



**Northern Ireland
Assembly**

Mr Barry McElduff
Chairperson, Committee for Education

Mr Mike Nesbitt MLA
Chairperson of the Committee for the Executive Office
Parliament Buildings

15 December 2016

Our Ref: 2016.XXX

Mike, a chara

At its meeting on Wednesday 14 December 2016, the Committee for Education agreed that I should write to you setting out its response to the consultation on the 2016-21 Programme for Government (PfG) draft Delivery Plans.

The Committee considered evidence from the Department of Education on the draft Delivery Plans at its meeting on 9 November 2016. The Committee also undertook a related informal stakeholder event on 16 November 2016 – a summary note of this is appended. A small number of stakeholder organisations have also made written submissions – these too are appended. The Committee wrote to the Department raising queries and sharing a summary table on the draft Delivery Plans. The Departmental response, provided on 15 December 2016, is also appended.

Committee for Education

Room 428, Parliament Buildings, Ballymiscaw, Stormont, Belfast, BT4 3XX

Tel: (028) 9052 1201

E-mail: peter.mccallion@niassembly.gov.uk

In the absence of detail within the draft Delivery Plans and a timely written response from the Department, the Committee struggled to scrutinise the PfG in an in-depth manner. Nonetheless, the Committee agreed the observations which are set out below.

1. Members felt that there appeared to be an appreciable degree of buy-in and support among stakeholders for the outcomes-based approach adopted in the draft Delivery Plans and the focus on cross-departmental co-operation. It seemed evident that the ongoing programme of departmental engagement with stakeholders has been well received and that consequently stakeholders' investment in the innovative nature of the PfG is quite high and their expectations are generally positive.
2. The Committee noted that stakeholders had asked that the PfG should focus more explicitly on the wider values of education including: softer, societal, well-being objectives; the treatment of marginalised children; and measures to tackle the "tail of underachievement". However, the Committee accepted that the Department of Education is operating in a challenging budget situation which, coupled with the need to provide a sustainable and high quality education system in the face of increasingly complex Special Educational Needs and other demands, may require difficult decision-making in terms of the schools' estate. In this context, the Committee felt that it would be difficult for the Delivery Plans to meet all or even some of stakeholders' expectations.
3. The Committee felt that the draft Delivery Plans might best be characterised as a "work in progress" and that consequently it is perhaps not surprising

Committee for Education

Room 428, Parliament Buildings, Ballymiscaw, Stormont, Belfast, BT4 3XX

Tel: (028) 9052 1201

E-mail: peter.mccallion@niassembly.gov.uk

that they don't include or make any reference to: detailed measures, budget information or implementation plans.

4. Notwithstanding the above, the Committee noted that limited or unclear information is provided in respect of a number of Department of Education actions including: possible extensions to the Delivering Social Change nurture programme and literacy and numeracy programme; changes to childcare provision (available to working parents for up to 38 weeks per year for 3-4 year olds); improved access to childcare for children with disabilities; and an undertaking to raise awareness of the needs of children with disability in schools. Further to the above, some Members noted with considerable concern the continuing absence of clarity in respect of the Childcare Strategy. These Members felt that it is possibly a little ill-advised of the Department to raise expectations in respect of all of the above and not include some level of detail in terms of what is planned.

5. The Committee also noted that the methodology for a number of important education measures e.g. school inspection evaluation or the new "dashboard of measures" for schools or the measurement of "development progress at 3+", have not been fully developed. Indeed, it is understood that the dashboard is to include the Levels of Progression which are currently the subject of (suspended) industrial action in schools. It is also not clear whether the adoption of the dashboard will require changes to existing Department of Education policy. It is further understood that the "development progress at 3+" measure may require data gathering for a significant portion of the PfG period. Members felt that it was therefore possible that the development of a number of key PfG education measures may run into difficulties and may not be in place until perhaps later in the

Committee for Education

Room 428, Parliament Buildings, Ballymiscaw, Stormont, Belfast, BT4 3XX

Tel: (028) 9052 1201

E-mail: peter.mccallion@niassembly.gov.uk

2016-21 PfG period. Alternatively, owing to the innovative nature of some of the measures, if these are agreed early and data is captured quickly, Members felt it possible that the Department might subsequently wish to review its choice of measures and perhaps even seek to change these during the 2016-21 PfG period.

6. The Committee also noted that the draft Delivery Plans reference school leaver GCSE attainment and use this as one of a number of key measures of the education system. It is noted that the North operates an open GCSE market – that is to say, children/schools are generally free to select GCSEs offered by English examination bodies. Thus, changes in marking practices in other jurisdictions may adversely (or favourably) affect our students' performance in GCSEs. Such an eventuality is outside of the control of the Department of Education and therefore presents some risk to the efficacy of this measure. It is not clear how the Department is to take account of this.
7. Some Members noted with surprise that some of the lessons from the previous PfG period e.g. in respect of: the difficulties with the adoption of the Levels of Progression, the difficulties in securing agreement on the content of a “dashboard of measures” for schools; and uncontrollable changes to GCSE curricula and marking in other jurisdictions etc. do not appear to have been built-in to the new draft Delivery Plans.
8. Some Members also noted with surprise that the difficulties with Levels of Progression had not apparently been communicated by the Department of Education to the Department of Health which has used these measures to assess the educational progress of Looked After Children in one of its draft Delivery Plans. Members noted – at the evidence session on 9 November

Committee for Education

Room 428, Parliament Buildings, Ballymiscaw, Stormont, Belfast, BT4 3XX

Tel: (028) 9052 1201

E-mail: peter.mccallion@niassembly.gov.uk

2016 – that the Department of Health had also apparently failed to communicate to the Department of Education its decision to include Levels of Progression in the relevant draft Delivery Plan. The Committee were unsure as to whether this was a consequence of poor inter-departmental co-operation or the result of the adoption of a fairly complex and innovative PfG framework with a large number of fairly detailed Delivery Plans.

Some Members also noted with concern the absence of explicit reference in the draft Delivery Plans to existing Departmental legal commitments relating to Integrated Education and the failure to include schools in targets relating to shared spaces.

If you require clarification in respect of the above, please do not hesitate to have the Clerk of the Committee for the Executive Office contact the Clerk of the Committee for Education.

