bigeducation

learning for the 21st century

Compass
together for a good society

Appendices

EDUCATION INQUIRY

DEVELOPING A NEW MODEL

Compass together for a good society

BIG EDUCATION: THE POLICY DETAIL

March 2015

This document serves as the policy detail appendices to the final report of the Compass Education Inquiry 'Big Education'. They provide more context, analysis and policy detail to the overview contained in that report.

We warmly welcome comments on the ideas and policies in these appendices in order to further develop our thinking. You can contact us at: info@compassonline.org.uk. Readers can contribute comments and ideas at www.compassonline.org.uk/education-inquiry/

Click the links below to go directly to chapter

1. DEMOCRATISING THE GOVERNANCE OF LOCAL EDUCATION

We live in an era when the drive towards greater devolution of power and resources to localities looks unstoppable. Taken together they create a powerful case for the local governance of education – which is currently in a mess. The voices of local education stakeholders are too weak and too much power is either unaccountably dispersed or concentrated in the hands of the Secretary of State. Local collaboration is key because there is a limit to what can be achieved in education by institutions operating alone. Such engagement and mutual collaboration best takes place the only way it can – at the local level. The autonomy granted to academies and free schools can't be reversed – but it is fair to expect all publicly funded schools to observe the same rules and to commit to the common good. Learning from the London and Manchester Challenges, we know that local coherence, commitment and collaboration are key. Local government is central to a democratically run local education service but isn't the only voice. The question is how to move forward, how to use the power of democratic engagement to power the educational improvements that social justice and economic utility demands.

OUR VISION

To help bring about the transformation of education in England, we have a clear view of the steps required:

1. Commitment to a diversity of models of planning, management and oversight with a freedom to experiment within broad national parameters that are set following a national debate about education's purposes, standards and priorities.
2. Devolution of power and resources from top to bottom – from central government down to the local community.
3. Self-managed education institutions accountable to the public through democratically run education-specific boards.
4. Government confined to a strategic agenda setting role with no more micro-management of teaching and learning.
5. Creation of an integrated department for education and a single funding agency for a coherent cradle to grave lifelong learning service, moving gradually to equitable funding regardless of provider.

6. Ofsted reformed, overseeing standards, supporting local improvement initiatives, offering HMI support and wisdom, carrying out area reviews and inspections, moderating peer reviews, intervening in *extremis.*
7. New evidence-driven council for curricula, qualifications and pedagogy.

SCHOOL COMMISSIONERS: WHY NOT?

Recently, there has been a flurry of proposals for creating a middle tier through the creation of regional or sub-regional education commissioners or directors of school standards. A key component of the role is to commission or procure new school places from a diversity of potential providers. England's school system is distinguished by the sheer variety of types of schools and school sponsors, a characteristic that might well be strengthened by a commissioner. But there are two serious objections.

1. We want to see the long-term trend to the fragmentation of the education system reversed with coherent planning for an integrated cradle to grave service. School commissioners strengthen the tendency to plan and develop one sector in isolation from the rest. For young people embarking on vocational pathways, the integration of the service offered by schools, colleges and private training providers should be paramount.
2. At a time of growing concern about the multiplicity of offices and agencies answerable only to government, the fatal flaw of school commissioners is their weak accountability. It is unclear who appoints them, by what principles and standards they will be bound, to whom they report and who can get rid of them.

We propose instead that responsibility for providing school places should lie with clusters of local authorities operating at a scale that supports strategic decision-making. Local authorities should also be wholly responsible for setting and overseeing admissions policy. All schools in a given locality should be funded via the local authority according to a formula set nationally to ensure equity regardless of provider. This system should also replace the contracts – often secret – between the Secretary of State and academies. These functions, in our view, should be carried out as part of the planning for a local integrated lifelong learning service, which should be led by local authorities in collaboration with local partners such as schools, colleges and employers. Responsibility for planning college places should rest with local enterprise partnerships as part of sub-regional or city-regional skills and economic development programmes.

WHY LOCAL EDUCATION PLANS?

Coherence will come from Local Education Plans that would perform several functions:

1. To focus resources on local priorities and objectives within a national framework.
2. To develop a joined up service.
3. To set out each provider's contribution to achieving local goals.
4. To ensure that there are effective improvement initiatives in every area.
5. To provide a benchmark for system-wide improvement, year on year.

The boundaries for plans would reflect local conditions. There is no one size fits all as conditions in one part of the country vary greatly from others. Where feasible the plans would shadow Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) areas. We envisage a range of possibilities and population sizes:

- County/rural areas such as Herefordshire, Shropshire and Worcestershire (LEPs: Marches/Worcestershire) Population (2011): 1,056m.
- County/city areas such as Nottinghamshire and Nottingham (LEP: part of Derby, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire and Nottingham) Population: 1,09m.
- City-regions such as Greater Manchester (LEP: Greater Manchester) Population: 2.68m.
- Urban clusters such as west London Boroughs of Ealing, Hounslow and Brent (LEP: part of London). Population: 0.91m.

