during subsequent years. At the beginning of our inquiry, Professor Sir Bernard Crick argued that he thought ministerial interests may have been diverted away from citizenship education toward newer initiatives, which, paradoxically, had many of the same aims:

“I am amazed that from the Prime Minister and other Ministers we get now a great deal of talk about respect, the problems of integration, the problems of youth behaviour. All this was part of the reason for the Citizenship advisory group being set up originally and it is embedded in the Order itself. I am amazed that some senior politicians, if I may say so, either do not have faith in it or perhaps have forgotten it in the welter of initiatives that there are, and this one after all is a long term initiative. You cannot change behaviour, you cannot change attitudes, overnight. These things were the concerns right at the beginning.”⁸⁸

Tony Breslin of the Citizenship Foundation was more circumspect in his analysis, praising effort to date but seeing a stronger role for the Department and ministers in the future:

“I want to acknowledge the work of the small citizenship teams in the DfES and in the other key agencies, but the steer has been insufficient. We really need a much stronger sense of the messages, a much stronger sense of the importance of this from ministers across DfES.”⁸⁹

86 Home Office, *The Respect Action Plan*, January 2006

87 HM Treasury/DfES, *Policy review of children and young people: a discussion paper*, January 2007.

88 Q 11

89 Q 102

104. The idea that ministers could play an important role in articulating more clearly and consistently, and more forcefully, the aims and objectives of citizenship education has been a theme running through the evidence we have received. The National Association of Head Teachers, for example, told us:

“Recommendation 4.10 from the Final report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship, chaired by Professor Sir Bernard Crick, *Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools*, QCA, 1998, stated that ‘everyone directly involved in the education of our children—politicians and civil servants; community representatives; faith groups; school inspectors and governors; teacher trainers and teachers themselves; parents and indeed pupils—be given a clear statement of what is meant by citizenship education and their central role in it.’ Although there are guidelines and programmes of study, the necessary level of clarity is not always present or apparent in practice.”⁹⁰

At the time of its introduction, citizenship education enjoyed strong personal support from ministers. This was crucial to its establishment and acceptance as a discipline. Four years, however, have passed since then and we are concerned about the potential for a waning of interest at a stage when much of the hard work in terms of implementation still remains to be done. To some, citizenship education’s aims, objectives and methods remain opaque, and difficult to grasp. There is a need for a clear public narrative on what citizenship education is setting out to achieve, and why it is considered important.

105. Para 5.11.2 of the original Crick report urged the creation of a Standing Commission on Citizenship Education. Members of the body were to include representatives of parents, the public, teachers, public authorities and cross-party political representation. In the event, a Citizenship Education Working Party was formed under the then-Schools’ Minister Jacqui Smith to oversee the development and implementation of the National Curriculum.

106. We asked Professor Sir Bernard Crick how he felt about the body that now existed to oversee citizenship education’s implementation, and in particular, whether he was happy with its constitution. His response to us was “no, certainly not, because the composition of it varies too much and ministers come and go”.⁹¹

107. We put it to Lord Adonis that the current arrangements for the Ministerial oversight of citizenship education’s implementation—particularly in respect of the working party—were insufficiently rigorous. He told us that the existing body “embraces leading figures from [the] Department, from the D[e]partment for C[onstitutional] A[ffairs] and from the Home Office. I do not know the membership here but I can supply that”.⁹² He went on to state that he was not sure when it last met, and that he “did not think that it was necessary personally to attend the working party itself for that work to be taken forward, but I meet my advisers who serve on the working party frequently and we take forward that work as

90 Ev 230

91 Q 18

92 Q 506 ff.

we need to at ministerial level”. Moreover, he challenged the general notion that Ministers’ interest in this area was waning:

“In my experience of dealing with senior politicians of all parties, including the Prime Minister, they are thoroughly committed to the embedding of citizenship education, both as a subject and in its applied dimension within schools [...]. I am sure there is more that can be done but I have never found any lack of willingness to recognise its importance or to engage in it when invited to do so.”⁹³

108. We consider that the level and consistency of ministerial attention to citizenship education needs to be increased—and that ministers need to be publicly seen to be engaged in this agenda. One way of doing this would be to revisit the decision to remove ministerial representation from the citizenship education working party. Such a move would send out an unambiguous message regarding the seriousness with which citizenship is taken, at the highest levels.