Is mise le meas,

Barry McElduff

**Barry McElduff MLA
Chairperson
Committee for Education
Enc.**

CC: Department of Education

Committee for Education

Room 428, Parliament Buildings, Ballymiscaw, Stormont, Belfast, BT4 3XX

Tel: (028) 9052 1201

E-mail: peter.mccallion@niassembly.gov.uk

COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION

Stakeholder Event – Programme for Government 2016-21

Summary of Education Issues Raised

Wednesday 16 November 2016

PRESENT:

Members –

Barry McElduff MLA (Chairperson)
Chris Lyttle MLA (Deputy Chairperson)
Carla Lockhart MLA
Catherine Seeley MLA
Colin McGrath MLA
Rosemary Barton MLA
Sandra Overend MLA
Phillip Logan MLA

Assembly Staff –

Peter McCallion
Mark McQuade
Bronagh Irwin
Kevin Marks
Zoe Rogers
Daniel Lowe
Ross Graham

Participants -

Governing Bodies Association
Council for Catholic Maintained Schools
Transferors Representative Council
General Teaching Council for Northern Ireland
Association of School and College Leaders
Northern Ireland Voluntary Grammar Schools Bursars Association
Association of Teachers and Lecturers
Centre for Evidence & Social Innovation, Queens University Belfast
Centre for Shared Education, Queens University Belfast
Stranmillis University College
Education Authority
Comhairle na Gaelscolaíochta
Children's Law Centre
Northern Ireland Commissioner for Children and Young People
Equality Commission for Northern Ireland
Early Years Organisation
Save the Children
Northern Ireland Youth Forum
Northern Ireland Council for Integrated Education
Drumragh Integrated College
Integrated Education Fund
Community Relations In Schools
Community Relations Council
Association of Controlled Grammar Schools
Fostering Network
Mencap

Family Fund
Disability Action
Employers for Childcare
The National Deaf Children's Society

Background to Event

The Executive launched a consultation on the 2016-21 Programme for Government (PfG) draft Framework in May 2016. A further consultation on the draft PfG Delivery Plans is currently underway.

The Committee for Education held an informal stakeholder event in order to inform its understanding of the education aspects of the 2016-21 Programme for Government draft Delivery Plans.

This event marked the beginning of a programme of engagement which will support the Committee's scrutiny of the 2016-21 Programme for Government. The Committee recognised that the views of other stakeholder groups may need to be sought in future, in this regard.

Members noted a large number of very useful and articulate contributions from stakeholders at the PfG event. Members agreed that the event helpfully informed their understanding of PfG-related and other important matters.

Summary of Education Issues Raised

Members noted a significant degree of buy-in and support among stakeholders for the outcomes-based approach adopted in the PfG and the focus on cross-departmental co-operation. It was evident that the ongoing programme of departmental engagement with stakeholders appeared to have been well received and that consequently stakeholders' investment in the PfG was high and their expectations were generally positive.

Notwithstanding the above, stakeholders generally commented with concern in respect of the absence of: detailed targets, ring-fenced budgets, implementation plans, obvious linkage to other major policy areas including e.g. the Childcare Strategy and the Children and Young People's Strategy and sufficiently explicit references to co-operation between departments and the 3rd sector. Stakeholders also noted with concern the absence of, or limited reference to, particular interests including: carers, children's participation in policy-making or policy delivery, disabled children, marginalised children, Irish Medium Education and Integrated Education.

Some stakeholders also felt that the PfG failed to reflect the Department's responsibility for the continued professional development of teachers and indicated that the quality of teachers being trained along with high quality leadership is critical to success. Concerns were also raised regarding DE's responsibility in respect of children with disabilities, young people in the justice system, Shared Education, and anti-bullying legislation – stakeholders argued that these didn't feature in the PfG.

Context for Education

Participants commented on the context for education – generally citing a very difficult budget situation and also referencing an inspection regime which was described as stifling

innovation in schools. Participants generally complained that there was no evidence that the objectives in the PfG for education would be followed-up with a sufficient level of funding and that there was no appetite in the Department for improvements to the inspection regime.

Some of these participants argued that current allocations designed to tackle underachievement linked to poverty were often ineffective and should be subject to greater levels of accountability. These stakeholders felt that Free School Meal Entitlement was not a reliable measure of deprivation and should not be the basis upon which additional education funding should be allocated to schools. Other stakeholders disagreed and argued for additional pupil premium allocations designed to enhance educational provision for children from socio-economically deprived backgrounds.

Some stakeholders contended that greater financial delegation - based on 3 year funding cycles - was required for schools in order to allow principals to better manage scant resources. Some of these stakeholders argued that the schools' estate was too large, with too many unsustainable schools and unviable 6th forms and that consequently resource was being wasted. They indicated an expectation that difficult Area Planning decisions including school closures would be required.

Participants also highlighted concerns in respect of the so-called real cost of education i.e. the increasing level of additional charges that schools feel that they must levy on parents in order to cover other costs e.g. school trips etc..

PFG Suggestions

Although stakeholders agreed that education should be of central importance to the Executive's PfG, there were differing views as to the purpose of education and the means by which the effectiveness of the education system should be assessed. Some stakeholders strongly contended that a continuing reliance on GCSE results – as a measure of the education system – was inappropriate. They highlighted unintended and unwelcome consequences e.g. pressure on teachers and undue focus on the margins of attainment. These stakeholders contended that the appreciation of the value of education should be much more broadly based in the PfG and should reflect the wide range of softer or societal associated outcomes.

Some stakeholders strongly argued that the current assessment regime for schools was not fit for purpose and should be reformed. Some of these participants argued that at least some of the key measures should reflect how the education system deals with the needs of marginalised children including: deaf children, Looked After Children and children making use of Education Other Than At School. Some participants also referred to the important role that education plays in overcoming limited social mobility and tackling underachievement both at the individual pupil level and in terms of underachievement in certain community groups including in urban or rural areas. These participants called for explicit PfG actions and measures to tackle the so-called “tail of underachievement”. Generally, participants commented favourably in this regard in respect of the Delivering Social Change projects.

Although stakeholders welcomed the reference in the draft Delivery Plans to the new “dashboard of measures” - which is designed to capture the value added by schools - they noted the absence of any detail in respect of that which was to be included in the dashboard. The Department subsequently advised that Levels of Progression are to be included in the dashboard.

Some participants argued that the PfG should include explicit reference to other forms of qualifications in schools e.g. conventional vocational qualifications and other practical qualifications including driving instruction.

Participants also highlighted concerns in respect of the availability of data on education which would underpin target-setting. These participants appeared to accept that a significant portion of the PfG period may be taken up with: devising new measures, gathering associated data and setting and then completely revising PfG targets.