Larger areas, such as Greater Manchester, might be the right scale for strategic planning for skills and economic development as well as for local education planning and governance.

Within these areas, plans could be developed for sub-areas, such as parliamentary constituencies or smaller neighbourhoods. Neighbourhood plans would make it possible to target concentrations of disadvantage. One way of doing this under consideration in areas such as Birmingham is through a 'Children's Zone'. Originally developed in Harlem, New York City, the rationale for this approach is summed up by Professor Mel Ainscough, director of the Manchester Challenge: **'**…closing the gap in outcomes between those from more and less advantaged backgrounds will only happen when what happens to children outside as well as inside the school changes.' Zones work by focusing resources and agencies on integrated service provision in the spirit of 'Every Child Matters', linking school, home and community and by ensuring a voice for children, young people, parents and all the people who work with them. This model of grass roots democratic participation could provide the basis for an area wide forum representing parents, children and young people and other interested parties.

WHY LOCAL EDUCATION BOARDS (LEBS)?

The design and implementation of local education plans would be the responsibility, as we have said, of local authorities and their partners. Overseeing the plans and holding to account education providers, including councils, would be the job of a new body, a local education board. These would replace the education scrutiny committees of the participating local authorities and would have a number of functions *excluding* service delivery:

- To provide strategic oversight and to promote joined up working *but not to deliver services.*
- To ensure that plans are properly drawn up and implemented, problems tackled and that providers collaborate.
- To hold service users, including councils, to account.
- To provide public right of redress when things go wrong; where the buck stops.
- To advise government on necessary improvements and meeting local demand for places and services (pre-school, youth, careers, etc.).
- To report to local community and government on progress annually.

In their role of strategic oversight, they would be analogous to health and well-being boards without the responsibility these bodies perform of operational management. They would replace education scrutiny committees, carrying out this vital function with greater power. Existing scrutiny committees are hampered in several ways:

1. As committees of backbench councillors they are a poor match for the influential cabinets of senior members.
2. As committees of the same body, the local authority, that is responsible for aspects of service delivery, they are potentially compromised by apparent conflicts of interest e.g. mounting a serious challenge to local safeguarding practice entails a challenge to the leadership of the council.
3. The adequacy of their resourcing depends on decisions made by the cabinet.

In comparison, LEBs would:

- Enjoy statutory powers including the ability to require providers to collaborate in the implementation of the plan and to make recommendations to the Secretary of State, Ofsted and the funding agency for education.
- Operate at a level above single local authorities.

- Be chaired by a senior elected local councillor nominated by the participating local authorities and endorsed by the members of the board with the status and pay of a council leader.

THE BOARDS AND THEIR MEMBERSHIP

The Boards would consist of elected local councillors, representing the participating local authorities including district councils, and representatives of local interest groups, which would be, as the table below shows, the majority. The composition of each Board would reflect local conditions but would normally be expected to give representation to the users of education services as well as the providers, statutory as well as voluntary bodies. Local education forums, or similar bodies providing a common voice for parents, students and service providers, would also be represented on the boards.

The chief operating officer of the board would be known as the director of education and would be supported by a small team including secondees from education providers and perhaps an experienced HMI. The director of education would work closely with providers and the senior officers of the participating local authorities such as directors of children's services whose responsibility for strategic planning and operational management would be unchanged.

MEMBERSHIP OF A LOCAL EDUCATION BOARD: ONE MODEL

Local council leader/mayor (chair)	**Education trade unions rep**	**Employer rep**
District council leader or urban council leader	Student union rep	Representative, local education forum
Representative, local head-teacher partnership	Governing bodies rep	Expert advisor/academic
FE private skills provider rep	Local authority senior officers	Early years rep
HE rep	LEP rep	Health and wellbeing board rep

A NEW WAY OF WORKING: DEMOCRATIC COLLABORATION

The boards would be characterised by a new way of working with no one member in a position to over-rule the others. Instead, members would be expected to work together to drive service improvement on behalf of their community. The organising principle is the inter-dependence of eco-systems, each with their own constituencies. Local authority representatives, who would be in a minority, would have to lead by their ability to build consensus and develop creative solutions. They would be responsible for engendering a civic renewal based on trust, inclusion and a recognition that legitimacy must be earned by a willingness to learn from others and to face public challenge. A key function of the boards would be to provide redress and to report annually to their communities on progress in achieving the objectives and standards set out in local plans. Both plans and boards would be subject to inspection by Ofsted. In the event of deadlock between board members of between boards and local providers, Ofsted would be empowered to intervene and to require solutions.

LEBS: THE OBJECTIONS

Let us now consider some of the objections that can be anticipated to the creation of LEBs.

1. A return to local authority domination by the back door

We fully support the principle of local management of schools and colleges. Indeed, we would like to see its extension – alongside the internal democratisation of institutions and a strengthening of public accountability. We are not nostalgic for a return to the era of local authority domination. That is why we propose the creation of local boards at arms-length from individual councils and with a majority of non-councillors. Legitimacy has to be earned not taken for granted. It is why we support the separation of operational management – an important function of local authorities in areas such as place provision and safeguarding – from oversight.