Specialist subject status

109. Currently, it is not possible for schools to apply for primary specialist status in citizenship—as is the case for other subjects such as maths, English or sciences. Schools which specialise in Humanities can elect to set targets in relation to citizenship (as one of their subsidiary subjects), but must have either history, geography or English as the ‘key’ subject specialism. Some submitting evidence to our inquiry have suggested that this implicitly accords citizenship a lower status than other subjects—and that a positive way forward would be to change the rules in this regard. For example, Jules Mason, British Youth Council, told us that “One of the things I thought might help ratchet citizenship higher up the agenda is around having that as a status for a specialism within a school”.⁹⁴

110. We asked Lord Adonis whether he foresaw a time when schools could apply for primary specialisms in citizenship. He told us:

“The rationale [...] is specialisms should be in areas where you can set effective targets because of performance in National Curriculum subjects. For example, in respect of history and geography, you can set targets for performance in those subjects because they are sat widely at GCSE. In respect of citizenship, you cannot do so yet because all that is available is the half GCSE. I have debated that criterion. It may be that your Committee may want to make a case for saying that is too narrow a view of what constitutes the capacity of a school to demonstrate year-on-year improvement in a particular area and there are other ways that you could demonstrate year-on-year improvement of citizenship that are not directly related just to a GCSE. That is a debate we are having inside the Department at the moment and with the Specialist Schools and Academies Trust, and we would welcome your view on it because it is very important.”⁹⁵

93 Q 504

94 Q 227

95 Q 584

111. Written evidence we received from the QCA draws attention to newly published guidance on non-exam-based assessment of achievement at Key Stage 3, which they argue has been “extremely well received”.⁹⁶ This appears to us a positive development, and one which also addresses the concerns of many of those who, in their evidence to us, have cautioned that teachers and leaders need further support on how to assess achievement in citizenship.

112. As well as providing development opportunities, a change in the rules to allow schools to obtain a primary specialism in citizenship would send a powerful signal that citizenship education is considered important and a “serious option” rather than an add-on to an already crowded curriculum. The primary objection given to date has been a lack of adequate assessment tools to measure progress in citizenship. The QCA has recently produced guidelines for assessment at Key Stage 3—so it is clear that methods for measuring citizenship attainment, even for those schools that choose not to offer the half-GCSE, are developing.⁹⁷ It is now up to the Government to work with the QCA to ensure that similar assessment guidelines are developed for Key Stage 4, with the presumption that as soon as suitable arrangements are in place schools will be allowed to apply for primary specialisms in citizenship education.

96 Ev 30

97 We note that Sir Keith Ajegbo’s report recommends the creation of a full GCSE in citizenship.

Conclusions and recommendations

Introduction

What is citizenship education?

1. As has been argued by many during the course of our inquiry, citizenship education is about more than knowledge—it is a skill which can be developed and applied only through active participation. At their best, good citizenship education programmes clearly involve whole school action—including engagement with the local, national and global communities, and the exploration of new, more participative forms of school or college management. (Paragraph 15)

The value of citizenship education

2. It is too early to say with any degree of confidence whether citizenship education is producing the wide range of impacts originally hoped for. Initial evidence from small-scale studies and the experience of individual institutions is promising but on its own not enough. A large-scale study is being undertaken by the National Foundation for Educational Research to look specifically at this issue. This project needs continued strong support from the Government and a sustained involvement and progress reports from Ofsted. (Paragraph 21)
3. As far as we are aware, there is currently no research underway to examine the links between citizenship education and general attainment; we recommend that the DfES should remedy this. (Paragraph 22)