Stakeholders advised of a number of other suggestions in order to enhance the education aspects of the PfG. These are summarised as follows:

- introduce a vocational measure of the success of all children in the education system which recognises the importance of citizenship and education itself rather than simply the attainment of qualifications;
- include a children's well-being measure in the assessment of efficacy of the education system – in line with the Children's Services Co-operation Act;
- ensure the new dashboard of measures properly recognises the value added by schools to individual pupils not necessarily or not only linked to socio-economic measures like Free School Meal Entitlement;
- recognise the role of Integrated Education in encouraging mixing in schools and review how Shared Education is playing its part in this process;
- include commitments to support a further roll-out of full service schools in order to enhance engagement by hard to reach groups in education;
- include a measure of the availability of play opportunities for children;
- review and revise the curriculum allowing teachers the professional autonomy to innovate and improve delivery;
- ensure that the PfG links to the Childcare Strategy and includes a comprehensive programme of Special Educational Needs early intervention support which features wrap around care for children;
- develop a key professional worker system for SEN children which includes prescribed referral pathways and supports the development of independence at key educational transitions;
- ensure the PfG focuses on the support and outcomes for children experiencing challenges owing to either their background or disability etc. while also recognising the need to support the progress of all children;
- develop an education policy focusing on ages 4 to 14;
- enhance support for children's mental health provision including counselling;
- include support for educational research including research into unmet educational need;
- include commitments to provide advocacy support for children and young people so as to ensure their voice is heard in policy development and policy delivery;
- require departments to include social impact clauses in contracts so as to encourage co-operation with the 3rd sector;
- incentivise schools to pool resources and support teachers to develop stronger communities of good practice;
- enhance support for teachers, governors and parents to engage meaningfully in schools and in the development of policy;
- consider the implications of Brexit on education; and
- consider alternatives to academic selection.



Response

Education Related Actions
In
Programme for Government

November 2016

INTRODUCTION

Children in Northern Ireland (CiNI) are the regional umbrella body for the children's sector in Northern Ireland. CiNI represents the interests of its 160 member organisations providing policy, information, training and participation support services to members in their direct work with and for children and young people. CiNI membership also includes colleagues in the children's statutory sector recognising that the best outcomes for children and young people are increasingly achieved working in partnership with all those who are committed to improving the lives of children and young people in NI.

CiNI welcomes this opportunity to provide some feedback and commentary on the Education Related Actions contained within the Programme for Government.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Working in Partnership

CiNI warmly welcomes the premise behind the Programme for Government to improve outcomes and work in partnership; it is our view that the best outcomes for children and young people can only be achieved through partnership working and co-operation.

In this regard, CiNI would highlight the need to ensure that the Children's Services Co-operation Act is fully embedded within these actions and not limited to a few.

The Children's Services Co-operation Act requires that every children's authority (including Government Departments) must co-operate towards the well-being of children and young people including:

- (a) physical and mental health;
- (b) the enjoyment of play and leisure;
- (c) learning and achievement;
- (d) living in safety and with stability;
- (e) economic and environmental well-being;
- (f) the making by them of a positive contribution to society;
- (g) living in a society which respects their rights;
- (h) living in a society in which equality of opportunity and good relations are promoted between persons who share a relevant characteristic and persons who do not share that characteristic.

It is imperative therefore that as the Department of Education is the lead responsible Department that all aspects of the Act are contained within the PfG actions.

Children with Disabilities

Not all children experience equal access to early years and childcare. There is a large volume of evidence to illustrate the positive outcomes for children when investment is targeted during the very early years, it is also important to note that some children and families will need additional supports and interventions at different points in a child's life.

The Department must have a sense of clarity and an agreed understanding of the concept of early intervention which must embrace early age and early stage intervention (irrespective of age). Indeed the Children & Young

People's Strategic Partnership sets out a position paper on early intervention and have an agreed definition which states:

Early intervention is defined as, 'intervening early and as soon as possible to tackle problems emerging for children, young people and their families or with a population at risk of developing problems. Early intervention may occur at any stage in a child's life'.

We would very much welcome the Education Committee adopting this definition of early intervention and encourage the Department of Education to do likewise.

There are a number of children and young people with disabilities who are often neglected within policies and frameworks, including children with a disability. Essentially there are limited actions within the document relating to children with a disability which we would like to see expanded, specifically transitions between primary and post primary.

Evidence clearly highlights that children with disabilities suffer from poor transition planning. All too often the transition of disabled young people causes stress, upset and disruption. Moreover, confusion for families in the transfer process can lead to ambiguity around the process as well as an increase in feelings of isolation within the family unit.

Transition difficulties for disabled young people can appear magnified; we would welcome further actions within the plan which will be of benefit to the child and their family.

Childcare & Child Poverty

For all parents juggling work and childcare has become more complex, often involving the use of family and friends. Moreover, families with a disabled child have an increased likelihood of being in poverty which is linked to the increased costs of raising a child with disabilities and the loss of income as parents choose to look after their child. Findings indicate that the cost of raising a disabled child is approximately three times the cost of raising a non-disabled child.¹

When it comes to development of policy in respect of children with disabilities and childcare there is no real consideration given to their particular needs and circumstances. As an example, emphasis on area-based approaches to disadvantage and targeted areas of disadvantage has an adverse impact on children with disabilities who are geographically dispersed and will often experience difficulty accessing specialist provision in their local area.

In 2004, the Promoting Social Inclusion (PSI) Working Group on Disability identified barriers to employment, education, transport, housing, access to information and lifelong learning for children and adults with disabilities and made a series of recommendations.² One of the recommendations was:

- Early Years and Family Support: More childcare provision is needed for families with children with disabilities.

Children in Northern Ireland fully support the action contained within this document regarding childcare for children with disabilities however we are concerned it does not go far enough.

¹ Child Poverty Alliance (2014) *Beneath the Surface: Child Poverty in Northern Ireland*. Belfast: CPA.

² Promoting Social Inclusion Working Group on Disability (2009), Report of the Promoting Social Inclusion Working Group on Disability, Belfast, OFMDFM

Childcare should be considered within two contexts: firstly, as contributing to a child's education and development and secondly as an economic issue, to facilitate parents to get in to and stay in work and an opportunity for job creation.

Government have long argued that the best route out of poverty is through paid work. However, in Northern Ireland, there is an absence of a childcare infrastructure to support parents to be able to get into work, education or training.

We really do need to see a childcare strategy that deals with the high costs of childcare; increases accessibility of childcare services, and greater information on what is available to help parents. We would particularly welcome a fundamental and long term commitment from the Department of Education to introduce a robust childcare strategy without delay.

Indicators and Data

We wish to highlight that we have concerns regarding the extent to which the indicators and data source actually does inform and underpin the overarching outcomes. We believe that currently the document lacks specific detail to show how the actions will improve the lives of children and young people in Northern Ireland.

In its report, 'Barriers to Effective Government Delivery for Children,'³ NICCY stated that

"Existing data is not always sufficiently disaggregated and insufficient data exists in respect of vulnerable and marginalised groups of children. There is a

3

[http://www.niccy.org/uploaded_docs/2011/Publications/QUB%20Barriers%20Report%20-%203%20Nov%2011%20\(body%20pages\).pdf](http://www.niccy.org/uploaded_docs/2011/Publications/QUB%20Barriers%20Report%20-%203%20Nov%2011%20(body%20pages).pdf)

limited amount of qualitative research conducted on the experiences of children and young people. The lack of good quality baseline data in some instances can make meaningful assessment of progress against the strategies, policies and action plans particularly problematic.”

