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Q51 The Chairman: Thank you all very much for coming along; we are very grateful to you for giving us your time and access to your expertise. A list of interests of members relevant to the inquiry has been sent to you and is available. This session is open to the public and is being recorded for BBC Parliament, and a verbatim transcript will be taken of the evidence and put on the Committee’s website. A few days after the session, you will be sent a copy of the transcript to check it for accuracy, and it would be helpful if you could advise us of any corrections as quickly as possible. If, after this evidence session, you wish to clarify or amplify any points made during your evidence, or have any additional points to make, you are welcome to submit supplementary evidence to us. Perhaps I could ask each of you to introduce yourselves, and then we can go straight to the questions.

Tom Franklin: Tom Franklin. I am from the Citizenship Foundation and we help young people develop the skills, knowledge and confidence to be actively engaged citizens.

Liz Moorse: I am Liz Moorse. I am from the Association for Citizenship Teaching. We are a teaching association, the subject association for citizenship education. We have a membership and we promote quality teaching and curriculum in citizenship across the country and beyond.

James Weinberg: I am James Weinberg. I am from the Sir Bernard Crick Centre in Sheffield. For the last two years or so, I have been the research lead in youth politics there and, for the last year, I have been co-opted as the lead fellow of citizenship on the All-Party Group on Democratic Participation.

Dr Avril Keating: My name is Dr Avril Keating. I am the director of the Centre for Global Youth and I work at the University College London Institute of Education. I am primarily involved in citizenship education through my involvement in the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study, which I have been involved in leading on since about 2007-08.

Q52 The Chairman: Thank you all very much. Let me open up with a strategic overview question. I would like each of you to describe the current state of citizenship education: who is receiving that education, how good is it and, equally importantly, who is being left out and how have you found people view citizenship education?

Tom Franklin: Our current view is that citizenship education is withering on the vine at a time when it is needed more than ever. If we look at the polarisation of society and the undermining of the faith in democratic society, there is such a need for young people to develop the skills, knowledge and confidence, yet what is happening with citizenship education is that the support for the subject has been dismantled. If we look at the fact that education regulators no longer focus on it; that there is not the support needed for teacher training; the fact that it is in the
national curriculum, but more and more schools do not follow the national curriculum and, therefore, do not teach citizenship education; and the fact that support for NGOs such as ourselves and others which provide support to schools has been withdrawn, meaning that we very often have to charge for our services rather than provide them to schools for free, it means that, although it is there in name for many schools, it is not happening. Whether young people are receiving high-quality citizenship education is a lottery; it is by chance as to whether they are getting it in their school or not, which is a great shame.

In terms of young people and what they want, now, more than ever, there is a cry from young people for this sort of education. The Youth Parliament has voted to have a curriculum for life as one of its core campaigns at the moment, teaching young people about politics and engagement. In this very place tonight, the All-Party Parliamentary Group on a Better Brexit for Young People will be publishing its report based on a whole series of focus groups, which have taken place with young people around the country, that we were very involved in. One of the core messages from young people is that they feel they are not given the information and the skills they need in order to take part and feel very let down and angry about that, so the state at the moment is not very favourable.

**Liz Moorse:** I would completely support what Tom said there and say that our evidence base for what is going on in schools is virtually non-existent, so it is very difficult to speak with certainty about the true picture of citizenship education. I would like to clarify that the comments that I will make focus on the situation in England. You may be aware that we also work with colleagues across the UK, in Wales, Northern Ireland, Scotland and the Republic of Ireland through our Five Nations Network, but I will focus my comments on England.

Citizenship education can work well and there are very good examples of practice out there, but they are just too few and far between. In a conversation that I had with a specialist citizenship teacher at Altrincham Girls’ School on Friday, she told me about how high-profile citizenship is in her school. It is an outstanding school, a teaching school. She has status within her school, as does the subject, and they have proper teaching time for the subject. These are all necessary for citizenship education to flourish.

The problem at the moment is that, despite policy having not particularly shifted in the sense that citizenship remains a national curriculum subject with a GCSE—the A-level is going but is still there for the next year or so—the focus on the subject and the quality of what is going on has diminished because other policies have detracted from it, so the position of citizenship education, we believe, is on the wither. If you look at the school workforce data, the decline from 2011 suggests that there are about half as many people who self-identify as a citizenship teacher as there were in 2011. In 2011, there were about 10,000 self-identifying citizenship teachers and there are now fewer than 5,000. The amount of
teaching time, according to that DfE workforce survey, also has diminished and is non-existent in some schools. The Association for Citizenship Teaching primarily works with those teachers who come to us looking for support with the subject. There are teachers out there who want to do this, but they are being marginalised and disenfranchised from doing their job well because of the undermining of current government policies, which I will say a bit more about later.

**James Weinberg:** I know that the Committee is looking more broadly at this notion of a civic journey, and it is excellent that you are taking the concept of education seriously. Previous academic and policy work on civic engagement has tended to focus more on methods of democratic design, whether that be welfare reform or voluntary service initiatives, such as the NCS. Those are, in essence, what we might term in political science as “supply-side reforms” aimed at facilitating public interest and, possibly, modes of engagement, but they have overlooked the power of demand-side reforms in general and the role of education in cultivating political interest and efficacy, in particular. On the question of why citizenship education is important in this debate, that is a very brief answer to the question.