Curriculum review—British history and diversity

4. The Government has indicated that it accepts Sir Keith Ajegbo's recommendation for the development of a fourth strand of the citizenship curriculum. We support his proposals that many different aspects of British social, cultural and indeed political history should be used as points of entry in the citizenship curriculum to engage students in discussing the nature of citizenship and its responsibility in 21st century Britain. (Paragraph 33)
5. Such coverage should rightly touch on what is distinctive in the inheritance and experience of contemporary Britain and the values of our society today. But it should not be taken to imply an endorsement of any single explanation of British values or history. Indeed, it should emphasise the way in which those values connect to universal human rights, and recognise that critical and divergent perspectives, as well as the potential to have alternative and different layers of identity, are a central part of what contemporary Britishness is. (Paragraph 34)
6. We recommend that the National College of School Leadership be more closely involved in engaging with these changes and in incorporating the challenges of citizenship education in its training programmes and other initiatives. (Paragraph 35)

7. The issue of identities and belonging can be challenging and sensitive for students and teachers alike; meaningful and productive discussions are more likely to take place if teachers have appropriate training in this area. As the Government takes forward the recommendations of the Ajebo report, it will be crucial that it develops concrete plans as to how it will equip those teachers and lecturers to deal with the teaching of these often challenging issues on the ground. (Paragraph 38)
8. We recommend that far more use is made of the opportunities provided by activities outside the classroom—as well as discrete events such as Holocaust Memorial Day or this year’s commemorations of the 200th anniversary of the abolition of the slave trade—to stimulate this. (Paragraph 39)

Implementation

Quality and reach of citizenship education

9. The imperative now is to ensure that patchiness is not allowed to remain, that high quality provision becomes the norm, and that progress is accelerated. This will require action from those on the ground, but also needs strong support from the DfES and Ministers. (Paragraph 42)
10. There is an enduring risk that in a minority of cases, schools could be adopting a passive approach to citizenship education, believing no action needs to be taken as they are doing it anyway. The DfES has a role to play here in driving home the message that what is important is a systematic and explicit—as well as comprehensive—approach to citizenship education. (Paragraph 45)
11. We believe it is very important that faith schools recognise their specific responsibility to make space in their studies for the discussion of what citizenship means in a diverse and pluralist 21st century Britain and to examine openly the differences and differing views that come with this, in the context of mutual respect and human rights, and that it requires a more explicit approach than simply asserting that an overall ethos of citizenship permeates the school and its curriculum. (Paragraph 46)

Modes of delivery

Embedded and discrete provision

12. Most witnesses agreed that solely cross-curricular approaches to citizenship education are likely to be insufficient—as one of our witnesses pointed out, “everywhere often can be nowhere”. Ofsted makes this clear in their subject reports, but stops short of prescribing one particular delivery model. We understand schools’ concerns about where time is to be found in the curriculum. The case for more overt prescription in terms of models of provision has not yet been made, but this does not preclude sending a clear message to schools about what is working best on the ground, and why. Ofsted should continue to monitor closely the development of citizenship studies in schools and particularly in the light of the implementation of

the Ajegbo recommendations and their resource and teaching implications. (Paragraph 49)

Participation and “whole school” citizenship

13. In respect of the active, participative dimensions of citizenship education, and adopting a “whole school” approach, we think there is a greater role for the DfES to play in disseminating best practice examples and case-studies. This should capitalise on the experience of those schools which have found space in the curriculum for creating “active” citizenship opportunities, and those which have allowed young people a real say in institutional management. The links with *Every Child Matters*’ focus on designing services around the needs of young people, with their input, should be stressed. (Paragraph 53)

School councils and active citizenship

14. We warmly welcome the Government’s practical support for school councils to date, including through the funding it provides to School Councils UK for the provision of materials and other development work. There is scope for information about schools with effective, innovative councils to be made more widely known. As in other respects concerning the sharing of best practice on citizenship education, supporting organisations (including the DfES) have a fine balance to maintain between the potential merits of offering “replicable models” to assist schools who have perhaps made little progress to date, and the potential risk of implying “one size fits all” approaches that may be entirely inappropriate in certain contexts. It would be undesirable to give the impression that a certain “model” could just be adopted and implemented in a school, giving end-users (students) little say in the design of the council. This needs to be stressed alongside any support materials or exemplars that are offered. It is important to situate councils within the wider citizenship education programme, and to ensure participation and ownership among the whole school population—not just an elite group. (Paragraph 61)

School councils as a statutory requirement?