CiNI recognises that some work has been undertaken in relation to disaggregating data to consider specific groups of vulnerable children and young people. However we believe that there remains considerable work to be done to develop a comprehensive, holistic set of data. Clearly an extensive range of data sets will enable the collation of much important and valuable information. They would also provide a complete picture of children and young people’s progress toward realisation of the overarching outcomes.

CONCLUSION

We wish to reiterate our support for the outcomes based Programme for Government that has the potential to improve outcomes for all children and young people; however it is somewhat disappointing that actions to improve the lives of some children and young people are limited in nature.

Finally, we trust that this feedback will be useful and beneficial to the Education Committee as it takes forward this work.

Ellen Finlay, Policy Officer

Children in Northern Ireland (CiNI)
Unit 9, 40 Montgomery Road
Belfast BT6 9HL
Tel: 028 9040 1290
Fax: 028 9070 9418
Email: ellen@ci-ni.org.uk

Note on concerns about the draft Programme for Government

12 December 2016

You will probably have noted this, but just in case you have missed it, I am writing to alert you to the disappearance from Outcome 14 of the indicator 'reduce poverty' and its lead measure: % of population living in (absolute)poverty (BHC) AND % of population living in (relative) poverty (BHC)), which featured in the original Framework document.

In our response to the Framework we had welcomed the introduction of the 'reduce poverty' indicator in support of Outcome 14 'We give our children and young people the best start in life'. But we argued that **reducing child poverty** is crucial to delivering on Outcome 14 and ensuring that all children have the best start in life.

Therefore, we urged the inclusion of child poverty measures, including the collection and reporting of levels of child poverty for different age groups, particularly for young children.¹

Furthermore, we recommended that the Executive should publish data on levels of persistent child poverty and track the additional measures set out in its own Child Poverty Strategy (2016), including monitoring the percentage of households with children where at least one adult is in work and the household is in poverty.

However, despite these obligations and commitments, the draft Pfg does not mention child poverty reduction. We would argue that without an indicator to prioritise the need to reduce child poverty, it makes no sense for the Executive to outline its commitment in Outcome 14's delivery plan to tackling the educational achievement gap between children from low income families and their better-off peers, to prioritising early intervention and to focusing on the crucial early years from birth, in order to help end child poverty. The delivery plans for Outcomes 5 and 3 also highlight the need to tackle the educational achievement gap between children from low income families and their better-off peers.

We would urge you to insist that a clear priority in meeting Outcome 14 must be to tackle child poverty amongst young children. The early years are a crucial stage in life for development in childhood and for laying the foundations for later learning and development.

We would also urge you to impress on the Executive that indicator 19 (% of population living in absolute and relative poverty (Before housing costs) should be expanded to include child poverty as outlined above.

Many thanks

Anne Moore

Save the Children, Manager Policy, Advocacy and Campaigns

028 90 432824

¹ According to the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016, the Executive has a duty to produce a strategy "which sets out the measures it proposes to take to ensure, as far as possible, that children in Northern Ireland do not experience socio-economic disadvantage". The Government also remains legally obligated to publish child poverty statistics across the four income measures set out in the Child Poverty Act 2010



**Northern Ireland
Assembly**

Committee for Education

Russell Welsh
Departmental Assembly Liaison Officer
Department of Education
Rathgael House
Balloo Road
Bangor
BT19 7PR

11 November 2016

Our Ref: 2016.201

Dear Russell,

2016-21 PfG Draft Departmental Delivery Plans

Please pass on the Committee's thanks to officials for the evidence session on 9 November 2016 on the 2016-21 Programme for Government (PfG) Draft Departmental Delivery Plans.

The Committee agreed to write to the Department forwarding the attached draft summary table of the educational aspects of the PfG Draft Delivery Plans. The Committee requested that the Department confirm that the content is accurate and complete and provide further information in respect of the development of education-related targets/measures.

The Committee also agreed to write to the Department seeking:

Committee for Education

Room 428, Parliament Buildings, Ballymiscaw, Stormont, Belfast, BT4 3XX

Tel: (028) 9052 0379

E-mail: committee.education@niassembly.gov.uk

- an update on the increase or decrease in the level of participation in shared education by schools;
- clarification as to how Area Planning proposals are to be rural-proofed;
- clarification as to whether: the new “dashboard of measures”, the agreed statement on what is valued in education and the new methodology relating to the evaluation of education/school quality (based on school inspections) will involve changes to the Every School a Good School policy. In particular, Members sought clarity as to whether the sustainability indicators for schools are to be revised in line with the dashboard of measures and/or the education value statement and/or the new evaluation methodology.;
- an explanation as to why the PfG Indicator 9 refers to sharing in e.g. leisure centres and libraries but does not refer to schools; and
- an explanation as to why the PfG draft Delivery Plans do not include an Indicator in respect of the facilitation, encouragement and (as appropriate) promotion of shared and integrated education in line with legal obligations.

If you require further clarification in respect of the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

A response before Friday 25 November 2016 would be greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely

Signed Peter McCallion

Peter McCallion
Clerk
Committee for Education
Enc.

Committee for Education

Room 428, Parliament Buildings, Ballymiscaw, Stormont, Belfast, BT4 3XX

Tel: (028) 9052 0379

E-mail: committee.education@niassembly.gov.uk

Rathgael House
43 Balloo Road
Rathgill
Bangor
BT19 7PR

Peter McCallion
Clerk to the Committee for Education
Room 375a
Parliament Buildings
Ballymiscaw
Stormont
BELFAST
BT4 3XX

Tel No: (028) 9127 9746
Fax No: (028) 9127 9100

Email: russell.welsh@education-ni.gov.uk

Your ref: 2016.201

15 December 2016

Dear Peter

2016-210 PfG DRAFT DEPARTMENTAL DELIVERY PLANS

Your letter dated 11 November refers.

With respect to the table provided by the Committee, Departmental officials have provided comments as appropriate and are content that the information is accurate and complete from our present understanding. An updated table is attached.

Regarding the development of education-related targets/measures, the methodology being used for the Programme for Government (PfG) does not include the use of targets at indicator level. This is in part because the objective is to achieve the identified high-level outcomes, to which energies are to be directed, rather than focussing on targets which can distort behaviours away from the delivery of the overall outcome.

In line with the outcomes-based methodology, the development of performance measurements (by which indicator owners can gain assurance that actions are having a positive effect) is underway. Given that the PfG is presently only in draft, and actions may need to be revised or added, that exercise is not expected to conclude before the end of the calendar year.

Finally, with reference to the Committee's additional questions, responses are provided in the further table attached. I would draw the Committee's attention to the fact that the Department is awaiting input from the Executive Office in relation to two points and I will write separately to the Committee when I receive a response.