Current proposals for devolution to clusters of local authorities reflect the growing recognition that our democracy and service provision suffers from over-centralisation. We support moves to devolve tax raising powers and to establish councils' strategic responsibilities in areas such as transport and health, and we can see no reason why this should not also apply to education. So we support the role of local authorities as champions of children, young people and disadvantaged groups. Instead of the complexity and lack of transparency of current school funding by contract, we believe that all local school funding should be transmitted by a single national funding agency through local authorities and that all schools should be subject to the same regulatory and auditing framework.

2. Wasteful bureaucracy

Nobody wants Local Education Boards – it is said - they are another example of the left's addiction to wasteful bureaucracy. Yet the commissioners put forward as intermediaries between Whitehall and schools are classic bureaucrats with no clear lines of local accountability – despite the growing rage across Europe against un-elected, un-accountable officials, and the electorate's mounting impatience with the remote, self-aggrandising bodies in charge of privatised and out-sourced public services. It is an oddity that although we pride ourselves on being a democracy, too often democracy is seen as a drag on progress, that we are better off being led by technocrats – professionals who know better. In the end, the only way for the people's voice to be heard is through democracy, with all its imperfections. It is our contention that democratic participation will increase standards and effectiveness.

3. Council scrutiny committees are already providing oversight

A further objection is that local education boards would duplicate the work of council scrutiny committees. In fact, we propose that education scrutiny committees are replaced by the Boards.

The Centre for Public Scrutiny, a body set up to develop local council scrutiny, is candid about the weaknesses of the practice such as the difficulty of challenging cabinet committees, whether that comes from within the governing party or the opposition. Scrutiny committees can demand the review of contentious decisions but little more. They lack muscle. Local Education Boards, which would replace local authority scrutiny committees, would be at arm's length from individual councils, led by a senior local political figure and underpinned by statutory powers so that they could require a local authority or a school to change its practices.

WHO LEADS ON SCHOOL AND COLLEGE IMPROVEMENT?

Making sense of the mess of local education governance throws up some tricky issues, few more so than how to ensure consistent and effective improvement strategies. A large part of the difficulty here stems from the unsustainably polarised position that Ofsted has been forced into by successive governments. It can be tempting to throw the accountability baby out with the bathwater but we'd prefer to propose ways in which Ofsted can be set on a new, more positive path. A further difficulty is the variability of local authority capacity for and appetite for leading or supporting school improvement.

We propose that:

1. School and college improvement should be practitioner-led as proposed by ASCL, the Association of School and College Leaders.
2. Ofsted should combine support and challenge through formative inspections of individual institutions and areas as well as the functioning of local education boards.
3. The health of providers should be assessed annually through peer review, moderated by experienced practitioners, to a format and timetable overseen by Ofsted.
4. Where weaknesses are identified, Ofsted should be able to call on improvement expertise provided by school or college networks, local authorities (where they retain capability and credibility) or a specialist company.
5. In extremis, notice to improve could be issued by Ofsted or by the Local Education Board if it has firmly-based concerns about the outcome of peer review.

LOCAL MANAGEMENT: TOWARDS A BETTER BALANCE

All of these measures – the introduction of local plans, LEBs and the reform of Ofsted – should lead to a better balance between devolved management and effective oversight in the public interest as well as establishing a voice for service users and rank and file staff.

Underpinning the shift to a more democratic and accountable system will be:

- A right to redress for service users – students, parents or employers – who feel let down and cannot get a serious hearing from the institution they have complained to.
- An obligation on publicly funded providers to contribute actively to the design and delivery of local plans.
- A unified regulatory framework for inspection and audit for all schools including academies and academy chains themselves.
- Trusts created in all schools enabling parental and external involvement in governance
- School funding contracts replaced by nationally determined formula funding, providing equity for schools, sixth form colleges and colleges, and conduited via local authorities to trusts and subject to audit by Ofsted.
- Stronger powers for local authorities to police admissions policy and to intervene in the event of school leadership breakdown or conflicts.

WHERE DOES THIS LEAVE LOCAL AUTHORITIES?

We can now summarise the roles and responsibilities of local authorities in the light of the proposals set out here.

- Councils' role in strategic education planning will be enhanced, in relation to school expansion and the creation of new places, and in relation to college places, skills and economic development through their participation in sub-regional or regional commissions involving LEPs, government departments and representatives of further and higher education. Councils will operate singly or in partnership with neighbouring authorities and other agencies in carrying out these functions. Councils will continue their role in relation to safeguarding and looked after children, and work towards creating integrated services for children and families. All these operational matters remain in the hands of cabinet members and senior officers.
- Councils will be expected to work alongside other providers to ensure that the expertise for school and college improvement is available locally. Councils will act as the conduit for the funding of all publicly funded schools and be empowered to ensure that it is properly used. Funding agreements between councils and school trusts will replace the contracts – often private - between the Secretary of State and schools.
- Education scrutiny committees will be wound up as local education boards come into operation.