To address holistically the state of citizenship education today is also to look at where we have come from, and you can go back as far as 1975 and the Trilateral Commission on the state of democracy then, which already was able to identify that, if social and economic structures stayed as they were, they would undermine democracy by concentrating wealth and learning in the hands of a few. We are, arguably, no different today. We have evidence showing that those in the top quintile for household income are five times more likely to participate in political activities than those in the lowest. The reason I mention this is because that intergenerational transmission of political inequality is evident already at school age. Citizenship education can redress this balance. We have evidence from pre-2010 that shows that citizenship education, where it is done effectively and consistently, can predict political efficacy, participation and levels of knowledge. Avril knows far more about this than I do, having been involved in the longitudinal study.

In terms of broader inequalities, you cannot get past that point where you are considering a wider understanding of the civic journey. We also have evidence abroad, especially in Chile, to show that, where citizenship education has been done well, it can mitigate socioeconomic inequalities, which is vital in discussing the idea of a civic journey in the 21st century UK context.

It is also worth acknowledging that what we are debating here is not new. In fact, in this very room, in discussing this and considering it as a policy initiative, we stand not only on the shoulders of many previous philosophers but those in the 20th century, such as Sir Bernard, the namesake of the centre I represent, who worked very hard from the 1970s onwards with a political association to get a policy response on citizenship education. His vision was “for people to think of themselves as
active citizens, willing, able and equipped to have an influence in public life”, and it remains just that, a vision. I would argue that there are two central reasons why that potential for citizenship education has been eviscerated. One, there is an implementation gap, largely under Labour but it carried on under the coalition and Conservative Governments, and, secondly, there was a significant vision shift under the recent coalition and Conservative Governments. Each of those has specific symptoms which I hope we can discuss more broadly in this session.

**Dr Avril Keating:** My fellow panellists have summarised the key challenges that we are facing. I will take the opportunity to reinforce the inequalities of access to citizenship education. The challenge is that, as it currently stands, it is the schools which have an interest and are invested in citizenship education which are providing good citizenship education. This often means that it is selective and fee-paying schools that are providing good citizenship education because it is part of their ethos. This means that you have children and young people who are receiving it based on their income or status rather than their entitlement to receive education about democracy. This creates problems in the short term and the long term for society and politics more broadly.

**Q53 Baroness Lister of Burtersett:** A number of submissions, including those from the Citizenship Foundation and the Association for Citizenship Teaching, have referred to the importance of primary school level. What are the priorities for teaching citizenship education at primary level, and do you think it should be made compulsory at that level?

**Tom Franklin:** Absolutely, it should be made compulsory, particularly for key stage 2, so from seven to 11. We run a programme, Make a Difference Challenge, in some schools, which is helping children of that age to select the issues that they care about the most, and they are involved, between them, in making those decisions as to which they want to focus on, and working with them to draw up a programme of action to make a difference, and it might be volunteering, fundraising, campaigning or letter-writing, to follow through that course of action and, at the end of it, to review how they have done. It is all about giving those children confidence that they have a sense of agency, that, even at that young age, they can make a difference. We find that the amount of enthusiasm and buzz they get from taking part in that sort of way is incredible, so it is a critical age. It is too late to wait until secondary school and it should be in the national curriculum for key stage 2, absolutely.

**Baroness Redfern:** I would like to focus on citizenship education. You mention that it has been undermined by government policies. Could you elaborate more on that, please?

**Liz Moorse:** We have seen a persistent exclusion of citizenship from key government programmes and policies. It is constantly left off the list when policies are being rolled out, notwithstanding more recently that the National College, which has responsibility for teacher training, has created a programme to create specialist leaders of education. Citizenship
teachers cannot apply to be specialist teachers of education; they are being discriminated against on the basis of what? Every other subject is included in that programme. We cannot understand why citizenship is not there. This is having a direct effect on the career prospects of our existing citizenship teachers.

**Baroness Redfern:** That is all colleges that you are talking about?

**Liz Moore:** Teachers cannot apply to this programme, Specialist Leaders of Education. In addition, there is now a crisis in initial teacher education. In 2010, 243 trainees in citizenship were going through programmes of initial teacher education; this year, it is 40. We cannot sustain this system. We need a massive push to train existing teachers and new teachers as citizenship specialist teachers. They make an amazing difference. I have described citizen teachers as “national assets”. They come with subject knowledge, with pedagogy, with proficiency in helping children look at controversial issues, difficult political issues, building a sense of agency and the skills to take action. This needs a specialist teacher to do this properly and well, particularly in our current climate with issues of extremism, et cetera. We cannot just have non-specialists teaching this, we need more specialist teachers urgently.

