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Examination of Witnesses

Q1 **The Chairman:** Thank you very much for coming today. Welcome to our first evidence session. I have to read the formal bit to you; the police caution, so to speak. A list of the interests of Members relevant to the inquiry has been sent to you and it is available. Since this is the first public meeting of the Committee, we shall go around the room and declare our interests before we start speaking or questioning you. The session is open to the public. It is broadcast live and is subsequently accessible via the parliamentary website. A verbatim transcript will be taken of the evidence and will be put on the parliamentary website. A few days after the session, you will be sent a copy of the transcript to check for accuracy. It would be helpful if you could advise us of any corrections as quickly as possible. After the evidence session, if you wish to clarify or amplify any points made during your evidence or have additional points that you feel should be made, you are welcome to submit supplementary evidence to us then.

Would you like to introduce yourselves so we know what you are about? Secondly, if you wish to say a few introductory words as background, that might also be helpful for the Committee. Shall we start from left to right?

**Ann Gross:** My name is Ann Gross. I am a director in the Department for Education where I am responsible for policy on life skills, which includes the citizenship area, policies for disadvantaged pupils and special educational needs and disability.

**David Rossington:** My name is David Rossington. I am director of the Office for Civil Society, which is part of the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport and deals with encouraging a healthy civil society in this country. I have been in my post for a relatively short time, a couple of months.

**Hardip Begol:** I am Hardip Begol. I am the new director for integration and communities at the Department for Communities and Local Government. I have been in my post for an even shorter period than David. I am responsible for integration, communities policy, race, equality and faith engagement.

**Paul Morrison:** I am Paul Morrison. I am the director of resettlement, asylum support and integration in UK Visas and Immigration, which is part of the Home Office. My areas of responsibility relate to the range of support that we give to newcomers, particularly those arriving through the asylum system, but as a member of UK Visas and Immigration that is also the part of the business that is responsible for naturalisation, citizenship and citizenship ceremonies, so it covers a range of issues that may be of interest to this Committee.

**The Chairman:** Is there anything any of you wish to say about the
background to your work, or are you happy for it all to come up as we start cross-questioning? No. In that case, we will now declare our interests. Perhaps we could go around the room. Lord Blunkett, would you care to start?

**Lord Blunkett:** I had better not go through them all in this area. My main interests are that I am honorary president of the Association for Citizenship Teaching and a current board member of the National Citizen Service, which has just been reconstituted, and I am a patron of City Year UK.

**Baroness Pitkeathley:** I am Jill Pitkeathley. I have no relevant interests to declare.

**Lord Rowe-Beddoe:** I am president of the Royal Welsh College of Music and Drama and a member of the Committee to recommend the UK City of Culture 2021.

**Lord Verjee:** I am chairman of WE Day (UK). We teach active citizenship in schools.

**Baroness Lister of Burtersett:** I am patron of Just Fair, which campaigns on social and economic human rights.

**Lord Harries of Pentregarth:** I am chair of the Commission on Civil Society and Democratic Engagement.

**The Chairman:** I am a trustee of Fair Trials International, which is publishing a pamphlet tomorrow, entitled *Britain’s Demographic Challenge*, about the increase in population expected by the ONS over the next 20 years.

**Baroness Morris of Yardley:** I have no relevant interests in this inquiry.

**Baroness Redfern:** I am an elected member of North Lincolnshire Council and past leader. I am pleased to meet you.

**Baroness Barker:** I run a management consultancy that has a lot of voluntary organisations and charities as clients, and I have extensive experience with a range of different charities.

**Baroness Stedman-Scott:** I am a deputy lieutenant for East Sussex.

**Baroness Newlove:** I am the Victims’ Commissioner for England and Wales, and I am involved with the OnSide Warrington Youth Club, which involves the National Citizen Service.

**The Chairman:** That has cleared the requirements of the House to make our interests clear.

I will begin the questions by asking a broad one. Your departments have the primary responsibility for citizenship and civic engagement. What cross-departmental co-ordination is there between the very distinguished
group that we have in front of us? Is there a department with explicit leadership responsibilities for ensuring that this programme is effectively dealt with? What are the Government doing in particular to support active citizenship among people post-secondary school, post-18?

**Hardip Begol:** We co-ordinate our work across departments on specific initiatives rather than having a standing committee that looks at the issues of citizenship and civic engagement, given how broad those topics are. At the moment we are working closely with a range of departments, including those represented here, on the integration strategy, which has a significant component on issues of identity and citizenship. We have a group, chaired by the director-general, that meets on a monthly basis in relation to that strategy. In addition to the departments you see here today, the Cabinet Office, the Ministry of Justice, DWP and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office included in the group that is preparing that strategy.

Given the cross-cutting nature of this, I do not think there is a natural lead, which is why you see four of us here today, but on any issues we obviously look to co-ordinate. I have met David three times in my first months on issues that cross both our areas of responsibility outside the issues relating to this Committee’s inquiry.

I will ask David to answer your question about post-18 engagement, if I may.

**David Rossington:** To add a little to what Hardip has said, another example of cross-departmental co-ordination is that my department organises a regular meeting of all those who are interested in the voluntary sector or have dealings with the voluntary sector. Citizenship is certainly a very wide-ranging subject, so it is not confined to the interests of a particular department.

I will talk a bit about DCMS’s own interests in citizenship and then give you some examples of some of our policies to support citizenship among the over-18s.

Our citizenship responsibilities arise primarily from our responsibility for my area, the Office for Civil Society. That aspect of citizenship is primarily about people acting together for the common good, often at the grass-roots level. That is our angle on it.

There are many examples of policies. I will select a few. My department provides support for a programme to train community organisers. We have reached around 6,500 people across the country who have been through that training programme so far, and our aim is to get to 10,000 by 2020. We do not have people from Whitehall going out and teaching people how to be community organisers; we provide funding and the training is provided by people who have knowledge and expertise in this area.

We also have a significant amount of work on encouraging volunteering. To give you some examples, first, we are working with the innovation
charity Nesta to encourage volunteering for people over 50. There are already significant numbers of people over 50 who volunteer, but with life expectancy in the UK increasing, getting those numbers up will make a further difference. They are often people with significant skills and experience and able to give back a lot to the communities that they are in.