The table below summarises the roles of LEBs, local authorities and education providers in relation to key functions.

BOARDS, COUNCILS AND PROVIDERS: KEY ROLES

	LEBs	**LAs**	**Providers**
Local education plan	Review annually/propose changes	Lead on design and implementation	Contribute to design and implementation
Advocacy and	Review progress on closing educational gap	Champion of children, families and	Accountable to LEB for safeguarding practice and for

redress	and safeguarding/final point of appeal on redress applications	disadvantaged/lead on safeguarding/1st point for redress	redress applications
Accountability	Report annually on education plan objectives online and via meetings with stakeholders/activity subject to Ofsted area review	Ofsted inspection of Council education services e.g. pre-school, youth, careers, children in care	Ofsted inspection
School/college places	Review annually/set five year plan	Recommend changes to funding agency	
School/college improvement	Review poor performers and action taken/make recommendations for further action to Ofsted and local providers	Establish sub-regional or regional self-evaluation and inspection programme in collaboration with provider partnerships Identify schools/colleges requiring support and consider action with Ofsted	School and college led self-evaluation supported by Ofsted but subject to external intervention where necessary
Funding	Make recommendations to education funding agency	Act as conduit for all school funding (incl. academies) according to national formula	Audited through Ofsted

2. BIG EDUCATION FOR THE EARLY YEARS

EVERY CHILD DESERVES THE BEST START IN LIFE

'There can be no keener revelation of a society's soul than the way in which it treats its children' said Nelson Mandela.

This sentence encapsulates Compass's view of Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC) and sets the framework of values for our proposals. Few would disagree, yet policy and practice have never set out to realise this in the early years of a child's life. Education in a good society starts at birth, yet spending on early years care and education, though it has increased in recent decades (the Labour government in the late 1990s made a promising start) it is still paltry compared to other budgets. Why? Perhaps because as a society we see childcare and education as separate entities. We accept the need for the state to fund schooling (from the age of 4 now) but before that it is parents' responsibility with the 'nanny state' intervening only if things are going wrong. Yet each new-born baby is 'our future' and ensuring the best possible care for each is a moral duty as well as an investment.

'This period of life sets the foundation for everything that is to come. It is when we learn whether the world is an exciting or a fearful place; it is when we establish vital relationships, take tentative first steps into the larger environment and continue the extraordinary biological processes that facilitate human development.'[i]

PARENTS AND FAMILIES MUST BE SUPPORTED TO GIVE EVERY CHILD AN EQUAL START

Mandela would undoubtedly have endorsed another African saying*, 'It takes a whole village to raise a child.'*

Unless society offers support to parents to raise their child in its first years, particularly those children from the poorest households, 'catch up' almost never works. Evidence abounds from research in the UK and internationally[ii] that children born and raised in poverty fall well behind their peers very early (already evident at 22 months, by the age of four as much as sixteen months behind, according to Feinstein[iii]). Good quality early support has greatest impact on the poorest children, improving their life chances. If we are serious about giving every child the chance to succeed, we must address wider social issues of family poverty, social deprivation and inadequate parenting and plan how best to support families in raising their children. Education policy must be developed within this context of wider social, political and economic policy[iv].

RADICAL CHANGES ARE NEEDED TO DELIVER THIS VISION

It is time to start the process of reversing priorities, recognising that the most important years of a child's life are the very first ones and that funding of services and the status of the profession must reflect this highest priority. How can we achieve such a radical change?

- A service underpinned by clear agreed aims. The question '*What is education for?*' must be extended to early years education, debated nationally and brought to life by research-informed policies and practices developed within a new independent National Education Council.[v]
- Wider social, political and economic reforms that reduce England's gross and increasing gaps in wealth, well-being and educational attainment and support the families most in need, thereby genuinely offering each child equality of opportunity. Recognise that childcare and education can only do so much to close the attainment gap.
- A curriculum that recognises this unique phase of development and is designed holistically to develop all aspects of each child, not simply prepare them for schooling and is based on structured and 'free' play. Avoidance of formal, externally required assessment that leads to 'teaching to the test', including the so-called 'baseline assessment' that is unreliable as well as stressful and demoralising.
- Considerable increase in the funding of early years provision for all children, with additional support to those most in need through a range of funding mechanisms applied to all nursery and childcare provision including, for example, a pupil premium.
- A highly trained and qualified workforce who are part of a well-respected profession which continues to provide work opportunities to young people who have not necessarily achieved high academic outcomes but then offers them a professional career with high-quality, life-long professional development. A drive to end gender stereotyping and recruit a more diverse workforce.
- Greater flexibility about when formal education begins, including entry into schooling, taking full account of individual children's developmental needs. Though fully funded schooling should continue to be available from an early age, attendance must not be compulsory.
- Inclusion of all ECEC provision (including private nurseries) in the collaborative local planning arrangements of Local Education Boards (as set out in Compass's Big Education). Early years to be seen as the first stage of an educational journey integrated fully into all others.