**Baroness Morris of Yardley:** This is a quick question to Dr Keating, given your longitudinal study. I suppose there are two arguments about the number of teachers, and I accept that, but you still visit schools where good citizenship education is going on, where teachers do not call themselves “citizenship teachers” and there is not an hour given in the curriculum. In your longitudinal study, not the content but the structure of citizenship in schools, what are you defining that as? Are you looking at lessons called “citizenship” which are taught by a teacher who teaches it so many times a week, or are you looking broader than that at what else is happening in the school?

**Dr Avril Keating:** Looking at what citizenship means in schools is one of the most challenging tasks.

**Baroness Morris of Yardley:** It is easy to do the form, but it might not be accurate, I suppose.

**Dr Avril Keating:** Yes, this is the thing. When we went to all schools, and bear in mind that the study has not been in schools since 2008, so we do not have that recent data, what we would have asked is, “In what ways are you delivering?” We looked at whether it was a formal citizenship class, whether it was combined with PSHE, whether it was the whole school or whether they were doing all of these approaches so that it was additive in that way, and we asked schools and teachers to report what they were doing, so we tried to take a holistic approach to that.

**Baroness Stedman-Scott:** Why do you think there is such a dismissal of this subject in terms of policy?
**Liz Moorse:** I can only put this down to party politics meddling in our children’s education. I do not know what other reason we can use here. It makes absolutely no sense. The arguments for why citizenship education is so critical, particularly at this time, are well established. Bernard Crick’s vision was for citizenship and democracy education. We have some critical challenges facing our democracy, and I believe it is government’s duty to educate citizens in democracy education and if that is not happening in school as an entitlement then it is left to chance, and that is not good enough. When I have been in meetings with Ministers and occasionally with DfE officials, they will tell you in private that it is important, but they will not get on a platform and tell schools, “This is an important subject and we expect all schools to be doing it”, and that is completely unacceptable. It does not happen for any other subject. This is a real problem.

**The Chairman:** Mr Weinberg, you have been very patient. You have the floor.

**James Weinberg:** Perhaps I might jump in to add something to each of those questions. On this idea of why it is being undermined, choices about citizenship education are political choices with political consequences, and it is worth remembering that. The move towards character education in place of citizenship education after 2010 is key in this narrative. That has, essentially, replaced the active element of citizenship education that was in the original Crick vision. We have moved from this justice-oriented approach to one that is far more individualised, and that is following the work and advice from the Jubilee Centre and others working on character. Even though citizenship was retained as a statutory feature of the curriculum in 2014, I think, and I used to be a secondary school teacher, it has become a ghost feature of our education. Instead, it is increasingly marginalised as other policies have come in that are far more resource-intensive and have incentives attached to them. I am thinking of social, moral, spiritual and cultural education which has been pushed forward and the Prevent programme, fundamental British values. All of these are taking far more symbolic time away from teachers, especially senior leadership teams in schools, and they are being followed up on as well, whereas we no longer have an assessment procedure with Ofsted for testing how citizenship is being delivered.

On the issue of teachers, I did some research last year with teachers from more than 60 schools in England. I was specifically thinking about Avril’s longitudinal study which found that it was delivered in diverse ways and not always as a discrete subject, as the curriculum might have intended, and, as Liz pointed out, there is a significant lack of specialist teachers, so my research was specifically with non-specialists. That showed that all these teachers, who had not been trained in citizenship but were delivering it in the classroom, did not have a shared understanding of citizenship and the purpose of citizenship education. There was a distinct gap between academic work on good pedagogy for citizenship education and the practice that they reported, and they were
open in admitting that this was because they had a lack of initial teacher training in citizenship education. They all agreed that citizenship education was sorely neglected within their secondary schools due to lack of resource and importance; and where it was taught, they described the delivery of citizenship education in individualistic and inward-looking political conceptions of good responsible citizens rather than active citizens, which is contrary to what Bernard Crick would have wanted in his report 20 years ago.

**Q54 Baroness Lister of Burtersett:** In our first oral evidence session, we talked with officials and I asked about the criteria against which we should be assessing citizenship education, but I did not get very far. What is citizenship education attempting to achieve, and what is being done to measure if current approaches to citizenship education are achieving it? I think you have partly touched on this already, Liz in particular: do good enough data exist on the quality of citizenship teaching? Are school inspections adequately covering the subject, and what should the role of Ofsted be? There are a lot of things there, so perhaps you could pick out the questions, particularly this question how we judge whether it is being effective or not.

**Liz Moorse:** This is a very difficult issue at the moment. We know that Ofsted is looking at the curriculum and is doing a special review at the moment, but by what standards is it making judgments about the curriculum? The national curriculum is not national any more as there are so many schools that do not need to follow it and even schools which say they are following it do not seem to be following it in every regard, so by what standards can we make any judgment about the quality of teaching or the curriculum if we do not have standards to measure against? It is completely crazy, to be quite frank. There is an absence of good data. I thought it was disingenuous of the DfE director to refer to the 2013 Ofsted report, which took two years to be published, so the data was drawn from 2009 to 2011. Basically, this is data from the previous national curriculum developed under the Labour Administration, which was much fuller in content, breadth of study and the types of skills, knowledge and understanding required, so we cannot refer back to that other than in broad terms to say, “That’s where we were. Where are we now?” We do not have good data now and we need Ofsted to start looking at this much more urgently.