Sport is a good example, too. My department is responsible for sport. Our estimate is that about 5.5 million to 6 million people engage in volunteering in sport in one way or another, both at grass-roots level and helping with major events. There was a lot of volunteer support, for example, for the Olympics in 2012, which you will probably be familiar with. The Sport and Recreation Alliance estimates that in 2014 there were approximately 150,000 community sports clubs in the UK and that, on average, each of these has around 24 volunteers associated with them, so this is a significant area of work. I will not talk about volunteering for young people at this stage, because I think you may come to that later.

The Chairman: You passed the baton a little and were talking, if I may say so, about people post-18, and Mr Begol about people pre-18. Is there a danger of there not being a continuous process, of it breaking down as it moves from your area of responsibility for school-aged children to adults?

David Rossington: My department is responsible for youth policy outside schools, so we do a great deal in relation to volunteering by young people. I can give you more details.

Lord Blunkett: I ought to say that we are not going to shoot the messengers here and we are having your principals later in December. The last time I came across Ann Gross was when I introduced her at a conference I was chairing only to find that she was not there, so I am glad you are here this morning, Ann. It is one of the dangers of not being able to see.

The very short paper that was circulated very late yesterday suggested from the Government as a whole that citizenship education was a fundamental—I use the word that was used in the document—part of the curriculum. Perhaps, Ann, you could say a word or two about how that fits with the virtual collapse of teacher training, the fact that, unlike other basic curriculum subject areas, there are no bursaries, that the removal of the half GCSE has seen a collapse in the take-up of the GCSE generally and where the Government feel they are going in terms of any future review and a national plan.

Ann Gross: Lord Blunkett has asked me quite a complex interaction of questions there, I think. I appreciate your saying that you are not going to shoot the messenger here. I will begin by setting out the Government’s overall policy on citizenship education, and then perhaps I can touch on the other points that you have raised about the GCSE and teacher training.
The Government are clear that education plays a really important role in equipping children with the knowledge, skills and values that will prepare them to be citizens in modern Britain. Our written statement sets that out more fully and I will highlight some of the key points now. First, all schools are under specific duties to promote the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of pupils—SMSC for short—and to prepare them for opportunities and responsibilities in adult life. We also expect all schools and further education colleges to promote fundamental British values: democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect and tolerance for those of different faiths and beliefs. Those aims can be achieved in a number of ways, for example by establishing a strong school ethos, collective worship and extracurricular activities beyond the classroom. Of course, citizenship is also part of the national curriculum at key stages 3 and 4, which means that it is compulsory in maintained schools. Primary schools can choose to teach citizenship at key stages 1 and 2, following the non-statutory framework for citizenship. The Government believe that the national curriculum contains the essential knowledge that all pupils should be taught and is a benchmark for what is seen as a high-quality education. Citizenship is therefore a core part of that quality education.

Our policy is that we expect schools to determine how best to deliver the national curriculum. Citizenship can be taught through many areas of the school curriculum, including subjects such as religious education; personal, social and health education; history; and English. We introduced new programmes of study in 2013 that give schools more freedom to decide how to teach citizenship so that teachers can draw on their knowledge of what their pupils need and their own professional expertise in order to draw up the right sort of approach for their school. We encourage them to draw on sources of specialist advice, too. There is much material, including from the Association for Citizenship Teaching, to draw on.

Of course, the national curriculum does not represent everything that schools provide. Almost all schools promote a wide range of extracurricular activity. There is lots of relevant activity outside the classroom. There are particular programmes, such as the National Citizen Service or the Cadet programme, that enable young people to develop some of the key skills such as responsibility, teamwork and self-reliance. That is the overview of our policy.

Lord Blunkett asked about the GCSE and the position on that. It is fair to say that there has been a drop in the number of GCSE entries, but that is not really the whole story of how schools are educating young people on citizenship. We want to make sure that all pupils are prepared to play a full and active part in adult life. Citizenship is taught through the national curriculum and it does not rely on pupils doing a GCSE-level qualification on it.

On bursaries for teacher training, we have had to take some difficult decisions about where to focus the bursaries budget for teacher training.
It is not possible to provide bursaries for all trainees. As we enter more pupils for the English baccalaureate subjects, the decision has been that we need to focus the bursary budget on the core academic subjects so that we build up expertise in the teaching profession. Citizenship teacher training is part of what is described as the “other” category for initial teacher training. That is just a term; it is of no significance in itself. For 2017-18, teacher training places in that category are uncapped. That means that schools and ITT providers can recruit as many citizenship trainees as they wish in line with local need. There is now a new dedicated citizenship page on the Get Into Teaching website, which means that people who are interested in that area can go there for further information. I hope I have covered the key points.

Lord Blunkett: That is very helpful. I do not intend to delay the Committee on one subject area only. We are looking at the journey, and the journey starts with young people through early years, through school.

Do the department have any plans to review not only how citizenship is delivered but what the role of Ofsted might be in overseeing whether it is being taught at all, never mind whether it is being taught well or badly?

Ann Gross: We do not have current plans to review citizenship in the curriculum. It was thoroughly reviewed in 2013 and the messages that we are getting from teachers are that they would really value stability of the curriculum at the moment. Obviously, we keep a close eye on all curriculum subjects and look at the evidence that we have available to us to see how well they are being addressed in schools, but there are no immediate plans to have a fresh review of the subject.

Clearly, Ofsted is an important source of information for us, alongside other surveys of schools and research. Over time we have had some important surveys, such as the Ofsted 2013 study, which showed that the quality of teaching in schools was improving. We commission regular Teacher Voice Omnibus surveys, which give us very direct feedback from school leaders about their perception of how things are progressing in schools. In September 2016, the survey indicated that most school leaders were confident about the preparation they were doing to teach the new wave of GCSEs, which include the citizenship GCSE, so there are some positives there. Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Schools is about to embark on a thematic review of the curriculum and will include citizenship.

Baroness Morris of Yardley: I take the point about it being in the national curriculum, I really do, but how much do you worry that messages that are given by the department, other than what is in the national curriculum, mitigate against citizenship having a really firm foothold in schools? If we were to think about the English baccalaureate, what Ofsted inspects, what speeches Ministers make, what announcements we have, or what good practice is there, I would struggle to think of examples over the last few years where I have heard that punchy message from the department that citizenship matters. What are your department’s thoughts about whether character education has
displaced citizenship education? There is a difference between the two, which I know you know because you are in charge of that. I worry that we hear a lot of ministerial statements and have plaudits and awards and things like that about character education but not about citizenship education. The Committee was also interested in knowing—and this goes to some of the comments you have just made about collecting data—why the Government are not taking part in the International Civic and Citizenship Education study that is coming up when they did in the previous one.