15. Subject to the findings of the Institute of Education review, we recommend that the Government makes school councils compulsory. The Government should, however, resist the temptation to define tightly what form they should take—as this is likely to add little and may even be counter-productive. (Paragraph 63)

Student training for school councils

16. The Government should look at how training for students can best be supported to give them the skills to participate fully. (Paragraph 65)

The role of local authorities

17. The DfES needs to issue further guidance to local authorities about citizenship education. (Paragraph 70)

Continuity across phases—a life-long citizenship education strategy?

Primary

18. One area of considerable agreement in the evidence we have received has been the need to disaggregate PSHE and citizenship education at the conceptual level, even if it often makes sense for citizenship education and PSHE to be delivered in tandem, particularly at the primary stage. Schools do best when they see citizenship as a separate subject. (Paragraph 76)

Post-16

19. Since we took evidence, the DfES has confirmed that it will continue to provide funding for the post-16 citizenship support programme. We welcome this commitment and hope that DfES will look at how further developments, including the Ajegbo recommendations, can be integrated into this programme. (Paragraph 80)
20. What is currently absent at the national level is a truly lifelong citizenship education strategy—which joins up primary, secondary, tertiary, adult education and training. Worthwhile activity is happening in all these phases of education yet it is hard to see these activities—particularly those in further, higher and adult education—as belonging to a coherent programme, with common aims and purposes. It will be vital that the lifelong strategy is developed in co-operation with other Government departments active in the citizenship arena—and in particular, the Home Office and the Department for Constitutional Affairs. (Paragraph 82)

Training—teachers and leaders

Secondary Initial Teacher Training and CPD

21. In the medium term there is a very strong case for increasing substantially the number of Initial Teacher Training (ITT) places for those who want to specialise in citizenship education. In the short term, no further cuts in the annual number of places available should be made. These actions would send a strong signal about the seriousness with which citizenship education is viewed. In tandem, there needs to be a campaign to encourage schools and colleges to employ ITT graduates in citizenship posts. This campaign needs to convey the expectation that all secondary schools should have a fully trained citizenship teacher in post. Consideration should be given to what incentives and support need to be offered so that schools are willing and able to fulfil this expectation. (Paragraph 86)
22. We welcome the expansion of the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) citizenship certificate programme, which responds to a clear need from within the existing school workforce, and seems to indicate the start of a more co-ordinated, national strategy. Our main concern is that the level of skill and knowledge that can be gained through the equivalent of five days' training is in no way comparable to that likely to be gained in the course of a full-year ITT course. A primarily CPD-

based approach would not be considered as appropriate for teachers of other statutory secondary subjects (such as maths) and we cannot see why it should be so in the case of citizenship. While CPD is crucial, it should not be allowed to serve as the main developmental route for citizenship education. (Paragraph 89)

23. We have received evidence of some effective practice in primary schools—for example, in Hampshire. We are nevertheless concerned that trainee primary teachers following the PGCE route may not have the opportunity to cover citizenship education in adequate depth, given the intensiveness of the course and the number of other areas which have to be covered. If this is indeed the case, there is a risk that new teachers entering the profession are starting out with only limited awareness of what it means and what it can offer. More generally, there is a risk that an opportunity to make citizenship education an integral part of the curriculum in all primary schools is being missed. The DfES, working with the Training and Development Agency and Ofsted (which inspects teacher training), needs to assess the priority currently being given to citizenship education on primary PGCE courses, and to consider whether any remedial action is needed in this regard. (Paragraph 92)

Leaders

24. We would welcome a clear statement from the National College for School Leadership on what it is currently doing to ensure heads are sufficiently aware of citizenship’s whole school implications, and specifically through its ‘leading from the middle’ and ‘National Professional Qualification for Headship’ training courses. (Paragraph 94)

The teaching of “controversial” issues

25. Currently, there is little concrete evidence about the consistency or scale of teaching on issues—such as homosexuality or abortion—which are considered problematic or controversial by some. Schools should be positively encouraged and supported in looking at ways to incorporate such discussion both into their lessons and other out-of-lesson citizenship activities as part of the acknowledgement and acceptance of diversity and difference. The DfES needs to make this expectation clear—and look at the support and guidance it provides to enable teachers to meet it. (Paragraph 97)

The Role of the DfES and Ministers

A “light touch” curriculum?