- Significant investment in research (in particular into early neurological, physiological and psycho-social development) and evaluation of delivery approaches, managed by an independent body and used to inform policy-not as ammunition to win political arguments.

SUPPORT FOR FAMILIES IS THE ESSENTIAL UNDERPINNING OF SUCCESSFUL ECEC

'Nothing is more important for a child's well-being than the first loving home relationships. We believe a much greater effort should be made to support parents in caring for their children in ways that they feel best suit their child and their family life choices.'[vi]

Extensive longitudinal research by Birkbeck and Oxford University professor Edward Melhuish's team[vii] finds, unsurprisingly, that the home environment is the most influential factor in a child's opportunities, impacting not only on childhood but also, as a result of their successes in schooling, into adulthood.

'The findings show clearly that in England the family remains the most important source of influence on young people at 16. Family advantage or disadvantage repeats itself across the generations.'

An holistic approach is vital in the design and implementation of support for families, one that concentrates on the well-being of the adults as well as children. The Sure Start programme was built upon this approach with multi-agency working to build a framework of support around vulnerable children and families. With modifications based on the national evaluation by the Education Select Committee as reported by the Policy Exchange, Sure Start should be extended[viii]. Whilst its greatest value is to disadvantaged children it should be universally available, partly as an entitlement and also to avoid the stigmatisation that accompanies initiatives that single out specific groups.

Financially supported parental leave policies, though improving slowly in recent years, must be enhanced further including tax incentives to remain at home for the earliest months or years. Parents, grandparents and other primary carers need to be better recognised and regarded for the work they do in raising the next generation.

Research shows, however, that those families most in need of help in providing excellent early care and education are least likely to take up the opportunities that are available to them. No matter how well-funded and expertly staffed are the nurseries, Sure Start centres, and other places of care and learning, they will have no impact on those children whose families do not use them. To reverse this pattern funding must be used to provide support and to incentivise families to make use of high-quality childcare and related support.

We must create a network of community programmes, run and staffed by local, trusted people who can work with families to help them engage in numerous ways. Backing them must be a wide range of family education programmes. Recent work by NIACE[ix] has shown what is possible if funding (and training) are made available.

'CHILDHOOD IS A JOURNEY, NOT A RACE' MUST UNDERPIN THE EARLY YEARS CURRICULUM

This should be the mantra for all curriculum development (and assessment practices), but none more so than in the early years which must not be narrowly defined as preparation for school. There is a great deal of consensus on the key elements of the best curriculum for ECEC amongst numerous well respected bodies and individuals. The consensus revolves around a shared belief that the whole of a child's development (social, emotional, linguistic, cognitive, creative, physical) must be the focus and that early years is a unique stage in its own right and should be recognised as such. A play-centred curriculum is the most effective route to success: early imposition of formal learning (literacy and numeracy) and the adoption of primary school methods in early years settings can be harmful. Play and learning go hand in hand, inextricably; they should not be counter-posed. The Cambridge Primary Review states[x]:

'There is no evidence that a child who spends more time learning through lessons - as opposed to learning through play - will 'do better'. In fact research suggests the opposite; that 'too formal too soon can be counter-productive', and goes on to cite numerous international examples.

The Save Childhood Movement's Manifesto states we should '*ensure that developmentally appropriate play-based care and education governs children's experiences until at least the age of 6'*, and *'that we have a cohesive and integrated ECEC system that is evidence-based and that has the best interests of the child at its heart. This should not be a one-size-*fits-*all solution but should be responsive to the diversity of parental and local needs'.*

Whilst a national curriculum framework is needed - one based on the values that underpin a good society as set out in Big Education[xi] - local stakeholders must be involved too. The Cambridge Primary Review[xii] suggests around 30%. Whilst Compass does not wish to put a figure on this, it endorses fully the need for local planning. The Cambridge model advocates *'an aims-driven entitlement curriculum of breadth, richness and contemporary relevance, which secures the basics and much more besides, and combines a national framework with a strong local component*.' This focus on aims is central to Compass principles.

Formal assessment of young children that is used not to directly benefit the development of an individual child but to judge performance of nurseries/schools is widely rejected by the great majority of early years carers/teachers, specialists and researchers as well as many parents too. Continuous informal assessment is essential in order to adapt the curriculum to individual children as well as to communicate with parents and other interested parties, but formal testing is a flawed and unreliable means of evaluating or predicting as well as being stressful to many children and parents. *'In principle, accountability should be to children, rather than to the system*[xiii]*.'*

GOOD QUALITY ECEC CHANGES LIVES

'Expanding access to services without attention to quality will not deliver good outcomes for children or the long-term productivity benefits for society. Furthermore, research has shown that if quality is low, it can have long-lasting detrimental effects on child development instead of bringing positive effects."[xiv]

There is a broad international as well as UK evidence base that demonstrates that high quality ECEC has a positive impact on early development, that its impact is most marked on the poorest children (those whose parents have lower incomes and lower levels of education) and that it has a life-long impact, being highly predictive of future attainment. Further evidence demonstrates that the quality of ECEC is patchy: the proportion of providers assessed as good or outstanding varied within UK regions from 64 to 98 per cent[xv] and, most worryingly, children in more disadvantaged areas have lower rates of access to high-quality care, as measured by Ofsted. Put simply, '*Poorer children are likely to receive poorer care"*[xvi]. Yet the importance of quality is in danger of being overlooked in the drive to rapidly expand services in order to encourage parents to return to paid work.