**Ann Gross:** There are several points there and I may have to ask you to remind me of them as I go through, if that is okay. I will start with the last of those first: the question about our participation in the International Civic and Citizenship study.

I am aware that there is quite a long history of international research in the citizenship area. There were two surveys in 1999 and 2009, and we have looked at them, taken account of their findings and built them into our current thinking about the citizenship curriculum. So we have that to build on. However, each cycle of that study is a standalone and a separate cycle. Ministers considered whether to take part in the 2016 framework study, but took the view that it was not going to be a priority this time because it is largely a continuation of the 2009 study. It was felt that the emphasis that it was giving was not going to generate new evidence that would be relevant to current policy priorities. They decided not to go for that route and instead we have joined a new international study with the British Council and partners in France, Spain and Greece. That is a three-year project and it will trial an intervention that is aimed at increasing active citizenship and promoting fundamental values. It started in March and is measuring teachers’ attitudes and practices in relation to citizenship teaching and those of pupils. It will look at the impact on schools more widely. We will make sure that that informs how government policy moves forward, so there is a new approach going on in that area.

That study links, as I said, to the question of fundamental values. I think that the emphasis on fundamental British values in schools has been mutually supportive of citizenship teaching. The department’s guidance on fundamental values reinforces some of the key elements that schools can use for teaching citizenship. It emphasises the importance of things such as mock debates, using school councils and schools running their own elections as a way of engaging pupils, and we encourage that. It is very much a reinforcing of the citizenship agenda, as is the focus on character or life skills, because, again, that is about schools working through extracurricular activities to develop particular qualities and aptitudes in young people—some of the more intangible things, such as resilience or team-working and having a bit of grit and determination to get over problems—so they are not in conflict but they are mutually reinforcing academic attainment. I think that covers your key points.

**Baroness Morris of Yardley:** Generally I think that character-building is much about more about the self and is much more inward-looking,
whereas citizenship education is much more outward-looking; it is about how you get out of yourself and be part of the wider community. I can see that there is an overlap, but I am not persuaded that the work on character education can be called citizenship education. Do you know anything about the young people who take the GCSE? What else do they take? Are they high-achieving students in leading schools or in less successful schools?

Ann Gross: I do not believe that I have that information with me. I do not know if my colleague has it, but if you would like that we can send you some further information.

Baroness Morris of Yardley: Just out of interest. Thank you very much.

Q5

Baroness Lister of Burtersett: What criteria do the Government use to assess the effectiveness of citizenship education, and how is it currently performing against those criteria?

Ann Gross: Clearly, we have quite a range of sources of information for assessing the effectiveness of citizenship education. For example, we draw on Ofsted findings, and Ofsted is required to report on SMSC in its inspection reports. It usually comes under a couple of judgment areas, either leadership and the management of schools or pupils’ social and moral development. We also regularly engage with stakeholders. We want to hear feedback. As I have already mentioned, we commission regular surveys of what is going on in schools. We look at it and keep it under review. We do not think it is our role to collect detailed information from schools on what is being taught in the classroom, because we think that would be very labour-intensive for schools. I think we all know—and I hope the Committee would agree—that teachers are very committed to providing a very good education and making sure that their pupils are fully prepared for adult life. Clearly, as Baroness Morris has said, citizenship is about preparing young people to take an active part in adult life as citizens and to take part in all those processes.

Baroness Lister of Burtersett: It is helpful to know the kind of information you draw on, but I am still not clear. Presumably, we teach citizenship education because we want to achieve certain things, and I am not clear what the criteria are for assessing how well it is performing that function. Maybe you could come back to us on that. I think we need to know what it is being tested against. When you collect this information, how are you using it to judge against criteria?

Ann Gross: Clearly, Ofsted has a set of criteria that it uses to inspect schools and they are set out in the Ofsted handbook. That material will be drawn on by all Ofsted inspectors, and their judgments are transparent in their reports and their feedback to schools. Ofsted has recently appointed a specialist inspector to lead in this area, which I think reflects its interest and the significance that it is attaching to it. Clearly, we assess taking account of all those sources of evidence that I have referred to previously.
Lord Verjee: What policy do the Government have to increase diversity in schools? Could you talk in particular about segregation in schools and the evidence that we see of that? Could you also say a bit about our policy towards faith schools?

Ann Gross: Thank you for that question. The Government recognise that schools play a vital role in promoting integration because they obviously play a significant role in local communities as well as supporting their own pupils to develop positive attitudes and respect for all people. As I have said, all schools are under a duty to support community cohesion, and there is an expectation that they will promote fundamental British values. That is the overarching framework.

Our admissions system is of course based on parental choice, so we do not control a school’s intake. All mainstream state-funded schools must comply with the state school admissions code, and admissions must be fair, clear and objective and must not disadvantage unfairly, either directly or indirectly, children from any particular social or racial group or, very importantly, children with a disability or special educational need, or local children. That is the clear diversity framework.

Of course, there are many other ways in which schools can and do provide opportunities for their pupils to learn about and mix with people from different backgrounds, such as visits, linking with other schools and encouraging participation in the National Citizen Service. There are lots of excellent examples. Parkfield Community School in Birmingham, which has 23 nationalities in its pupil population, has a policy for promoting diversity called No Outsiders. It is very much about welcoming people of all race, colour and creed into school, and they have an ambassadors programme. I think some of those things are really important.

Faith schools are required to offer every child who applies, whether of the faith or another faith or no faith, a place at the school if there are places available. Where one of those schools is oversubscribed they may then use faith-based criteria and allocate places by reference to faith. I think those are the key points that I wanted to put across. Have I answered your questions?

Lord Verjee: From what I understand, while the Government have a philosophy of trying to encourage more diversity in schools, we do not have targets and, by definition, we do not measure against those targets.

Ann Gross: That is correct.

Lord Verjee: Do you think we should review that?

Ann Gross: I think I have set out our policy and the importance of schools promoting understanding and integration. I do not think we have any expectation to develop targets, but Hardip might wish to comment.

Hardip Begol: We are preparing a cross-government integration strategy that will include education, because there was a clear commitment in the Conservative manifesto for the election to work with schools to make sure that those with intakes from one predominant
racial, cultural or religious background teach their children about pluralistic British values and help them to get to know people with different ways of life. Our primary aim is to make sure that where schools have a particular intake the school takes action to make sure that children mix with those of different backgrounds rather than review the whole admissions system.