**Tom Franklin:** One of our concerns with the current curriculum is that citizenship has been narrowed and is much more now a list of bits of knowledge rather than more of a rounded programme. We would describe it as learning to play an instrument where there is the theory, which is very important, but, to learn to play an instrument, you need to play it. We think it is the same with citizenship, and what is needed is a review of the citizenship scheme of study there so that it includes much more about action, so it is about practising being a citizen and, therefore, developing the confidence in young people to take part, which at the moment is largely not there; it is a much more narrowed-down focus than is needed.
Dr Avril Keating: The first question you asked there is one of the most challenging because you asked the question of what citizenship education is trying to do, and I am not convinced there is a shared understanding either cross-party or cross-society as to what we want citizenship to be, or even agreement at this table as to what is in the curriculum and what citizenship is doing or should be trying to do. That bleeds into having this conversation about whether citizenship education in schools is good or not, whether we have enough data and measures and how we measure it and what are we trying to measure—is it simply skills, knowledge or attitudes?

My personal view is that it should be more rounded than it currently is in the curriculum and that there has been a reduction to focus too much around political institutions and how Westminster works, which is an absolutely vital dimension of citizenship, but only one. If you look internationally, there is much more of a movement towards trying to develop measures. I am a social scientist and I will never agree that they are perfect, but they are trying to take a more holistic approach that will look at knowledge, identities, values and skills. Currently, we have almost no data on what young people have in those domains because we are not participating in these studies.

James Weinberg: It is worth acknowledging that, as an abstract concept, citizenship education has myriad potential impact areas. I know from doing some work in the DfE last year that even there they are not entirely sure what citizenship education means, and it is certainly not a priority. It might be worth thinking about this more in terms of input and output. From my own research, when it comes to input, what we need to do is re-orientate the way we look at it to include pedagogy as both content and skills, thinking about the skills to do with critical debate and public speaking, which will set young people up for life, and the content. Yes, the formal curriculum mentions political institutions and the processes in Westminster. There are a lot of teachers who do not know about that themselves and are not teaching it and that is getting in the way of that knowledge being transferred. The content, as it is currently conceived from a character perspective, needs to be re-politicised. I am not talking about politicising young people but, with a small “p”, understanding the law, the machinations that drive industry and trade, formal and informal avenues of political campaigns and exerting pressure and systemic change; that needs to be introduced. On the output, we are looking at whether we can improve young people’s sense of political efficacy, their participation rates after school and their social attitudes. Evidence from around the world says that citizenship delivered in different ways can achieve different levels of those different outcomes, but considering them all in a remodelling would be useful.

Q55 Lord Blunkett: Mine is a very practical question, but perhaps I might say that, 18 years ago, when the working party was set up, there was cross-party agreement and it was not seen as a party-political issue. In fact, the only party politician who was on the working party was Ken Baker. I just want to put that on the record.
I have a very practical question about training. We have the figures, and you have mentioned them already, regarding the drop in initial teacher training. There are no bursaries any more, despite the rest of the curriculum subject areas having bursaries. What do we do? How do we, through continuing professional development and in-service training, at least in the short term, ensure that there are people who are knowledgeable and committed to being able to do what you are advocating?

**Liz Moorse:** First, we need a shift in some government policies here. There are things that we can do as citizenship organisations, but, to be quite frank, without a shift in national policy, it is very difficult for us to gain the reach that we need to train enough citizenship teachers, both existing and new, so that every school has a subject specialist citizenship teacher to lead the subject in their school. We need probably about 400 trained every year for the next 12 years to have any hope of ever reaching that ambition. We need to make citizenship a priority teacher-training subject, with the appropriate financial support, so that all potential trainees from all social and economic backgrounds can train as citizenship teachers. We need to establish a national programme of CPD, and the citizenship organisations in front of you would be more than happy to be partners in developing that national CPD programme, and we want to work with government on this. Apparently, there is new money available for CPD, continuing professional development, and some of this urgently needs to go towards citizenship. Also, we need to end the exclusion of citizenship from key national programmes such as the Specialist Leaders of Education programme which I referred to earlier, so that citizenship teachers are not marginalised and not discriminated against but have the same right of access to professional development and career progression that any other subject teacher has.

**Dr Avril Keating:** I would add to that simply that it has to be clear that this policy will be sustained into the long term, otherwise schools and teachers will shrug their shoulders and say, “Oh look, here’s another little tinkering in the system, another policy initiative. Next month, next year, it’ll be something else. Let’s just put that into a drawer and we’ll forget about that until the next one comes along”.