THE TRAINING, STATUS AND REMUNERATION OF ECEC PROFESSIONALS MUST BE ENHANCED TO MAKE A REAL DIFFERENCE TO CHILDREN'S DEVELOPMENT

"Ensure that the adults working with young children are highly trained, skilled, emotionally mature and appropriately valued and remunerated."[xvii]

More and better training, leading to appropriate (early years) qualifications along with continuous professional development has a huge impact on the quality of ECEC. Despite widespread recognition of the importance of expertise, training and qualification of nursery and other child care workers, there are considerable disagreements between politicians about what is needed and the inter-

relationships between levels of qualification and child-adult staffing ratios. Again the IPPR offers valuable evidence upon which to base policy. In summary:

'The sector should move towards having all childcare professionals hold or be working towards a level 3 qualification (with an adequate standard of English), and ensuring that all settings which care for three and four-year-olds have at least one individual with an early years graduate-level qualification (either Early Years Professional or Early Years Teacher status).'

Re-instating the closed Graduate Leader Fund is an important though insufficient step. Research shows that graduate teachers impact on the performance of other staff as well as the children in their care but the tendency for them to lose direct contact with children (in favour of other 'leadership' duties) diminishes their effectiveness. Higher staff-child ratios have been shown (in France) to be effective when a graduate workforce is deployed, but not for under threes for whom small ratios remain essential. The introduction of NVQ qualifications some years ago is widely thought to have diluted the quality of training, all too often simply accrediting existing knowledge and failing to extend it. A pedagogy of education for the early years is needed (as in Finland, Italy and elsewhere), one that is updated by new research, with rigorous and continuing professional development based on research findings.

The training must be specialist. Simply to hold a number of GCSEs, Advanced levels or a degree (all much debated of late) is not the answer. It can, moreover, create a barrier to entry of the professional by otherwise suitable applicants. Nutbrown[xviii] made valuable proposals such as for a 0-7 QTS teacher that were unfortunately rejected by the coalition government in favour of proposals for a lower level of qualification for the earliest years and a specialist Early Years Teacher (EYT) qualification that that does not carry either the status or entitlement to nationally agreed pay and conditions of QTS.

The education and training of child-minders is equally important but largely ignored. Many children are cared for by child-minders 41% of whom do not currently have a level 3 qualification. Where the child-minder is another family member (as increasingly it is because of the relatively high cost of child-care for low paid parents) the challenge is even greater. These minders are not registered so the few current requirements do not apply. Yet in some families the cycle of deprivation will continue unless more effective ways of offering ECEC are found. It is encouraging to see from a recent IPPR survey found that three-quarters of registered child-minders supported the introduction of extra requirements for professional qualifications and almost half of those thought child-minders should hold at least a level 3 qualification.

All of these recommendations have cost implications. Compass views this as an investment in our future, as well as an entitlement of children, their parents and their care-givers.

HIGH QUALITY ECEC REQUIRES A SUPPORTIVE SPECIALIST INSPECTORATE FOCUSED ON IMPROVEMENT

'Ofsted is not always the best judge of early years quality, particularly for the youngest children, and functions primarily as an inspector rather than a supporter of quality improvement."[xix]

Ofsted's inspections do not command widespread respect throughout the ECEC community nor do they offer clear guidance in how to improve. Its judgments do not align, especially in the under threes, with those of the more widely respected Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scales (ECERS) or the Infant-Toddler Environmental Scale (INTERS-R). Insufficiently specialised training in early years practice of Ofsted's inspectors as well as a focus on 'structural' measures such as ratios and qualifications may contribute to this.

Moreover, a reliance on Ofsted judgements of good or outstanding may undermine the use of local-authority-led quality improvement schemes, which have themselves diminished in recent years due to funding constraints and the moving of responsibility for inspection from local authorities to Ofsted. Compass is calling for a review of the role and functioning of the inspectorate [xx]within which considerable changes to early years inspection are required.

GENEROUS ECEC FUNDING, WISELY TARGETED, REAPS GREAT DIVIDENDS FOR INDIVIDUALS AND SOCIETY

The logic of targeting those most in need is undeniable but there is danger of stigmatising certain services and those who would benefit from them. An Early Years Pupil Premium, supported by the Save Childhood Movement and others, would be a helpful first step towards better funding but does not go nearly far enough. Compass supports a generously funded universal base to which are added further specialised services. The logic of radically re-balancing (reversing even) our society's prioritisation of funding, in favour of early years, is compelling. State support for nurseries and other childcare is no different from the principle of state funding for schooling and will, we are certain, come to be seen that way by almost everyone.