Q7  Baroness Redfern: What is the Government’s policy on citizenship activity beyond the classroom? I know Ann mentioned encouraging school councils and mock debates. Do you believe this is an effective way to promote active citizenship? David also mentioned over-50s volunteering and sports clubs and volunteering in sports events, et cetera. When we talk about that, can you also tell me how we can promote best practice in those areas?

David Rossington: I will begin by talking about citizenship activity beyond the classroom and a few of the pieces of policy that we implement in my department. To give you some examples, we provide grant funding to the British Youth Council, which encourages young people to engage with democracy. A particular initiative is the British Youth Council-run UK Youth Parliament, which is made up of democratically elected members. The Youth Parliament’s Make Your Mark vote takes place every year. It is the largest ballot of youth views in the UK. In 2016, just short of a million young people took part in the voting, which is a very significant number. We are hoping this year we can get above the 1 million mark. Those are a couple of examples.

More widely on youth volunteering, my department is part of the #iwill campaign, which is co-ordinated by the charity Step Up to Serve. We are doing that in partnership with the Big Lottery Fund and a number of other organisations. The aim is to really early on in a person’s life get them thinking and engaging in social action of a positive kind. Over 700 businesses and charities have pledged support for the campaign. There is £40 million of seed funding from us and the Big Lottery Fund. The aspiration is to increase the number of 10 to 20 year-olds taking part in meaningful social action to the 60% level. It is currently just over 40%. Those are some examples of areas where outside the classroom the Government are seeking to encourage initiatives for younger people.

Baroness Redfern: Do you work very closely with universities and colleges for students to get involved? Is there work being done there?

David Rossington: We certainly involve young people. For example, yesterday I was at a board meeting in relation to the #iwill campaign and there were young people who were full members of the board who were providing really useful insights.

Baroness Redfern: Good.

Ann Gross: Yes, we think that activities such as school councils and mock debates can be a really effective way of promoting active
citizenship. It is something that the guidance on British values encourages.

**Baroness Redfern:** Do you get a lot of feedback on that?

**Ann Gross:** We do, and there are some excellent examples of schools. The Bennett Memorial Diocesan School in Kent has a very strong emphasis on these sorts of activities and promotes the sorts of things we have been discussing, such as debating tournaments from year seven, school-wide voting for pupil leadership roles, including hustings and mock elections, and obviously during general election periods pupils taking part in mock elections. That is one example among many schools.

We would also say that these are not the only ways in which schools can promote active citizenship. Volunteering can be a really excellent route. The key stage 4 programme of study for citizenship encourages volunteering and encourages schools to make partnerships with voluntary and charitable organisations locally. That can be really powerful. We have already heard about a number of organisations that are involved in that sort of thing with schools. An interesting initiative is UNICEF’s work on rights respecting schools. It can be a very good way of engaging children and young people. There are some really encouraging initiatives in those areas.

**Q8 Baroness Newlove:** I am really keen on youth and engagement. In my previous role as communities champion I met many of the people you have discussed this morning, especially the community advisers, who I think are wonderful and help the community.

Young people refresh our default mechanisms, I might say. My question is about the National Citizen Service. I want to ensure that this is effective. What is the Government doing to ensure it is effective in creating active citizens? What are they doing to ensure that the NCS is linked to citizenship education and the government programmes to boost active citizenship. I have seen them and other group programmes, but they seem to do it at the cliff edge. It should be about engaging them all together to create a better generation.

**David Rossington:** Thank you very much for that question. Let me start with the recently agreed royal charter for the National Citizen Service. Among the various things that this covers is a requirement for the NCS to have regard to the desirability of encouraging participants to take an interest in matters of local and national political interest, and to promote their understanding of how to participate in national or local elections. There is among the various frameworks for the NCS a strong link into active citizenship.

I will give a couple of concrete examples. Part of the NCS programme involves volunteering, and the NCS Trust, which is directly responsible for the programme, estimates that past NCS participants have donated around 10 million hours of volunteering. There was an independent evaluation of the NCS in 2015, and it suggested that the effect lasted beyond the programme and that NCS participants contributed four
additional hours a month in volunteering compared with people who had not been on the programme.

The second area links more directly to political citizenship. The NCS Trust works with various other bodies, such as The Basics Rock’n’Roll Party, to deliver sessions on democratic engagement in NCS courses. There is also some evidence from the NCS evaluations that young people are more likely to vote after taking part in the NCS programme than they were before. There is definitely a strong link. However, the NCS programme is devolved and run by the NCS Trust and it is not identical in every area of the country or for every group of participants. That is because there are differences in different places. There is no mandation, but it is a very strong link and the data suggests that it is making a difference.

Baroness Newlove: My worry when we speak about the Youth Council and other bodies is how that citizenship activity is provided for the people who are difficult to reach. You get very articulate people who shine a light. I am more for the people who have never stepped out of their communities. How do we engage them, because they are part of our society? Could you provide anything on that?

David Rossington: That is clearly something the Government are very concerned about—absolutely. There is some evidence, for example, that the population going into the National Citizen Service is more socially disadvantaged and more diverse than the average population. I am very happy to send you further data on that if that would be helpful.

Baroness Newlove: Thank you.

Baroness Barker: What evaluation of the National Citizen Service exists that is not carried out by the NCS itself?

David Rossington: The National Citizen Service has not been going for that long, so the evaluations that I have quoted from are, I believe, independent. Again, I can send you more details about them if that would help.

Baroness Barker: The Public Accounts Committee report on the National Citizen Service asked some pretty searching questions of it and of your department, and their questions are due to be answered this month.

David Rossington: Indeed.

Baroness Barker: I know we have had the election, but is that timetable still in force?

David Rossington: Yes. Obviously I am aware of the PAC hearing and I am aware that the Government are looking actively at responding to the questions that came out of that. I am not aware there is any change to the timetable.

Lord Verjee: Do we have numbers of how much we spend on the National Citizen Service and how much it costs per head?
David Rossington: Yes, we do. It is clearly a significant sum because there are large numbers of people involved in it. I do not have the precise figure for this year, but it is certainly more than £200 million. The unit costs for the National Citizen Service very much came up in the PAC hearing and is something that the department and the National Citizen Service are working together on. It is clearly an important area. As you no doubt will be aware, the National Citizen Service, following the royal charter, is undergoing change to the charter body, and, indeed, a new chair and new board members are being recruited at the moment. There is a lot of focus on helping the National Citizen Service to provide an even better experience and on looking at issues such as value for money and so on. It is something I spend a lot of time on. It is very important indeed, given the importance of the National Citizen Service, which this year will have about 100,000 participants.