Yours sincerely

Russell

RUSSELL WELSH
Departmental Assembly Liaison Officer

Education Committee queries on 2016-21 PfG Draft Departmental Delivery Plans

Education Committee Query	Department of Education Response
<p>An update on the increase or decrease in the level of participation in shared education by schools.</p>	<p>There are currently 314 schools involved in the Delivering Social Change Shared Education Signature Project (against a target of 350). Agreed action plans include an increase in shared classes within these schools. An additional application call issued in September 2016 and work is in progress with a number of other schools with the expectation that the target will be achieved. The Peace IV Shared Education programme is expected to commence implementation in schools with no or limited sharing in 2017. The number of schools and pupils engaged in shared education will increase as a result.</p>
<p>Clarification as to how Area Planning proposals are to be rural proofed.</p>	<p>Decisions on statutory Development Proposals (DPs) are first and foremost based on ensuring that the educational experience of pupils is enhanced within a school setting that is educationally sustainable and financially viable. Each DP is assessed on its own particular circumstances against the criteria and indicators set out in the Sustainable Schools Policy (SSP). These criteria and indicators frame the characteristics of a sustainable school. The SSP was assessed against the Rural Development Council's rural proofing checklist set out in its report, <i>Striking the Balance</i>, before publication in 2009, and no adverse impact was</p>

Education Committee queries on 2016-21 PfG Draft Departmental Delivery Plans

	<p>identified.</p> <p>The SSP recognises the needs of rural communities and this is reflected in a lower enrolment threshold for rural primary schools, an accessibility criterion which provides guidance on home to school travel times and a ‘strong links with the community’ criterion which recognises the central place a school has for many communities, both urban and rural.</p> <p>Officials from the Department also engaged with officials from the Rural Policy Branch of the former Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD) when the policy was being developed to ensure that it adequately addressed rural needs.</p> <p>The Department will continue to meet its legal obligations to give due regard to rural needs.</p>
<p>Clarification as to whether: the new “dashboard of measures”, the agreed statement on what is valued in education and the new methodology relating to the evaluation of education/school quality (based on school inspections) will involve changes to the Every School a Good School policy. In particular, Members sought clarity as to whether the sustainability indicators for schools are to be revised in line with the dashboard of measures</p>	<p><i>Every School a Good School</i>, the school improvement policy, is one of the strands of our focus on raising standards and tackling educational underachievement. No changes are currently planned in respect of the key principles and policy approach set out in the policy document.</p> <p>Across the policies and programmes operating in the education system there are a range of measures which are used to</p>

Education Committee queries on 2016-21 PfG Draft Departmental Delivery Plans

<p>and/or the education value statement and/or the new evaluation methodology.</p>	<p>indicate their impact of activity and further inform policy development and practice. There is, however, a perception that only attainment measures, especially exam results at Level 2, contribute to the evaluation of the education system and school performance. Reflecting the fact that it is a high-level articulation of what the Executive wants to secure for our citizens, the PfG itself presents a limited number of measures related to educational outcomes. The dashboard will communicate a richer, more diverse range of performance measures relating to the context and performance of our education system that underpin and complement the measures in the PfG. An effective dashboard will evidence a strong, coherent message about what is valued in education and increase awareness of what constitutes a 'good' education system. It should also promote a shared understanding of the vision for education and what all partners can do to support our children and young people, recognising that a range of inputs and factors determine outcomes for our pupils.</p> <p>The ultimate aim of all policies and programmes is to ensure that every learner fulfils his or her potential at every stage of development. Each of the policies and programmes make a</p>
--	--

Education Committee queries on 2016-21 PfG Draft Departmental Delivery Plans

	<p>particular contribution to that overall goal and each has its own set of indicators and measures that are aligned with the delivery of that policy intent.</p> <p>The Sustainable Schools Policy has 6 criteria and a range of indicators that relate to a number of existing DE policies including Every School a Good School. In line with the NIAO recommendations in its report – “Sustainability of Schools” the Department is considering the current indicators to ensure they are fit for purpose. Any changes to the indicators will reflect the current policy position for the assessment of a quality education experience in line with Every School A Good School.</p> <p>With regard to the new methodology relating to the evaluation of education/school quality, the intention is not to create a new measure for school quality, but rather to develop a methodology for using inspection outcomes (reached in line with existing practice) to reflect school quality in a way that best serves as a measure at system level.</p>
<p>An explanation as to why PfG Indicator 9 refers to sharing in e.g. leisure centres and libraries but does not refer to schools.</p>	<p>The Department is awaiting input from the Executive Office on Outcome 9 and will respond separately on this.</p>
<p>An explanation as to why the PfG draft Delivery Plans do not include an Indicator in respect of the facilitation, encouragement</p>	<p>As above.</p>

Education Committee queries on 2016-21 PfG Draft Departmental Delivery Plans

and (as appropriate) promotion of shared and integrated education in line with legal obligations.	
---	--

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE Comments
Review the school evaluation framework in order to support increased innovation.	Measures not yet developed.	Derek Baker, Department for the Economy	Indicator 22 – Rate of innovation activity (% of companies engaging in innovation activity).	Outcome 1: we prosper thru a strong competitive regionally balanced economy.	As set out in more detail below
Increase integration of education and work – support to be increased for schools to embed innovation, collaboration and entrepreneurship at all levels of education from primary to career development. Develop a new pattern of school-to employer engagement – includes the changes to the evaluation framework set out above.	Measures not yet developed.			Outcome 5: We are an innovative, creative society, where people can fulfil their potential.	Careers Advisory Forum has been commissioned by DE and DfE Ministers to bring forward advice on school to employer engagement by May 2017
Promoting skills in growth sectors from early education through to A-level.	Measures not yet developed.	Derek Baker, Department for the Economy	Indicator 16: Seasonally adjusted employment rate (16-64). Indicator 18: A better jobs index. Indicator 34: Employment rate by council area.	Outcome 1: we prosper thru a strong competitive regionally balanced economy. Outcome 3: We have a more equal society. Outcome 6: We have more people working in better jobs.	Implementation of the Careers Strategy to facilitate informed careers decisions by young people at key decision-making points
Integrate rural and disabled	Measures not	John McGrath,	Indicator 23: average	Outcome 2: We live	Resources of £459k

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE Comments
services with health and education passenger transport to increase opportunities for rural communities.	yet developed.	Department for Infrastructure	<p>journey time on key economic corridors.</p> <p>Indicator 25: 25% of all journeys which are made by walking /cycling/public transport.</p>	<p>and work sustainably – protecting the environment.</p> <p>Outcome 13: We connect people and opportunities through our infrastructure.</p>	<p>have been allocated in 2016/17 from the NICS Cross-cutting Reform Programme, of which £40k has been allocated to the EA, for the Integrated Passenger Transport Project. This project will test the concept of using all publicly funded buses more flexibly to better meet the travel needs of users and achieve better value for money. DE continues to engage with other transport providers through this DfI led project to ensure the effective and efficient use of resources.</p>
Delivery of an enhanced Active Schools Programme.					<p>The Department for Infrastructure and the Public Health Agency is funding Sustrans to deliver the Active School Travel Programme to 2021. DE is engaged in relation to the delivery of the programme and will</p>

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE Comments
					consider a programme of cycle shelter installations to support the extended programme. Investment will be considered against competing priorities and in line with the available capital budget.