Most ECEC is delivered in private nurseries but this must not be allowed to get in the way of providing the necessary funding to offer the high quality care to which every child is entitled. Intervening in the early years prevents the need for more expensive interventions later in life not only additional educational support requirements but in the longer term on employability, income and health and well-being.[xxi] The recent (2013) Save the Children Fund's '*Too Young to Fail*'[xxii] report reinforces this message.

Whilst we argue for free entitlement for all children, no funding pot is infinite, therefore, the question then becomes how that funding should best be used. Here the recent (2013) IPPR research provides evidence from the UK and international studies of the relative benefits of, for example, providing earlier care for younger children versus more hours for older children and the level of qualification required at different stages. Put simply, research indicates that the optimum funding and staffing arrangements should provide: *'stability for the youngest, low –ratios for one and two-year-olds and highly qualified childcare professionals for children of three and over, alongside a workforce with good standards of English*[xxiii]*'*. This is a valuable yardstick for the distribution of funding. Whatever is decided, funding must be ring-fenced, especially at a time of austerity. Money for children's services allocated to local authorities has too often been used instead to subsidise other services. Stability to allow secure forward planning is essential too.

FUNDING MUST SUPPORT FAMILIES

Family taxation already takes into account, to a small degree, the impact on families but it does not go far enough and, indeed, policies that try to push parents of young children back into work, run counter to what research tells us about the child's needs in those first months and years. Taxation must support families to make the right choices for themselves, whether these are to return to work or for one parent to remain at home in the child's early years.

Outreach strategies to ensure that the most disadvantaged children do access quality care settings must be high in our priorities too. 'Wrap around' services to support vulnerable families (such as Sure Start and Children's Centres); mechanisms to encourage parents to make use of early years care such as 'conditional cash transfers', payment of which depend upon a child's regular attendance, have been successfully trialled. Funding to support family learning has been shown make a significant impact too and should be considerably strengthened and expanded. Financial incentives for highly-qualified and experienced staff to work in the most disadvantaged areas is another of the many funding mechanisms that should be considered.

RESEARCH IS NEEDED TO IDENTIFY WHAT CAN ENSURE CONSISTENT HIGH-QUALITY CARE

There is some consensus about the essential elements, including for example experienced, highly-qualified staff with continuous professional development, low child-adult ratios, high salaries, age-appropriate and stimulating materials, warm interactions, excellent physical environments and working closely with parents. What is unclear is what specific factors or combination of factors lead to the best outcomes (which includes not only educational outcomes but also 'well-being' and the foundations of sound mental and physical health) or the extent to which these vary for different age groups. This impacts on decisions about the curriculum, professional training and staffing ratios required. Research has been undertaken some of which is succinctly analysed and reported by the IPPR (2013), but more is needed, particularly into the care for the under threes and that given by child-minders and other non-institutional settings.

The body of research into development in early childhood has grown considerably in depth and quality in recent years, including new insights into of early brain neurology. But a good deal more is needed if we are to understand the science of early learning and development. Most important of all: governments in developing policy must pay more regard to these findings than they do and stop 'cherry-picking' the bits that support their ideology.

CONCLUSION

'The true measure of a nation's standing is how well it attends to its children – their health and safety, their material security, their education and socialisation and their sense of being loved, valued and included in the families and societies into which they are born'. UNICEF 2007

The impact of these policies will be slow: ambitious goals must be set for long-term change with realistic interim goals. Policies across government departments should be aligned to ensure they do not undermine this, the most important phase of all, leading to the provision of excellent early childhood care and education that gives every child an equal opportunity to develop its talents and succeed in life.

Whatever the current state of the nation's finances, universally excellent ECEC is 'the right thing to do' as well as the best investment it can possibly make.

3. THE DEMOCRATIC SCHOOL

In order for the approaches and recommendations coming out of the Big Education report to be effective it is essential that we look at creating a cultural shift in educational practice on all levels. This involves embedding the values identified into the fabric of everyday school life; for the teacher, the learner and all involved. Our goal is the self-improving democratic school, and the means is the creation of a culture of collaboration involving teachers and learners working together, the basis of a good society.

Students who experience this education learn about looking after not just themselves but their peers and the whole of their community. They learn the habits of inter-dependence that are the basis for an evolving, democratic society.

So how does the democratic school work? It is built on two pillars:

1. **Shared decision-making**

   Everyone in a community has responsibility for that community. When young people share that responsibility, on an equal basis with adults, and make decisions which have a real impact on their everyday lives, they not only arrive at wise conclusions, they also learn skills which will be useful throughout their lives.

2. **Self-directed learning**

   The focus is on learning rather than teaching. When young people are in charge of their own learning, choosing what, when, where, how and with whom they learn, they follow their natural curiosity and learn more effectively. The role of the adult is to support young people on their own learning journeys.