Lord Verjee: That is quite an easy number. So it is £200 million for 100,000, is it?

David Rossington: Roughly, yes.

Baroness Pitkeathley: My question is about how the Government support civil society initiatives, but, David, I think you have already given us some very helpful examples about that, so I would like to ask you to move on a bit and ask what mechanisms you have for receiving feedback from the civil society organisations that are involved in these initiatives. I am thinking of local authority funding; many local authorities are having great difficulty with it and some of these initiatives were dependent on it.

David Rossington: There is a range of ways of doing this. When the department funds a programme, we will look at its effectiveness. We will undertake it and evaluate it at the end so that we can learn what worked and what could be improved for next time. That is a regular occurrence, quite properly. More than that, we have close relationships with bodies in the civil society area. As a newcomer to this area, I spent quite a lot of the summer meeting lots of civil society organisations, talking to them and hearing their views on a range of subjects. It is very much part of my job and my department’s job—not just me but lots of us—to do that.

Baroness Pitkeathley: Can you give us a flavour of those discussions?

David Rossington: In summary, first—and it may sound strange to say this—I have really enjoyed these meetings. There has been a kind of passion and enthusiasm about making society a better place that was really quite uplifting, if I may say so. There are clearly various issues, such as how charities, particularly smaller charities, can compete on a level playing field for public services. That is clearly a significant issue. Those are probably the two main points that I would bring to your attention.

Baroness Pitkeathley: Thank you very much. Could I ask you specifically about the innovation fund that was set up to increase political engagement? Could you give us a flavour or a progress report on how
that seems to be working?

David Rossington: I am not familiar with that. I apologise. It is a function of me having been in post for a short time. I am happy to write.

Baroness Pitkeathley: Are any of the witnesses up to speed with the innovation fund?

David Rossington: We will write to you.

Baroness Pitkeathley: Could you do that? Thank you very much.

Lord Harries of Pentregarth: I have a short follow-up. Are there initiatives to liaise with faith communities to see what issues there might be within the faith communities themselves in order to encourage civic engagement?

Hardip Begol: The Department for Communities and Local Government is responsible for faith engagement and we meet regularly with faith organisations. Lord Bourne is very active about meeting organisations. By coincidence, in the next couple of weeks we have an interfaith group focusing particularly on the issue of community sponsorship for those who have come in as part of the Syrian resettlement programme to look at what faith organisations can do to encourage people to house or accommodate those individuals. We have very strong links with those main organisations and we cover a whole range of issues through the meetings that Lord Bourne leads.

Lord Blunkett: To follow up very quickly, how much liaison is there between you—I recognise that two of you are quite new in the job—on what is working out there and how to spread it, because we keep reinventing the wheel?

David Rossington: I will start off and others may want to say more. The fact that we come together when there are major issues that we share is really helpful. The example that Hardip has given of the cross-departmental group on integration is a very good one. We are ensuring that we share what is good about what has been done and where we can develop things better through fora such as that.

The Chairman: It would be very helpful if you could write in. Obviously we are not asking you now because that would be unfair, but if you could show us where good things have happened and how you have spread them all around the country—as Lord Blunkett says, we do not want to keep reinventing the wheel—that would be helpful.

Baroness Morris of Yardley: Can I very quickly follow that up? This is a genuine question because I have forgotten what the rules are. Like Lord Blunkett, I have been around too many years, I suppose, and that is our problem, but there have been one or two initiatives that you have mentioned today that you have now started that I know we tried when we were in government. I have forgotten what the rules are about whether you can look back at how that was implemented and learn
lessons from that. I know there is a tendency for the politicians not to want to do that, but could you remind me? The example that came to my mind was the initiative to make schools that had children from one ethnic group mix with others. I can remember that from about 2001. To follow up Lord Blunkett’s question, do you look back that far and say, “It was exactly the same idea and initiative. What did we learn from that?” I cannot remember if you can do that or not.

**Hardip Begol:** As government officials, it is a core part of our professional policy development to present to Ministers the evidence of what happened previously and the evaluation of that evidence. For instance, on that precise point, DCLG and DfE are together funding the Linking Network that links schools together in different parts of the country. It originated in Bradford, I think, almost a decade ago and links schools together so that children mix. That is a joint-funded initiative from both departments.

**Ann Gross:** I very much agree with Hardip on this. I think you are right; it is something we all have a responsibility to do and we need to get better at. When I look over my career—and I have worked in education and social policy areas—I can see some of the really difficult questions that keep recurring. There is something about making sure that we know both what the public evidence says and that we talk to people who are working on the ground so that we are drawing in their current knowledge and up-to-date understanding of what the real challenges are. That is something we really do try to do. Hardip and I have worked together over quite a long period on similar linked areas.

**Lord Blunkett:** Just to be a little mischievous, when Jack Straw handed over the Home Secretary’s job to me, he said, “One of the things you will find is there is no collective memory whatsoever”, and as a vice-president of the Alzheimer’s Society I am quite keen that we overcome that.

**Hardip Begol:** Could I add one final point about working with the voluntary sector? The CCLG co-chairs a community partnership board, of which it is a member, with people from organisations such as National Council for Voluntary Organisations, Co-operatives UK and Locality, so we regularly meet organisations that represent voluntary sector partners. I have not had the pleasure of co-chairing one of them, but I think they are absolutely clear and forthright in their views about how the voluntary sector is working in local areas.

**Baroness Pitkeathley:** I am not surprised to hear it.

**Q11 Lord Harries of Pentregarth:** On British values, you may remember that when this was first introduced as part of the school curriculum there was a certain amount of disquiet from some faith leaders because it was introduced in some connection with the Prevent programme and there seemed to be a heavy emphasis on “British” rather than “fundamental” or “shared”. Is there any experience from teachers who are teaching or promoting this subject in their schools as to how it is going on the ground? If there is no evidence so far, are there any plans for a survey to
find out, because it has not been part of the curriculum for very long?

**Ann Gross:** I will hand this over to Hardip, because he has led on this area more recently than I.

**Hardip Begol:** As a director for counterextremism at DfE until July this year—I implemented the introduction of fundamental British values and the Prevent duty—we surveyed teachers and school leaders about how they were implementing the Prevent duty. We did that a couple of years ago and we carried out a subsequent survey to ask teachers how effectively they thought their pupils were being prepared for mixing with people from different backgrounds. Both of those surveys showed that schools were comfortable in relation to both the Prevent duty and teaching children how to work and interact with those of different faiths and beliefs. We have followed that up. It also became a more significant part of the Ofsted school inspection framework given the duty to actively promote fundamental British values was a new duty on independent schools and academies. Our feedback from Ofsted regarding its inspection reports is that it believes that schools have grasped this and are doing a good job on it. That is their informal feedback to us. They do not see it as a particular cause for concern across the whole sector.