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE Comments
<p>With Department of Health, potentially undertake a research proposal to learn what is currently working to reduce health and educational inequalities in school and on promoting physical activity possible through expansion of the iMatter programme.</p>	<p>Measures not yet developed.</p>	<p>Dr Anne Kilgallen, Department of Health</p>	<p>Indicator 2: gap between highest and lowest deprivation quintile in healthy life expectancy at birth.</p> <p>Indicator 3: healthy life expectancy at birth.</p> <p>Indicator 4: preventable mortality.</p> <p>Indicator 5: % babies born at low birth weight.</p>	<p>Outcome 3: We have a more equal society.</p> <p>Outcome 4: We enjoy long, healthy, active lives.</p> <p>Outcome 14: We give our children and young people the best start in life.</p>	<p>Initial discussion with DoH has taken place.</p> <p>DE will circulate to schools material received from DoH/PHA on the promotion of physical activity under the iMatter banner.</p> <p>The ongoing work in implementing the joint DE and DoH Food in Schools policy is likely to be relevant to the healthy eating aspects of this action.</p>
<p>Collaboration across government to mainstream the Early Intervention Transformation Programme.</p>					<p>The Delivery Plan for Indicator 15 has an action to build on Delivering Social Change EITP outcomes and embed early intervention in universal early years practice.</p>
<p>Revise the system-level and school-level evaluation structures to support the highest quality educational</p>	<p>A target for GCSE (or level 2) attainment has not been</p>	<p>Dr David Hughes, Department of Education</p>	<p>Indicator 11: % school leavers achieving at level 2 or above including English and</p>	<p>Outcome 3: We have a more equal society.</p>	<p>Prior work on a Dashboard of Measures for education-system evaluation is being reviewed in light of the</p>

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE Comments
provision and outcomes by creating a dashboard of measures. This will reflect the wide range of outcomes that constitute success and will demonstrate the interplay of responsibilities across the system.	set – the intention is to improve beyond the current trajectory for improvement.		Maths.	Outcome 5: We are an innovative, creative society, where people can fulfil their potential.	development of the Programme for Government
Develop a strong, coherent message about what is valued in education and a shared understanding of what all partners can do to support our young people.	A target for FSME attainment gap has not been set – the intention is to improve FSME attainment beyond the current trajectory,		Indicator 12: gap between % non-FSME school leavers and % FSME school leavers achieving at level 2 of above including English and Maths. % schools found to be good or better	Outcome 11: We have high quality public services. Outcome 14: We give our children and young people the best start in life.	A future system-level dashboard of measures must encapsulate what is valued in education; these two strands of work will be taken forward together.
Continue and increase the momentum in Area Planning in effectively implementing the Sustainable Schools Policy and Area Plans will support the delivery of improved educational provision and enhance the network of sustainable schools.	thereby narrowing the attainment gap. A new measure for school quality has not yet been developed – in the meantime existing school				The Sustainable Schools Policy and area planning aim to deliver educationally sustainable financially viable schools to meet the needs of children and young people. Consultation on the draft first strategic Education Authority Area Plan closes on 12 December 2016. Annual Work action/plans to address priority actions

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE Comments
	inspections will provide a qualitative indicator.				at the local level will follow after input from Local Area Planning Groups, which include Planning Authorities and sectoral interests. The new Area Plan will cover the period April 2107-March 2020.
Schools will be supported to innovate and collaborate as they focus their efforts to tackle underachievement. DE is to revise the education system and school accountability framework in order to support innovation in the interest of positive outcomes.					This aspect will be included in the revision of system evaluation and school evaluation.
Foster school to school collaboration with FE to support professional development, curriculum delivery and innovative practice.					Area Learning Communities (ALCs) provide vehicle for school to school and school to FE collaboration to deliver the Entitlement Framework and share best practice.
DE to ensure that there are good clear routes through schools to pursue both					Entitlement Framework ensures all pupils have access to balance of

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE Comments
academic and professional / technical educational pathways after the end of compulsory schooling at 16 and beyond.					applied and general courses at Key Stage 4 and post-16, with the opportunity to access some courses offered in collaboration with FE colleges
The Executive will support more effective engagement with parents to help support their children’s education from the earliest stages through to leaving school, and with children and young people in corroboration of their educational progress.					Building upon the previous <i>Education Works</i> campaign, work is to begin on a parental engagement strategy.
The Executive to work to put in place structured means by which schools, parents, employers and other stakeholders can meet, engage, inform and learn.					Career Advisory Forum (CAF) commissioned to provide advice to Ministers on school to employer engagement by May 2017
DE will work with other key departments in the delivery of actions within the PFG and beyond aimed at addressing social disadvantage.					Liaison with other Departments will be developed further following the conclusion of the period of consultation on delivery

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE Comments
					plans.
<p>Design and deliver a Digital Learning in Schools Programme so as to: create a long term partnership between education, industry and communities; build capacity and empower education; and develop the skills pipeline. The programme will focus on inclusion of young people who are living in poverty.</p>	<p>Measures not yet developed.</p>	<p>Ian Maye and Denis McMahon, Department for Communities</p>	<p>Indicator 19: % population living in absolute and relative poverty (before housing costs).</p> <p>Indicator 28: Self-efficacy.</p>	<p>Outcome 3: We have a more equal society.</p> <p>Outcome 5: We are an innovative, creative society, where people can fulfil their potential.</p> <p>Outcome 8: We care for others and we help those in need.</p> <p>Outcome 10: We are a confident, welcoming, outward-looking society.</p>	<p>In collaboration with the Executive Office and the Department of Education, the Department for the Communities is leading on a Social Cohesion driven programme called “Digital Learning in Schools”. This programme will focus on building teacher confidence and capability in delivering digital skills in the classroom. The initial project will focus on Urban Villages and will be delivered by NI Screen in partnership with Queens University Belfast. If successful, the aim is to develop a NI wide strategy for extending the delivery of these vital skills</p>