**Tom Franklin:** I agree with that. It is also very important that there is training for senior leadership teams so that they also understand the importance of this. The other thing that is of real potential is about outside experts coming into schools. One of the things that we do is Lawyers in Schools where lawyers will go into schools and work with young people to help them to understand the rule of law and how that works, and there are others where there are financial experts going in and teaching young people about the economy and taxation and so on. There is a real potential for an expansion of that with national support as well. If we think about civil servants, politicians, local government, journalists, lawyers, financial experts and others, there is a real opportunity. With some of the young people that we work with, it will be the first time that they have spoken with a lawyer, the first time they
have had that sort of contact, and it can open their eyes completely in
terms of the potential. We know lawyers today who are lawyers only
because of the fact that they were given those sorts of opportunities to
meet and to see what they might be able to achieve, and we could
expand that on a big scale across all schools.

_James Weinberg:_ I would urge caution that you cannot plough money
into initial teacher training for citizenship and expect anything to change
if you do not also add the resource for improving its significance within
individual schools. I know a lot of citizenship teachers who, out of that
small pool who have trained in citizenship, are not teaching citizenship in
the schools where they are based, so, unless it is re-prioritised as a
curriculum subject, that initial teacher training will not have any impact.

Baroness Morris of Yardley: James has mentioned this, and I will
change the question a bit because it was trying to look at the change to
citizen education from citizenship education, so let me ask this: would
you agree that both are necessary and that, in a way, to pit one against
the other is not great, but you end up doing that when one has priority
and one does not? Can you see, in the best of worlds, a situation where
we can deliver something that has both of those elements, the inward-
looking inner strength and the outward-looking active citizen, or do they
have to be pitted against each other in the curriculum?

*Liz Moorse:* Character education has not been described or set up as a
subject. It is an outcome of good, well-rounded, broad and balanced
education; it has a personal development focus and it is about the
individual. Citizenship is about the knowledge, understanding and skills
that you need to be an active citizen, so to pit them against each other
does not make sense as they are of a different order.

Baroness Morris of Yardley: The Jubilee Centre, as one of its
characteristics, says of character education that it can be taught.

*Liz Moorse:* Through other things.

Baroness Morris of Yardley: I am not sure why that matters.

*Liz Moorse:* Possibly, but it creates a different order of things. We would
not be arguing for specialist teachers in character education. We would
expect every teacher to be supporting the children’s personal
development and development of character; that is a natural outcome of
good, well-rounded education. I do not think we can look at them entirely
similarly, although, in some respects, their aims and ambition, in the
broadest sense, are quite similar.

_James Weinberg:_ They do not have to be entirely antithetical, I agree
with you. Some of the issues that Liz has mentioned come from the fact
that the Jubilee Centre has tried to almost territorialise citizenship
education as one of four components to character, and they describe it as
"a civic virtue, such as service and volunteering". In doing so, they
denude it of the politicised aspect that citizenship education should also
have. I would quote an academic article here, that, “National policy
discourse must redress the imbalance between the two by clarifying the distinction between learning through volunteering with social capital as a learning outcome for young people”—character education—“and learning through community involvement with democratic citizenship, which includes an understanding of the political base of the community as a learning outcome”—citizenship education. Only if you can stress the fact that the two have very distinct inputs and outputs and need to be taught separately, not in shared curriculum time, can both co-exist.

**The Chairman:** Are you saying that all teachers should have some citizenship education or only a few should have deep citizenship education—that is, are we going narrow and deep or broad and shallower?

**Liz Moorse:** In the past, we have had both. In the past, every trainee teacher has had at least a little element of some citizenship education. It is part of the moral purpose of teaching, in a sense, but we need subject specialists to lead and co-ordinate the curriculum, the teaching and learning and the activities that comprise a good-quality citizenship curriculum.

**Lord Blunkett:** So, given that at the moment it is the secondary schools where the curriculum is supposed to be encapsulating this, do we need someone who, even if it is through CPD, has responsibility for citizenship in that school? At the moment, someone can have responsibility for maths, English or for the history curriculum, but not for citizenship.

**Liz Moorse:** Absolutely, there has to be a specialist leading the subject. In some respects, I agree that schools should have freedom to determine how they put their curriculum together, but it should be based on good practice and what quality looks like. The research that has happened over past years demonstrates that discrete specialist subject teaching led by a specialist trained citizenship teacher creates much better outcomes for learners and is everywhere and nowhere. It needs leadership in the school and that person needs the status and backing of their head teacher, and it needs to be given the same treatment and parity of esteem as other subjects in the curriculum.

**Q57 Lord Harries of Pentregarth:** The Government require British values to be taught in schools as part of the curriculum. I know from my experience on the Commission on Religion and Belief in British Public Life that there is a very close link between this introduction and the Prevent programme. Certainly, the faith groups and secular groups we talked to found that this was very unsatisfactory and various religious groups felt “othered”. What, if any, experience do we have from people who teach on the ground and from schools themselves as to whether this has had a detrimental effect?

**Liz Moorse:** British values are an interesting concept. I do not think anybody has any problem with what is contained within them. Democracy, the rule of law, respect for different values and religious beliefs are the fundamental principles, if you like, that underpin a thriving
democracy. The choice of “British” is interesting, given that they are only promoted in schools in England, and that does not seem to make sense to a lot of people, nor are those values, as described by government, peculiar to Britain; they are quite universal in their nature. I do not think that should be the issue here. The problem is that schools have often equated British values with Britishness. There has been a proliferation of pictures of the monarch and union flags being put up on classroom walls just in case an Ofsted inspector pops in and wants to see some evidence of how the school is promoting British values. This is superficial and meaningless. We need to embed these democratic values, as I would see them, in a proper citizenship curriculum. They should represent the content and things that are taught as part of a good-quality citizenship curriculum.