There are particular independent schools that have struggled with parts of this and I think Ofsted may want to give evidence to this Committee on its experiences of going around schools to check how it is done. Our surveys are school leaders and teachers’ own impressions of their implementation of those issues, and **I think Ofsted is probably a bit more independent in checking how well schools are doing.**

**Lord Harries of Pentregarth:** Thank you very much. It would be helpful if we had copies of those surveys and Ofsted report at some point.

**Hardip Begol:** We can send those in.

**Q12 Baroness Lister of Burtersett:** I have to admit that I have a problem with this concept of fundamental British values. What is quintessentially British about those values? When I read them, it seems to me they are values that underpin democratic citizenship and we are not the only citizenship democracy, so what is so British about them?

**Hardip Begol:** I do not think there is anything unique to Britain about them, but I think it is important to articulate those things we value as being core and fundamental to life in Britain. I think “British values” is a shorthand for things with a common core or fundamental understanding that we particularly value here. If we want to bind British society together we have to write something down. I do not think they are uniquely British, but they are the things we value in Britain, and I think “British values” is shorthand for that.

**Lord Verjee:** Going back to numbers, it seems a bit bizarre to link fundamental British values with the Prevent programme. **How many people do we think are at risk of extremism in this country?** It seems to me that we are talking about a very small number, yet “British values”
suggests a huge number.

Hardip Begol: I was responding to the question that mentioned both. I think that fundamental British values are core to what all schools promote. Democracy and the rule of law link very closely to the citizenship agenda. It is what schools do all the time in making sure that people do not discriminate, bully or harass people of different faiths and beliefs. I think that is separate from the Prevent duty on schools, which is very much about safeguarding young people who are at risk of being drawn towards terrorism. The schools that I have spoken to and the survey evidence shows that schools have been confident in implementing that separate duty to safeguard young people. I think they view it very much as their obligation to make sure that children are kept safe, particularly given emerging issues such as online grooming and radicalisation, in the same way in which they would want to keep children safe online from other predatory behaviour.

Lord Verjee: Have we any idea of the numbers? Is it 10,000? Is it 50,000? There is so much talk about these issues, yet to me it seems to be a very small number.

Hardip Begol: We have data on Prevent referrals that are in the public domain.

Paul Morrison: Counterextremism and Prevent are both within the Home Office’s remit and they are two distinct things. There is a wider issue relating to extremism, holding values and challenging those behaviours that are antithetical to that. Then there is the Prevent programme, which, as Mr Begol has described, is focused really on national security, safeguarding, and preventing people becoming involved in terrorism.

On the numbers, Channel is the multidisciplinary referral point to which people under the Prevent agenda are referred. There have been around 1,000 referrals since 2012, which gives you an idea of how the Prevent agenda focuses necessarily on a smaller cohort of people and set of issues than the issues relating to fundamental values, which ultimately should encompass the entire population because they are intended to bind us together. You have drawn the right distinction, and sometimes it is unhelpful to elide the two, but you need to recognise that there is a connection between the two agendas.

Lord Verjee: So we are talking about just 1,000 people?

Paul Morrison: That is the number of people who have been referred through the Channel programme; some 1,000 people have come to attention and been considered. I would highlight that of that 1,000 people, a third might be involved in far-right extremism, but the programme focuses on people who are at the harder end rather than the general issue, as I have said, which is about values and is broader.

Baroness Barker: We are in tricky territory here, not least because we have the terms “British values”, “pluralistic British values” and
“fundamental British values” this morning. I think we are struggling somewhat. I want to take us back to schools. You said that there is evidence from Ofsted that schools do this and actively promote British values, but what evidence is there of the effect of that, and what difference does it make?

**Hardip Begol:** In terms of outcomes for young people?

**Baroness Barker:** Yes.

**Ann Gross:** My understanding is that in its inspection reports Ofsted reports on how activity under that heading contributes to the various outcomes regarding the leadership and management of the school and children’s social and welfare development, so it is about making a contribution to the positive running of the school and the overall ethos of the school.

**Baroness Barker:** Will we at some point have evidence requiring schools to actively promote British values? It makes a material difference that would not have been achieved by encouraging pupils to respect British values.

**Ann Gross:** I guess the change in that wording was intended to give a clear signal to schools that this was an important area to focus on and that we wanted schools to take positive steps to address it in a serious way and to make sure that there was a clear understanding of the importance that the Government place on those values. We think that the values and the practical steps taken to promote them are more important than the particular language or label that you use around it.

**Baroness Barker:** Thank you.

**Baroness Morris of Yardley:** Anecdotally, when I go around schools now, I see much more evidence of what schools think they do to promote British values, so I can see that there is a range of activities, but I want to follow up on what you have said because I am not sure we have a real answer to that. There is a danger in judging the programme by input rather than output. We have probably agreed that there is more input, so the head will get a better score for management and leadership because they are being shown to promote it. I assume that the effect of it is more long term, because you are talking about the way young people grow up. What has been put in place, if anything, to monitor the impact on the behaviour of children as they grow up, because I assume that was the purpose of the project? On this, we are in real danger of measuring input rather than output, so do you have anything to reassure us on that?

**Baroness Lister of Burtersett:** That relates to my earlier question on citizenship education, but you have put it much better.

**Ann Gross:** You raise an interesting and important question, and it perhaps goes back to some of the points that members of the Committee have been making about how we think longer term about children’s and young people’s outcomes and how we prepare young people for adult life,
so some of the measures will need to be about longer-term participation in civic society as active adults. This is Hardip’s area in DCLG, so he might want to add to that.

**Hardip Begol:** On the schools point, in the school inspection framework, which is the framework Ofsted developed, there are criteria that inspectors should look at relating to the social development of children, which includes a willingness to work actively with people from different backgrounds. It tests their understanding of people from different cultures and different religions, so an inspector going in would ask, “Do your children understand what activities are taking place when they mix more and understand more about these values?” The inspector would look at what impact that is having in the school and the way the children talk about different groups of people from different backgrounds. I think Ofsted would say that it is independent, and where it has found that that has not happened it has found children with very stereotypical views of people from other backgrounds, which has been noted by the inspectors. So that is an issue.