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE Comments
					across NI.
Individual Early Intervention Transformation Programme activities to be evaluated and subject to agreement continue some or all of the work beyond the 4 year period previously agreed.	Measures not yet developed.	Eilis McDaniel, Department of Health			Delivery Plan for Indicator 15 has an action to build on DSC EITP outcomes and embed early intervention in universal early years practice.
DE is to support DoH in the development of a social inclusion wraparound service – designed to support people at risk to access services from across the Social Inclusion Group and across government.	Measures not yet developed.	Denis McMahon, Department for Communities			DE will work with DfC as required, following the conclusion of the consultation on Delivery Plans
More disadvantaged families particularly those seeking work to be enabled to access early years childcare. Extra places would be sourced from community and voluntary settings, private sector settings with vacancies and registered childminders.	Measures not yet developed.	Cathy Galway, Department of Education			Executive Childcare Strategy actions will help to address this action. DE/DfC will work with Childcare Partnerships in each trust in taking forward this action.
The Delivery Plan refers to ongoing support for the Delivering Social Change Nurture programme but gives no information as to whether this is to be maintained or	Measures not yet developed.	Caroline Gillan, Department of Education			The Minister has indicated that he would wish to sustain existing provision while seeking to engage other Departments and

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE Comments
increased.					funding sources in developing a new Nurture Programme. Work to develop a new programme is currently underway.
The Delivery Plan refers to ongoing legacy work relating to the Delivering Social Changes literacy and numeracy programme but gives no information as to whether this is to be maintained or increased.	Measures not yet developed.	An SRO is not identified for this intervention			The ETI DSC report (due shortly) will provide more detail on the existing legacy that is already evidenced in the former DSC schools and DE will be exploring how best to take forward the legacy of the signature programme into the future.
Explore the feasibility with DE to extend free childcare provision available to working parents for up to 38 weeks per year for 3-4 year olds.	Measures not yet developed.	Tommy O'Reilly, Department for Communities	Indicator 17: Economic inactivity rate excluding students. Indicator 32: employment rate of 16-64 year olds by deprivation quintile. Indicator 33: % people working part-time who	Outcome 3: We have a more equal society.	Delivery Plan for Indicator 15 includes a key intervention to 'extend responsive, quality provision in early childhood education and care'. Executive Childcare Strategy actions will help to address this action.

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE Comments
DE and DfE and local partners establish an Employability Forum in each council area to effectively bring about a change in how we better match the supply and demand for work through the Community Planning process.	Measures not yet developed.		would like to work more hours.		Career Advisory Forum (CAF) commissioned to provide advice to Ministers on school to employer engagement by May 2017
Consolidation of wellbeing and mental health services with the Department of Education. The Delivery Plan refers to the promotion of positive mental health and emotional well-being as being a central focus in schools. The Plan refers to a number of DE preventative programmes to educate children on the risks to their mental health and emotional well-being and to assist teachers and equip parents to deal with these issues.	Measures not yet developed but will include Health and Social Care measures.	Chris Matthews, Department of Health	Indicator 6: % population with GHQ12 scores greater than or equal to 4 (signifying possible mental health problem).	Outcome 4: We enjoy long, healthy, active lives. Outcome 8: We care for others and we help those in need.	We intend to further develop the material available under the I-Matter programme to include promotion of positive emotional health and well-being (EHWB). We are funding a pilot 'Preventative Education – Keeping Safe' project that is being taken forward by the NSPCC which aims to equip teachers to effectively teach a preventative education curriculum and engaging with the school community. We will also engage with DoH and PHA to consider all existing

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE Comments
					EHWB programmes and ensure a coordinated approach moving forward.

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE comments
Work to identify barriers to participation in arts and culture and co-design relevant actions and interventions to diversify cultural participation and improve engagement amongst those groups with lower levels of engagement. This will include developing potential early intervention measures to raise ambitions for a career in arts and culture.	Measures not yet Developed.	Ian Maye, Department for Communities	Indicator 27: % engaging in arts/cultural activities in the past year.	Outcome 5: We are an innovative, creative society, where people can fulfil their potential.	DE will work with DfC as required, following the conclusion of the consultation on Delivery Plans.
DE, DfC, DoH and DfE to develop an Economic Social Inclusion Framework to enable people of working age to improve their skills thru the provision of training and support and therefore enhancing employment opportunities.	Measures are not yet developed and responsibility will set with the Strategic Skills Forum when established.	Derek Baker, Department for the Economy	Indicator 14: proportion of the workforce in employment qualified to level 1 and above, level 2 and above, level 3 and above and level 4 and above.	Outcome 6: We have more people working in better jobs	DE will work with DfC as required, following the conclusion of the consultation on Delivery Plans
DE, DfC, DoH and DfE to refresh the Community Family Support Programme.					DE will work with others as required, following the conclusion of the consultation on Delivery Plans.
DE and DfE to rationalise the current skills advisory landscape to deliver a collaborative approach across government and with industry, education and academia to inform skills strategy, policy and deliver the					DE will work with DfE to take forward this action and ensure appropriate engagement with education sector.

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE comments
skills pipeline, pathways and progression for our economy.					
<p>DE and DfE implement the recommendations of the policy review of the education of 14 to 19 year old including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote parity of esteem between academic and vocational routes • Complete a project to investigate decision making by individuals and institutions re post-16 options by April 2019 • Develop a methodology for measuring educational attainment of the entire cohort at 18 and not just school leavers by April 2018 • Introduce revised GCSEs in English and maths by September 2017 (for first teaching) taking into account both departments literacy and numeracy strategies • Produce an analysis by April 2018 of how FE can contribute to shared education pre-16 					<p>Parity of esteem between qualifications – through the Entitlement Framework, schools are required to deliver balance of applied and general courses. Implementation of Careers Strategy to facilitate well informed careers decision making, particularly in terms of most appropriate route for young person post-16.</p> <p>Revised GCSEs in English and maths by September 2017 – CCEA is on target for the delivery of new GCSEs in these essential subjects. They will include greater onus on the functionality of the subjects and the importance of literacy and numeracy in line with employers' comments and expectations.</p>
DE and DfE to deliver by December 2017 a digital service					Personal Learner Record (PLR) – Schools are continuing to roll-

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE comments
to enhance the recording of employability skills, qualifications and learning episodes that will allow citizens to share their Personal Learning Records and receive feedback from employers.					out the Unique Learner Number (ULN) to all Year 11 pupils. This will be the route by which pupils will be able to access their PLR. DfE is continuing to make progress on a NI specific PLR which is unique to learners here.
DE and DfE to implement the recommendations of the Careers Strategy by 2020 including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of a central database by DfE to improve the quality and depth of access to work experience opportunities • DfE to ensure reliable labour market information is available • DfE to provide careers advice in a more accessible way 					A joint steering committee of officials from DE and DfE oversees the implementation of the Careers Strategy and associated action plans. Careers Advisory Forum, established under the strategy, provides advice to Departments on the Careers System.
DE to continue to deliver with partners on T:BUC activities including the Strule campus; 10 shared campuses; summer camps, 10k NEETS on the new United Youth volunteering programme.	Performance evaluation will be based on individual programme achievement.	Dr Mark Browne, The Executive Office	Indicator 26: a respect Index. Indicator 31: % who think leisure parks, libraries and shopping centres in their areas are “shared and open” to both Protestants and Catholics.	Outcome 7: We have a safe community where we respect the law and each other. Outcome 9: We are a	As contracting authority for the Strule programme, DE continues to deliver construction and business change projects with educational, community and statutory stakeholders. Five shared education campus projects under the T:BUC headline action are progressing in planning - Limavady and