26. Balancing the need to ensure faster progress with the need to avoid overt prescription, thus risking stifling innovation and local appropriateness, is very difficult. Too prescriptive an approach on citizenship education could result in schools and other settings being formulaic and box-ticking, but Government should look seriously at how QCA and others speed development. As we have noted throughout this report, we see a much greater role for the DfES—along with partner agencies—in terms of sharing best practice on what other schools have found to work; of particular use would be access to whole-school “case studies” explaining the

approach that other institutions have taken, and the reasons they have pursued that approach. (Paragraph 99)

Policy coherence and intradepartmental working

27. Several Government departments have legitimate interests in citizenship education, broadly defined. However, it is not always clear that they are working to the same ends, nor that they are working in a truly collaborative way. Rather than just issuing a commitment to work together, we ask the Government to tell us what practical steps it intends to take to ensure greater co-ordination between the departments with responsibilities in this area—and in particular, between the DfES, Home Office, the Department for Constitutional Affairs and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. We would also like the Government to undertake a review to explicitly identify areas of overlap and complementarity in existing policies across departments. (Paragraph 102)

Priority, leadership and clarity from Ministers

28. At the time of its introduction, citizenship education enjoyed strong personal support from Ministers. This was crucial to its establishment and acceptance as a discipline. Four years, however, have passed since then and we are concerned about the potential for a waning of interest at a stage when much of the hard work in terms of implementation still remains to be done. To some, citizenship education's aims, objectives and methods remain opaque, and difficult to grasp. There is a need for a clear public narrative on what citizenship education is setting out to achieve, and why it is considered important. (Paragraph 104)
29. We consider that the level and consistency of Ministerial attention to citizenship education needs to be increased—and that Ministers need to be publicly seen to be engaged in this agenda. One way of doing this would be to revisit the decision to remove Ministerial representation from the citizenship education working party. Such a move would send out an unambiguous message regarding the seriousness with which citizenship is taken, at the highest levels. (Paragraph 108)

Specialist subject status

30. As well as providing development opportunities, a change in the rules to allow schools to obtain a primary specialism in citizenship would send a powerful signal that citizenship education is considered important and a “serious option” rather than an add-on to an already crowded curriculum. The primary objection given to date has been a lack of adequate assessment tools to measure progress in citizenship. The QCA has recently produced guidelines for assessment at Key Stage 3—so it is clear that methods for measuring citizenship attainment, even for those schools that choose not to offer the half-GCSE, are developing. It is now up to the Government to work with the QCA to ensure that similar assessment guidelines are developed for Key Stage 4, with the presumption that as soon as suitable arrangements are in place schools will be allowed to apply for primary specialisms in citizenship education. (Paragraph 112)

Formal Minutes

7 February 2007

Members present:

Mr Barry Sheerman, in the Chair

Mr Douglas Carswell
Mr David Chaytor
Jeff Ennis
Paul Holmes
Helen Jones

Fiona Mactaggart
Mr Gordon Marsden
Mr Andrew Pelling
Stephen Williams
Mr Rob Wilson

The Committee deliberated.

[Adjourned till Monday 19 February at 3.30pm.]

21 February 2007

Members present:

Mr Barry Sheerman, in the Chair

Mr Douglas Carswell
Mr David Chaytor
Jeff Ennis
Fiona Mactaggart

Mr Gordon Marsden
Stephen Williams
Mr Rob Wilson

The Committee deliberated.

Draft Report, proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read.

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

Paragraphs 1 to 44 read and agreed to.

Paragraph 45 read.

Amendment proposed, to leave out lines 12 to 18—(*Mr Rob Wilson.*)

Question put, That the Amendment be made.