On the question of the understanding of democracy and the rule of law, over the longer term we would hope that if young people understood them better and started volunteering earlier, that would carry on into their adult lives. Some of the evidence that David has given of the impact of the NCS, for instance, and of sustained volunteering should feed through.

**Q14 Baroness Barker:** What do citizenship ceremonies achieve?

**Paul Morrison:** One of the ways of thinking about this is to look at what happened before citizenship ceremonies came in in 2005. Before then, a person would go through the naturalisation process, at the end of which, in a largely bureaucratic exercise, they would get a letter from the Home Office; the act of their receiving that citizenship was not marked in any particular way. In 2004-05, the proposals to introduce citizenship ceremonies were based on our belief that it was important to mark that moment of achieving citizenship; it is a major thing to commit to the country that you are now becoming a citizen of. Not only do we think that is an important part of the process and an important symbolic undertaking that is made, but the evidence shows that the people who are going through it, the immigrant communities, and their families who attend those ceremonies welcome the ceremony. I think it serves as an important symbolic moment to underline what it means to become a British citizen.

**Baroness Barker:** You introduced them in 2005.

**Lord Blunkett:** It was in 2003, but let us not argue about it.

**Baroness Barker:** I absolutely take your word for it. We are now in 2017. Have you not gathered any evidence about what difference they have made?
Paul Morrison: I think a hard, longitudinal study would be needed to collate evidence of a causality between the opportunity to make that commitment in the ceremony and the wider societal impact. We have to base our evidence on the experience of the people who are undertaking it. The symbolism of it is important, and I think the Government would continue to say that it is a key part of the process. It is certainly better than just having a letter from the Home Office at the end of an administrative process.

Baroness Barker: I have no doubt. Indeed, I have been to several, and they are extremely moving. Given that this activity of performing those ceremonies, which local councils do, is seen as being valuable, it seems to me that we should now ask where this fits into the wider issues of citizenship that we are looking at. I am surprised that we have no information about that, but thank you very much.

Q15 Baroness Lister of Burtersett: What are the Government doing to increase political participation among young people and, in particular, to increase the number who are registered to vote?

Hardip Begol: I will take the registration part of that to start with. Maximising registration is a responsibility of the Cabinet Office, which works closely with partners, including electoral administrators and the Electoral Commission, to ensure that we have a democracy that is open to all. Since the introduction of individual electoral registration in 2014, over 28 million applications to register have been made, with over 7.3 million of those coming from those aged 16 to 24. We know that the online registration is especially popular with young people. The Cabinet Office has supplied me with some figures relating to the recent general election. Between the announcement of the 2017 general election on 18 April and the registration deadline on 22 May, over a million applications were made by those in the under-25 age group. This figure represents 37% of all applications made within this period and is an increase of 51% from the 2015 general election. The outcome of all that activity is that the youth turnout has also seen a significant increase, so an estimated 66.4% of young people voted in the 2017 general election, representing a 14-point increase over 2015, which makes it the highest youth turnout figure since the 75.4% recorded for the 1992 election.

We know that there is more to do, and one initiative in this area involves the Minister for the Constitution leading the campaign and carrying out visits in every region and nation of the UK to hear about the barriers that prevent some groups from participating in the democratic process. He has spoken with over 100 individuals and organisations, including civil society groups and universities, and in the autumn the Government will publish their democratic engagement strategy to set out how we continue to work through this Parliament to increase registration levels among all, including the young and disenfranchised.

Baroness Lister of Burtersett: You mentioned barriers. As you may know, one of the Committee’s concerns is the barriers more generally to active citizenship and citizenship engagement, not just voting but wider.
Have the Government identified those barriers, and what are the Government’s policies, which they have or are developing, to address those barriers?

**Hardip Begol:** In particular in relation to registration, we know that students make up a sizeable division of frequent movers, as they often have at least two addresses in a year and tend to move between them, and there is a clear correlation between that home movement and the completeness of the register, so we know that there is definitely more to do there.

More widely on civic engagement, DCLG has set up some projects, and we have some overall frameworks in relation to people taking part in communities. Through the Localism Act, we have the right to have assets listed and the right to challenge and to take over the provision of those assets. Through a community fund, we are also funding projects in local areas for people to get engaged, particularly tackling some of those trickier, long-standing issues, but it is definitely an issue that we need to do more about.

**Baroness Lister of Burtersett:** Thank you, that is helpful, but I suppose I am trying to get at whether the Government have an analysis. There are many different groups, and we are not just talking about young people now but about poverty or where people live that could act as barriers to different kinds of engagement, and whether the Government have an analysis of that to then drive a policy.

**David Rossington:** The Government hold a dataset on a set of attitudes towards civic participation and engagement in the Community Life survey. It comes out once a year and has been running now for four or five years, and it builds on a dataset that goes even further back, to the early 2000s, in the Citizenship survey. That is a national dataset, which is published, obviously, and it gives a lot of information about people’s attitudes to the communities they live in, such as whether they think they are places where people get on together. It also gives data on civic participation, which can certainly be broken down by ethnicity and various other pieces of data. That is an underlying dataset that is extremely useful for all the departments here and for the rest of government in analysing what is going on.

**Lord Verjee:** It seems to me that there are two big areas of opportunity here. I know that this is a political question, but one is younger people, younger voters and lowering the voting age. Could you comment on that a bit, and on the immigrant vote? Is there a particular focus on increasing voter participation among immigrants to this country?

**Hardip Begol:** The Cabinet Office has advised that we have no plans to lower the voting age for UK parliamentary elections. The Conservative Party manifesto outlined a commitment to maintain the minimum voting age for these elections at 18. I am afraid I do not have information on migrants in particular and on voting registration for those who are able to do so, but I will write in relation to that.
Baroness Stedman-Scott: We have had the publication of the Casey review. Can you tell us whether the Government are preparing a response to it and a response to the consultation on faith schools?

Hardip Begol: I can give a fairly short answer to that. Yes, we are working on that and expect to publish the government’s strategy.

Baroness Stedman-Scott: When might that be?

Hardip Begol: This autumn.

Baroness Morris of Yardley: I remember the autumn.

Hardip Begol: Famous last words, of course. That is the intention.

The Chairman: On what date are we seeing the Ministers? On 13 December, so the autumn must be before 13 December, yes?

Hardip Begol: As Ann has said, we have been around for a long time when it comes to making promises about when documents are coming out, but it is being actively worked on across government at the moment.