Tom Franklin: What is quite interesting is that, having downgraded citizenship and not provided the resources for us to do anything about it, it then pops up in these other areas and suddenly the Government create new initiatives, whether it is around Prevent in schools or British values, which sort of replace it and it all becomes a bit of a mish-mash. These issues, as Liz said—debating controversial issues, discussing British values and what they mean and everything else—are all part of a good, rounded citizenship education. We would say that, instead of the Government creating new initiatives and new programmes, they should focus on making sure that the core subject is taught well and these other areas will, therefore, be covered.

Lord Harries of Pentregarth: What you have said so far bears out what you said right at the beginning: there is so little data. We do not know from teachers how they feel about this if there is no data.

James Weinberg: I have data.

Lord Harries of Pentregarth: You do have data?

James Weinberg: Yes. All the teachers in my study were highly critical of the concept of fundamental British values, and those criticisms can be reduced to one: a misunderstanding of why or how they should be teaching something that is solely British. They were worried about teaching fundamental British values and they did not know legally what they could do without overstepping the mark in terms of at what point this becomes almost nationalistic and partisan, in a sense. They also had worries about delivering it in a pedagogical sense. A number of the teachers raised concerns that, “If we are simply told we need to tell young people that these are fundamental British values, then surely forcing something down someone’s throat will not work because they go home and tell their parents, ‘Well, I’ve been told that these are now the fundamental British values I have to adhere to’”.

Those who have had some training in cognate specialisms to citizenship, such as history and politics, raised the point that a far better way of delivering these values, British or not, would be through the medium of citizenship education, if that is based on critical debate. You want young
people to discuss these ideas and come to a conclusion of their own. You do not want the teacher to have the responsibility of telling them, ad hoc and without deliberation, that these are the values that are British and must be adhered to.

Dr Avril Keating: We come back to the issue that teachers themselves need the training, the confidence and the experience to know how to deliver this part of the curriculum effectively, whether that is through Citizenship or through some other part of the school.

Baroness Newlove: I am listening to very valid evidence, articulated very well. My confusion is that, if anybody could describe what citizenship and British values are about, it is very convoluted and complicated. Has it ever been embedded, what should it look like and why has it splintered so much? You have mentioned government funding and social issues, which have changed, but there are a lot of things that need to be put back in. Like you say, teachers cannot just say things and put it down their throats. With youngsters today, you have different dynamics, with people who are really interested in politics and history and very articulate and others who are only interested in TOWIE and base their lives on that. For me, it is about how we embed it. From where we are, how will we embed it and make it go forward, if we had the money and with a Government, as you say, of whatever colour? For me, it is about the next generation understanding those British values, and they could educate their own parents who have never been taught British values.

Dr Avril Keating: Your core question is about whether it has ever been embedded and why it never quite took off in the way that it was hoped it would. Part of the reason comes back to the very beginning and the way that it was set up in the early 2000s. There was a bit of nervousness around making schools have something that was too formalised and too uniform, so schools had more autonomy to do what they wanted. This was a wonderful aspiration, but, in practice when it was rolled out, school autonomy meant that good schools could do it well and bad schools just went, “Here’s a video, guys. That’s all you need to watch this week” or, “We’re talking about drugs and sex education. That’s Citizenship, and that’s all we need to do”. That has persisted and, coupled with that, there came a policy drift; a policy problem emerges for example, community cohesion pops up - and citizenship starts to be redefined as community cohesion. A new Government comes into place and they redefine what citizenship is, so nothing is ever stable and no consensus on what citizenship could or should look like in schools is ever really established. It has been weakened over time, which is how you end up with more and more splintering, which makes it very hard for teachers, students, parents or the people in this room to get a good grip on this. It is possible to define what citizenship education is and should be, and I could lecture here for hours, though the Chairman would be very upset about that, but these are some of the fundamental policy structures which have helped to create this confusion.

Tom Franklin: I wonder if there is an opportunity at the moment. I would not want to go a whole hour without mentioning Brexit in some
form, but things are in flux at the moment. There is a sense of things moving, and we would urge the Government, as part of their discussion about the way that we are moving forward in the future, to think about some sort of charter for citizenship, setting out the responsibilities that people have for active citizenship and the rights that they have to the education that they need for that. We wonder whether, if the Government would take it, all the discussion about our national future could be a platform that could be used positively in getting more of a consensus around this going forward.

Q59 **Lord Rowe-Beddoe:** We have heard a lot this morning which has covered a number of issues, obviously. We have seen and heard of a significant fall in the number of teachers teaching the subject and a fall in citizenship being taught as a dedicated subject. Is there any evidence, in your opinion—and, Dr Keating, you just touched upon this—that this is being dealt with in schools in other ways, or is it a total disaster, which is what I am hearing?