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 2

Noes, 5

Mr Douglas Carswell
Mr Rob Wilson

Mr David Chaytor
Jeff Ennis
Mr Gordon Marsden
Fiona Mactaggart
Stephen Williams

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraphs 46 to 62 read and agreed to.

Paragraph 63 read.

Amendment proposed, in line 6, to leave out from “ownership” to the end of the paragraph–(*Mr Rob Wilson.*)

Question put, That the Amendment be made.

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 3

Mr Douglas Carswell
Mr Gordon Marsden
Mr Rob Wilson

Noes, 4

Mr David Chaytor
Jeff Ennis
Fiona Mactaggart
Stephen Williams

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraphs 64 to 69 read and agreed to.

Paragraph 70 read and amended.

Question put, That Paragraph 70, as amended, stand part of the report.

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 5

Mr David Chaytor
Jeff Ennis
Fiona Mactaggart
Mr Gordon Marsden
Stephen Williams

Noes, 2

Mr Douglas Carswell
Mr Rob Wilson

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraphs 71 to 96 read and agreed to.

Paragraph 97 read.

Question put, That paragraph 97 stand part of the report.

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 5

Mr David Chaytor
Jeff Ennis
Fiona Mactaggart
Mr Gordon Marsden
Stephen Williams

Noes, 2

Mr Douglas Carswell
Mr Rob Wilson

Paragraph agreed to.

Paragraphs 98 to 112 read and agreed to.

Question put, That the summary be agreed to.

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 5
Mr David Chaytor
Jeff Ennis
Fiona Mactaggart
Mr Gordon Marsden
Stephen Williams

Noes, 2
Mr Douglas Carswell
Mr Rob Wilson

Summary agreed to.

Motion made, and Question put, That the Report, as amended, be the Second Report of the Committee to the House.

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 5
Mr David Chaytor
Jeff Ennis
Fiona Mactaggart
Mr Gordon Marsden
Stephen Williams

Noes, 2
Mr Douglas Carswell
Mr Rob Wilson

Resolved, That the Report, as amended, be the Second Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chairman do make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That the provisions of Standing Order No. 134 (Select committees (reports)) be applied to the Report.

Several papers were ordered to be appended to the Minutes of Evidence.

Ordered, That the Appendices to the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee be reported to the House.

[Adjourned till Monday 26 February at 3.30 pm

Witnesses

Monday 24 October 2005

Page

Professor Sir Bernard Crick, Emeritus Professor, University of London; **Ms Miriam Rosen**, Director, Education, Ofsted; and **Mr Scott Harrison**, Specialist Subject Adviser for Citizenship, Ofsted

Ev 1

Mr Keith Ajegbo, Head of Deptford Green School; and **Mr John Clarke**, Deputy Director of Children's Services, Hampshire County Council

Ev 13

Wednesday 26 April 2006

Mr Chris Waller, Professional Officer, Association for Citizenship Training; **Ms Bernadette Joslin**, Post-16 Citizenship Project Manager, Learning and Skills Network; **Mr Mick Waters**, Director of Curriculum, QCA; and **Mr Tony Breslin**, Chief Executive, Citizenship Foundation

Ev 42

Monday 15 May 2006

Ms Jessica Gold, Director, School Councils UK; **Ms Raji Hunjan**, Carnegie Young People Initiative; **Mr Tom Wylie**, Chief Executive, National Youth Agency; and **Mr Jules Mason**, Head of Citizenship and Development, British Youth Council

Ev 69

Monday 22 May 2006

Mr Simon Goulden, Director, United Synagogue Agency for Jewish Education; **Dr Mohammed Mukadam**, Chair, Association of Muslim Schools UK; **Mr Nick McKemey**, Head of School Improvement, Church of England Board of Education; and **Ms Oona Stannard**, Chief Executive and Director, Catholic Education Service

Ev 88

Wednesday 7 June 2006

Mr Nick Johnson, Director of Policy and Public Sector, and **Dr Marc Verlot**, Head of Public Policy, Commission for Racial Equality

Ev 108

Professor Linda Colley, Princeton University; **Professor David Conway**, Senior Research Fellow, Civitas; and **Dr Dina Kiwan**, Institute of Education, University of London