The Chairman: It would be very helpful for us if that were in the public domain. It will not influence us, but if our little influence counts at all we would urge you to have it available before we reach the end of our evidence collection.

Baroness Stedman-Scott: Do the Government agree with the Casey review that they need to be more robust in countering false perceptions about Prevent? If so, what are they doing to counter these perceptions?

Paul Morrison: We certainly think that there needs to be an ongoing effort to make sure that there is as broad an engagement with the Prevent approach as possible and to address some of the myths and problems that prevent that, whether it is a particular community’s perception that it focuses on them or the perception, which Mr Begol described before, that it is not about safeguarding and understanding vulnerability. There is a need to ensure that we are working collectively with communities to provide that protection. I think it will have to be an ongoing process of engagement. There is a lot of activity on this, whether it is the direct engagement with community groups, events run by the Government that involve getting out there and having roadshows, or me and others appearing at events like this and saying again how important it is to see Prevent for what it is, which is identifying vulnerable people and ensuring that their protection is provided before the negative things happen.

Hardip Begol: When I was at the DfE, a lot of the media stories were about young people and their referrals, so as a department we obviously looked into those. I think Louise Casey’s review commented that a lot of them are not what is reported. The teachers I meet think that the safeguarding of young people in their schools is paramount and that when they make referrals it is always, as far as I have seen, in the best
interests of the young person. I am not saying that mistakes do not happen, but, as with all safeguarding, the professionals out there need to be trusted to make the correct decisions when they seek help and advice on very serious matters concerning children’s safeguarding.

**Baroness Stedman-Scott:** A key criticism of Prevent is that it does not engage sufficiently with local stakeholders, and that is one of the reasons why it is mistrusted. What is your answer to that?

**Hardip Begol:** I think that the local Prevent organisers, who I know and have worked with over the last two years, make a strenuous effort to make sure that they engage locally with both the public sector organisations and the communities. Part of their job being based in local areas is to get that community engagement. The Home Office also funds significant numbers of community-based projects. Some 169 were delivered in 2016-17, reaching over 50,000 participants. Those projects involve everyone from the Home Secretary, who went to Yorkshire last week to talk to some of the community groups that have been funded in relation to counterextremism, to the Home Office officials—Paul is one of them—actively going out and talking to groups to make sure that Prevent, as a safeguarding initiative to stop people being drawn towards terrorism, is well understood and that it covers all ways of being drawn towards terrorism, both Islamist and far right.

**Baroness Lister of Burtersett:** Going back to the Casey review, I think Ministers have said that there will be a new integration strategy as part of the response to it, but I want to bring in Paul in particular here. Are you working on a specific integration strategy with regard to immigrants and refugees? You will be aware that the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Refugees, in which I declare an interest as a member, produced a report on the integration of refugees before the summer and, just yesterday, although I have not managed to read it yet, published a report, *Integration not Demonisation*. I have not heard anything that suggests to me that there will be an explicit strategy about integrating people who are new to this country, which seems to me slightly different from the kinds of things that Louise Casey was talking about.

**Paul Morrison:** The Casey review said quite a lot about newcomers and their integration and made some recommendations on that. Certainly, our intention is that those issues will be part of the response that we are working on with communities and local government. It is an area that is very much a joint undertaking. For example, I am currently responsible for the joint Home Office, DCLG and DFID group, which covers our need to work not just on how people are moved from one place to another, which is part of what the Home Office is responsible for, but on how they then achieve self-sufficiency and what their longer-term outcomes are. It is certainly the intention that it will be covered in the strategy, but not necessarily that there will be a separate strategy specifically for newcomers. But those issues will certainly be addressed in the wider integration strategy that we are discussing here.

**The Chairman:** Before we thank you formally, are there any points that
any member of the Committee would like to pick up?

**Baroness Stedman-Scott:** I have two points. I think we have received written evidence from the Lord Lieutenancy secretariat.

**The Chairman:** We have.

**Baroness Stedman-Scott:** Is there anything in there that would have answered Baroness Barker’s question about effectiveness and the difference they are making? That might be something that you want to drill down on.

**The Chairman:** I am not sure that we know yet.

**Baroness Stedman-Scott:** If we do, it would be good to know, and if we do not it might be worth going back to them.

**The Chairman:** Yes, we will note that. Any others?

**Lord Harries of Pentregarth:** We heard before the meeting that the Government intend to set up a new commission on counterterrorism. I wondered whether you had anything to say about that.

**Paul Morrison:** The commission on counter extremism was mentioned in the Queen’s Speech. The intention is that it will look at many of the areas that we have been discussing here and counter the obstacles to the values that we have been talking about, such as how to promote them and how to learn what has worked and how to engage with community groups. The next stage will be the Government coming forward with proposals on it will function and operate. That is being worked on at the moment, but it is about counter extremism rather than counterterrorism.

**Lord Harries of Pentregarth:** Is there any idea of the date when it might begin?

**Paul Morrison:** I do not have a specific date, but there will be a further announcement on the detail of some of those issues imminently.

**Lord Blunkett:** Chairman, could all the witnesses today liaise and provide you and the Committee with a list of the forthcoming responses, reports, commissions and reviews that they know are coming in the pipeline in the next six months? I think it would help us, because there is a great deal going on and the duck is paddling but we only get the quacks. I do not mean that in a disparaging way; I mean that we only hear what we hear.

**Baroness Stedman-Scott:** Building on the question about whether citizenship ceremonies are effective, there has been some talk about young people having a ceremony when they leave school. I wondered if that is on your radar and whether you have thoughts on that.

**Ann Gross:** It is not immediately on my radar, but we will take it away and let you have some more considered thoughts on that.
Baroness Morris of Yardley: You are writing to us, so I wonder if you could give us a summary of the national curriculum requirements, because everything that you have said revolves around citizenship.

Ann Gross: I am very happy to do that. That is not a problem.

Baroness Morris of Yardley: That would be good, even if it is only a link so that we can see exactly what they say.

Ann Gross: Yes, absolutely.

The Chairman: Since you have been very kind and answered all our questions, can I give you the last word? Is there anything you wish to say, apart from goodbye?

Hardip Begol: I would like to say thank you. It has been a very good session. It is right to challenge whether we have evidence and evaluation of the programmes and spending that we are undertaking, and to make sure that we all keep in touch with one another and that we have a consistent government approach to this really important subject.

The Chairman: On behalf of all the Committee, I would like to thank you very much. It has been wide-ranging and very helpful in getting our Committee under way.