**Liz Moorse:** Going back to an earlier point I made, it is very difficult to be sure what the national picture is at the moment. We know that where it works well—and it is working well and I do not want anybody in this Committee to go away with the impression that it is absolute doom and gloom everywhere, because there are still models of high-quality citizenship teaching, curriculum and practice—it is in the schools with specialist trained teachers, with head teachers who support the subject, with proper curriculum time, and which are using the GCSE in citizenship studies. Unfortunately, lots of things are driven by metrics, and a GCSE, for all its issues, gives a subject certain status and credibility among students, teachers and parents. Where those features are in place, we see good-quality practice, curriculum and provision. Where those things are not in place, it is much harder to identify clear citizenship education. There might be bits and pieces. You heard last week from our friends in the social action arena with huge amounts of resource, massive programmes and huge reach. If we had anything like the level of funding in citizenship education that some of those providers have, we would be in a very different place. They have the support of a government department. At the moment, it feels like we are on our own. The DfE does not show any leadership here and, in order to change things, we have to change that perception. We also need Ofsted to do a special study to uncover what is working and why and what the quality looks like. Without that, we will never be sure of what is going on.

**The Chairman:** Is one of the problems that citizenship education is not seen as an academic subject? I would use the analogy of, instead of going to university, doing vocational training.

**Liz Moorse:** It is very interesting because citizenship exists at postgraduate degree level quite widely and there were previously undergraduate courses in citizenship. Unfortunately, those have, apparently, dried up. If you look on the UCAS website, you will not find citizenship courses, but you will find political science and social science courses which have aspects of citizenship within them. So I do not buy
the argument that it is not academic because there is an academic underpinning to the knowledge and understanding of the concepts that we want children to be addressing in their citizenship education.

**James Weinberg:** I do not take the criticism that citizenship is not academic and I do not think Avril would either, or anyone else on this panel, but I certainly agree with you, having been a secondary school teacher, that that is how it is viewed within schools. Where it is not viewed like that, it has the backing of senior leadership teams. One excellent school I have been to recently, School 21 in Newham, has that ethos surrounding citizenship as an academic and an active component of what they teach. They provide their staff with ongoing qualifications in various aspects of pedagogy, including how to teach community action and citizenship, and they have community involvement woven into what they teach.

The problem from a national policy perspective is that this is a subject with long-term outputs and outcomes—i.e., participation and knowledge, the civic journey—being fitted into a short-term test-oriented education system. Someone needs to put the money behind a proper study to get new data and a new design of a proper assessment structure for citizenship education that is going to give it heft in schools.

**Lord Rowe-Beddoe:** Is it leadership or financial, or both?

**James Weinberg:** They go together.

**Lord Rowe-Beddoe:** To drop from 96,000 GCSE successes in 2007 to fewer than 20,000 this year is incredible.

**Liz Moorse:** It is criminal. The point on GCSEs is that we have had substantial GCSE reforms. There are new qualifications in citizenship studies being taught now and we will not know the effect of those until we have student entries for next summer’s exam. Next summer, 2018, is the first time the new qualification will be examined. The nature of the qualification has shifted dramatically, which is another worry to our citizenship teachers in that the active citizenship component, which was a key part of the previous GCSE, has been diminished and is now a much smaller part, and it is critical to citizenship education.

**Tom Franklin:** The leadership point is crucial. The thing that distinguishes schools such as School 21, which James mentioned, is the leadership and that understanding of the role of schools and the role of education in preparing young people for life as a whole. We can see these islands of excellence, but we are lacking leadership at the national level and the help to school leaders right across the country to understand that that should be the purpose of their school rather than just ticking the boxes of attainment in a very narrow curriculum.

**James Weinberg:** We have not even touched on post-16, where finance really is an issue. Not only has the A-level in citizenship been scrapped, arguably at a time when teaching 16 to 18 year-olds about the kind of
issues we have been discussing is most critical, but you saw under the
colition Government a cut of up to 75% in entitlement funding, which
was how FE colleges funded citizenship-oriented extra-curricular activities
for young people, so the capacity to deliver citizenship beyond the age of
16 has also been eviscerated.

Baroness Barker: A civic journey depends upon there being a pathway
that is logical and follows on. Some of us have been very concerned
about the way in which the National Citizenship Trust has been set up
and we are keen to look at ways in which it can be better integrated with
other parts of that civic journey. Would you like to talk about that in
relation to citizenship education?

Tom Franklin: It is vital that the NCS is not just an island because, if
that happens, it is a wasted opportunity for all those young people going
through it, unless they have had the opportunity beforehand to learn
about the skills that they need and everything else. It is seen as a rite of
passage and there has been a huge investment, but if it is just this
island, it just happens, they go away and then it is over.

Baroness Barker: So how can it be joined up?