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE comments
			Indicator 35: % population who believe their cultural identity is respected by society.	shared society that respects diversity.	Ballycastle post primary school projects and Moy, Brookeborough and Dunenane/Moneynick primary school projects. A third call for applicant projects closes in January 2017.
DE to encourage, facilitate and promote shared education in line with legislation and the DE Sharing Works policy and the DSC Shared Education project.				Outcome 10: We are a confident, welcoming, outward-looking society.	Briefing sessions have been completed for DE and with relevant arms-length bodies on the duties/powers in the Shared Education Act 2014. A 6-monthly survey has been implemented to gather data. Work is progressing on the policy commitments. DSC SESP continues to be implemented – currently there are 314 schools, in excess of 22,000 pupils, over 2,200 teachers and more than 3,500 parents involved in shared classes and activities. A capacity building strategy is being rolled out to ensure teachers have the knowledge, skills and ability to deliver high quality shared education.
DE to continue to facilitate integrated education including consideration of the					The report for the Review of Integrated Education has been received and is currently being

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE comments
recommendations from the review of integrated education.					considered by the Minister.
DoJ working with partners to increase the qualifications and readiness for employment amongst those who offend including the potential repurposing of the Woodland Juvenile Justice Centre – this includes an EOTAS setting which is to transfer to EA.	Measures not yet developed.	David Lavery, Department of Justice	Indicator 39: Reoffending rate	Outcome 7: We have a safe community where we respect the law and each other.	Work to conclude the transfer of education services in Woodlands JJC to the Education Authority is ongoing and expected to conclude in early 2017.
With DoH ensuring care-experienced children are given a voice by way of formal engagement mechanism working with and thru stakeholder organisations.	Measures and the LAC and Family support strategies are in development.	Eilis McDaniel, Department of Health	Indicator 10: % care leavers who aged 19 were in education, training or employment.	Outcome 8: We care for others and we help those in need.	DE has commissioned VOYPIC to engage with Care Experienced Children to ensure that their views and experiences are articulated to the Department and can be fully taken account of.
With other government agencies and in line with the Children's Services Co-operation Act implement the Looked After Children and Family Support strategies – including improving educational outcomes for children in care- this is to include the piloting of LAC champions by the EA.				Outcome 14: We give our children and young people the best start in life.	The QUB Nurture evaluation pointed to the prevalence of attachment difficulties among LAC children / children known to social services. The Department's Nurture programme is likely to contribute to delivery of this indicator. The LAC Education project has multi-agency working at its core and seeks to improve support

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE comments
					<p>for LAC @ KS2 level through the introduction of a LAC Champion.</p> <p>The Children’s Services Co-operation Act places a duty on individual NI departments to co-operate with one another (and others) to improve the well-being of children and young people.</p>
<p>The education sector with partners including DfC, DoH, DfE etc. identify and implement a prioritised list of improvements for disabled young people transitioning from education to employment – initial changes to be in place by 2018-19.</p>	<p>Measures not yet developed.</p>	<p>Andrew Hamilton, Department for Communities</p>	<p>Indicator 42: Average life satisfaction score of people with disabilities.</p>	<p>Outcome 8: We care for others and we help those in need.</p> <p>Outcome 9: We are a shared society that respects diversity.</p>	<p>DE is working with DfC in relation to PfG Indicator 42 and is represented on the cross-departmental and cross-sectoral Disability Employment Stakeholder Forum in regard to improving transition from school to employment for young people with a disability.</p>
<p>DE to also raise disability awareness of the needs of children with disability in schools.</p>					<p>The Department has developed a DVD to raise awareness of provision for children with SEN in mainstream schools, including young people with disabilities. The DVD will issue when the new SEN Code of Practice is launched for consultation in the second quarter of 2017. Furthermore,</p>

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE comments
					the Department has asked the Education Authority to take forward capacity building to support the implementation of the new SEN framework. This 'capacity building' is being scoped at present (November 2016.) The capacity building will take place during 2017 and 2018.
DE to develop a new children and young people's strategy.					The Children and Young People's Strategy is an Executive Strategy. DE is leading on this on behalf of the Executive. The draft Strategy is currently being developed in conjunction with stakeholders including all NI departments and is expected to be published for consultation in December 2016
DE to work with the educational sector to improve the educational attainment of young people with a disability.					DE will work with DfC as required, following the conclusion of the consultation on Delivery Plans.
DE and DfC to implement the Childcare Strategy in order to					DE will work with DoH to ensure this action is taken

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE comments
provide better access to childcare for children with disabilities and children of parents with disabilities.					forward.
With DoH and other partners, adopt and embed a coordinated and collaborative approach to the investment in and implementation of early childhood development policies and programmes and transform practice across core maternity, health visiting and early years education and learning services to improve the social and emotional development of children aged 0-4 – through inter agency working and early intervention.	Measures not yet developed.	Cathy Galway, Department of Education	Indicator 15: % children at appropriate stage of development in their immediate pre-school year. Indicator 2: gap between highest and lowest deprivation quintile in healthy life expectancy at birth. Indicator 3: healthy life expectancy at birth. Indicator 5: % babies born at low birth weight.	Outcome 14: We give our children and young people the best start in life. Outcome 8 and Outcome 6 in relation to childcare	DE will work with key strategic partners to ensure the action is taken forward.
Engage and empower and support parents in their role as their child's first and ongoing educator – to support this, the Executive will make available to all the universal child health review at age 2.					DE will work with key strategic partners, including health practitioners to inform the action is taken forward.
Extend responsive quality provision from 2017 in early childhood education and care initiatives for families with children aged 3-4 of up to 38 weeks per year – the Executive is					Executive Childcare Strategy actions will help to address this action.

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECTS OF PFG DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Education-related actions – to be undertaken by DE with partners	How is success or failure measured?	Who is in charge? (SRO)	What Indicator does this action support?	What Outcome does this action support?	DE comments
to complement existing pre-school provision with responsive affordable childcare provision.					
Develop a regional approach to measuring children’s development in their immediate pre-school year and put in place timely interventions for those children and families who need additional support.					A new measure was introduced on a pilot basis in Autumn 2016. Putting baselines in place and establishing regular monitoring arrangements forms part of the data development agenda for the PFG.
Improve the quality of early childhood development services by increasing the capacity of the workforce – DE and DoH are to undertake a joint review of the early years workforce including consideration of minimum qualifications, graduate leadership, CPD, and career pathways. The delivery plans references variations in the assessment of the quality of childcare provision.					DE will work with key strategic partners to ensure the action is taken forward. DE will work with DoH and with DfE in taking forward this action.