Ev 126

Wednesday 11 October 2006

Mr Trevor Phillips, Chair, Commission for Racial Equality

Ev 140

Monday 6 November 2006

Lord Adonis, a Member of the House of Lords, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Schools, Department for Education and Skills

Ev 166

Monday 11 December 2006

The Most Reverend Vincent Nichols, Archbishop of Birmingham, Chairman of the Catholic Education Service; and **Dr Muhammad Abdul Bari**, Secretary General, Muslim Council of Britain

Ev 188

Dr Rajinder Singh Sandhu, Head Teacher, Guru Nanak Sikh Secondary School; **Rabbi Mark Kampf**, Deputy Head, and **Mr Tim Miller**, Deputy Head, Jewish Free School; and **Ms Rachel Allard**, Head Teacher, The Grey Coat Hospital Church of England Girls Comprehensive School

Ev 199

List of written evidence

1	John Clark, Deputy Director of Children’s Services, Hampshire County Council	Ev 11
2	Association for Citizenship Teaching (ACT)	Ev 21: Ev 62
3	Learning and Skills Development Agency (LSDA)	Ev 23
4	Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA)	Ev 29
5	Citizenship Foundation	Ev 32
6	Schools Councils UK (SCUK)	Ev 64
7	Carnegie Young People Initiative (CYPI)	Ev 65
8	The National Youth Agency (NYA)	Ev 67
9	United Synagogue Agency for Jewish Education (USAJE)	Ev 87
10	Commission for Racial Equality (CRE)	Ev 105
11	Professor David Conway, Civitas	Ev 117: Ev 137
12	Dr Dina Kiwan	Ev 118
13	Department for Education and Skills (DfES)	Ev 157: Ev 185
14	The Most Reverend Vincent Nichols, Archbishop of Birmingham	Ev 198
15	Danielle Stone	Ev 208
16	Jeremy Cunningham	Ev 208
17	Focus Learning Trust	Ev 212
18	Nuffield Foundation	Ev 214
19	CitizED	Ev 216
20	Professor Audrey Osler	Ev 219
21	National Institute of Adult Continuing Education (NIACE)	Ev 223
22	National Union of Teachers (NUT)	Ev 225
23	Oxfam	Ev 228
24	National Association of Head Teachers (NAHT)	Ev 229
25	Development Education Association (DEA)	Ev 233
26	CSV	Ev 235
27	Dr Hugh Starkey, University of London	Ev 237
28	Changemakers	Ev 240
29	Hansard Society	Ev 243
30	UNICEF	Ev 245
31	Institute for Global Ethics UK Trust	Ev 247
32	Save the Children	Ev 248
33	Regent College	Ev 250
34	National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER)	Ev 252
35	British Council	Ev 263
36	Association of Colleges	Ev 265
37	European Parliament	Ev 266
38	The Children’s Society	Ev 267
39	The Mayor of London	Ev 269
40	National Union of Students	Ev 271
41	NASUWT	Ev 274
42	Holocaust Educational Trust	Ev 279

43	Inter Faith Network	Ev 283
44	Dr Andrew Mycock, University of Manchester	Ev 284
45	British Humanist Association (BHA)	Ev 296

List of unprinted written evidence

Additional papers have been received from the following and have been reported to the House but to save printing costs they have not been printed and copies have been placed in the House of Commons Library where they may be inspected by Members. Other copies are in the Record Office, House of Lords and are available to the public for inspection. Requests for inspection should be addressed to the Record Office, House of Lords, London SW1. (Tel 020 7219 3074). Hours of inspection are from 9:30am to 5:00pm on Mondays to Fridays.

Children for Peace

East Sussex Millennium Volunteers

Mark Clay, London Borough of Greenwich

Field Studies Council

Dr Jackie Lukes, University of Hull

Values Education Council

Professor David Conway, Civitas

Reports from the Education and Skills Committee, Session 2006–07

First Special Report	Government's Response to the Committee's Fifth Report (Public Expenditure) of Session 2005–06	HC 211
First Report	The Work of the Committee in 2005–06	HC 301