Liz Moorse: We did some work with the NCS Trust several years ago to
develop some examples of how preparation for NCS and learning about it,
the skills, knowledge and understanding that you need, could be
developed and integrated into citizenship education in schools. The reality
is that young people are in school and it is a perfect moment to introduce
them to a programme like that. We also need to recognise that, for many
young people, going away on a residential with unknown people is a
frightening prospect. We are also concerned about some of the quality of
the social action that is included in National Citizen Service. It lacks a
political dimension and the programme is set up such that undergraduate
students work in providers around the country with young people who
may themselves not have very much of an idea about what meaningful
social action and active citizenship is. We have done some work with the
National Citizen Service Trust and we had hoped that that work would be
disseminated with their support and that we could offer providers
training. But, unfortunately, that has not happened to date. We are still
very much in contact with colleagues there and working with them, but
we believe there is a connection between the citizenship curriculum in
schools and the NCS programme that could be made but is not being
made at the moment.

James Weinberg: The NCS was, essentially, a big idea for the big
society, to put it bluntly, and it was a flagship policy. It was symbolic and
it was dominated by character in the same way as other education
reforms have been since 2010. I submitted suggested amendments to
the NCS Trust Bill, along with Sarah Mills, who I believe you spoke to last
week. In that, we both said that there was no reason why you could not
integrate a formal citizenship education aspect to the NCS programme,
which could fit quite neatly within the summer that students were
spending there, and that would provide more direct links to curriculum-
based citizenship education as well. Although those amendments were not accepted, Michael Lynas emailed me afterwards to say, “This is something we’d like to look into and we’ll be getting further help”, but I have not heard anything since. That could be pushed.

**Dr Avril Keating:** There have been three questions about three different aspects of the current education system—fundamental values, character education and the NCS—which are often treated as distinct from citizenship education and can cause confusion in schools when there should be more policy co-operation, more joining up between all these different programmes. A simple way to join with the NCS would be to make citizenship education compulsory throughout that 16 to 18 period both in academic selective schools and in vocational-track students who often do not get any opportunities whatsoever to have any sort of citizenship education during that period.

**Baroness Stedman-Scott:** Mr Weinberg, you have mentioned Chile already, but where might we, as a Committee, look around the UK or internationally to identify relatively low-cost but high-impact citizenship education? Where should we look?

**James Weinberg:** Low cost?

**Baroness Stedman-Scott:** Value.

**James Weinberg:** There are many examples of citizenship education being done abroad. Before I mention some positive examples, I would stress caution in taking leads from other countries, especially the Far East where China and Korea, for example, have, ostensibly, citizenship education programmes which were initially about overwriting that perceived civility and subjectivity of their citizens with a focus on knowledge and responsibilities, but that has become highly nationalistic and cultural. I fear that what you see there is maybe the other end of a slide where character education could take us, so we should heed warnings from other countries as well.

For some good examples, you could look at New Zealand, where schools are given a lot of autonomy but within some broad basic instructions and where a whole host of initiatives outside the curriculum and through informal curricula in individual schools are taking place. South America has a much bigger emphasis in citizenship education on collective goods, and their citizenship education programmes have a big impact on preventing youth crime and gang culture. Specifically, there was some good research done in 2012 in Colombia on the use of citizenship education to re-orient vulnerable young men away from gang crime and towards socially oriented movements, protests and formal participation. Bahrain as well, surprisingly, has had a very good programme of social movement-oriented citizenship education since 2012, so you could look there as well. That is a good intro.

**Dr Avril Keating:** The saddest thing about all of this, of course, is that in the early 2000s everyone was looking to Britain to copy its model.
Liz Moorse: To England.

Dr Avril Keating: To England, pardon me; apologies for my mis-speaking there. We are very fortunate that next month there should be some new international data released in a comparative study of citizenship and citizenship education across about 20 different countries from the Far East, Europe, Asia and Latin America, which could give you some insight into which countries are doing well. Of course, this depends on what we consider good citizenship education to be, so, just because they have high test scores and know a lot about how Parliament works, it does not necessarily mean that it is good citizenship education, but that might be an interesting place to start.

Lord Blunkett: Is that next month?

Dr Avril Keating: Yes.

Tom Franklin: It is also interesting to look at the different nations within the UK because there are different examples. In Scotland, it has been far more embedded for much longer. If we look at Wales and the new curriculum there, the curriculum for life, having active, confident citizens is one of the key principles.

Liz Moorse: Closer to home, probably Ireland is the closest model to citizenship in England in the sense that it is established as a subject. In the other parts of the UK, it is done slightly differently with different levels of impact and effect. I know that colleagues in Scotland are quite worried about what has happened to citizenship education there. Some of the Scandinavian countries are also interesting, Norway and Finland in particular, and some of the Danish model—but Norway in particular—is probably good to have a look at.

Baroness Lister of Burtersett: When you say Ireland, do you mean Northern Ireland or the Republic?

Liz Moorse: The Republic has a model. Northern Ireland has a slightly different model, but it is set up in a particular way because of the particular context in Northern Ireland, so it focuses on local and global citizenship without so much of an emphasis on national.

The Chairman: We are over time, but I thank you very much indeed. You have given us a lot of food of thought and, in particular, your passion for the subject has impressed us all. Thank you very much indeed.