How?

The culture of the school is one of collaboration based on the values of: trust, respect, responsibility, tolerance, equal relationships, happiness and rights. How do these values manifest themselves? How does the democratic school function? It does this by:

- Creating opportunity for learners to have autonomy and influence to achieve tangible impacts in their everyday lives.
- Allowing students to experience, practice, and therefore learn these values as part of their school life.
- Ensuring that every member of the community is listened to and can shape their experience, regardless of their background or needs. It is ultimately inclusive.

- Placing at the forefront a set of wider capacities including personal perseverance and resourcefulness; sociability and the ability to work with others; curiosity and criticality; mastery of tools and technologies and consciousness of the world around us.
- Enabling students to follow their own interests and explore a wide range of areas in depth.
- Pedagogic leaders creating a learning environment that nurtures individual progress and encourages co-production of knowledge.
- Stripping the culture of fear from the education experience to open up dialogue through constructive conversations amongst equals.
- Practicing the identification and pursuit of purposeful learning from day one, so that constructive life-long learners will emerge.

THE PRACTICE

Democratic schools may take many forms, but they share the twin pillars of shared decision-making and self-directed learning described above. Here are some typical features of democratic schools:

- An effective representative system such as a school council, or alternative student leadership structure[xxiv].
- A weekly school meeting where everyone can raise points for discussion and vote on new proposals[xxv.]
- Whole-school consultations through which everyone plays an equal role in developing and deciding a code of conduct in place of school rules.
- Enabling students and adults equally to lead activities in which they are the expert[xxvi..]
- Involving students in the staff recruitment process, even to the extent of them independently running an interview panel and having a vote[xxvii.].
- The head of department leading a curriculum inquiry with a group of students and collectively deciding the curriculum content for the year.
- Covering the curriculum through abandoning traditional lessons for a designated time and embarking on an inquiry based learning adventure[xxviii].
- Teaching according to co-operative learning principles[xxix.]
- Students and teachers devising and implementing a system by which students observe lessons and provide teachers with feedback.

CASE STUDIES

A Year 4 class in a big London state primary school had weekly class meetings. An online agenda was set up for the duration of the week and any member of the class could add agenda items from home or school. Initially, the class' school council members facilitated the meetings, one facilitating and one recording. After half a term children were elected in to facilitate or record for a set number of meetings. The teacher initially met with elected members before the meeting to support them in any way they needed, but after a while, as more children had been involved, children were able to coach each other in facilitation skills. The teacher had to be clear about the extent of her own, and the class's, power to change things. For example, she was explicit that she had no power herself over re-organising the times of lunches and breaks (it was a very large school), but within these limits, the children had real power to re-organise what happened within the four walls of their classroom.

A Year 6 'school journey' at the end of their time in primary school had 45 London children spending five days camping in a field. Together with the teachers, the children designed a plan for the day, which usually consisted of around five workshops (led by both adults and/or children) that the children could move around as they pleased. The whole camp community was split into groups who took turns cooking for one another (the only strictly compulsory activity) and twice daily meetings were used for children to suggest activities and bring up any issues. If children became engrossed in organising, for instance, a performance to show to the group, or building a den in the woods, they were able to do this rather than take part in the workshops.

A Year 3 class was given a list at the start of each week of the compulsory activities they needed to ensure were completed that week, but they were able to choose in what order to do them. In addition, in consultation with their teacher, they could suggest their own projects to add to the list. Half way through the week they would have a 'check-in' where they would discuss with the teacher where they were and ensure that the compulsory literacy and numeracy objectives were being covered.

A Year 6 class spent every morning engaged in 'project work'. For each project, the students would be given the learning objectives from the curriculum they needed to cover (translated into child-friendly language). However, how they met these objectives was up to them. They could work individually, in pairs or in groups and their work might be in the form of a film, a story, a play, a blog

etc. The freedom to think creatively, work in a learning style that suited them and stay in line with their own interests and experience meant they were wholly engaged almost all of the time. Projects lasted from three days to three weeks.

Students in a secondary school petitioned to be involved in recruiting for a new deputy head. After some effort, they succeeded in being allowed an hour's interview with the three top candidates. They designed a series of questions and eight students took part, asking questions that were relevant to them in the choosing of new management. Afterwards, they had a meeting with the head-teacher and a governor and gave them feedback. Interestingly, the candidate who was their favourite was employed.

Some young men who said they didn't enjoy school much and weren't generally very engaged were asked if they would like to coach their classmates in football, which they were very keen on. The teacher readily admitted that they were much more skilled than her and she would also like to learn from them. They worked with her to design a series of six sessions, which they led. Not only did the rest of the class receive good training, but the teacher claimed that their engagement in the core subjects was noticeably better too. The teacher learnt some football too!

4. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND IMPROVEMENT: THE FUTURE OF INSPECTION

HOW DO INCLUSIVE EDUCATION SYSTEMS BECOME HIGH QUALITY?

There are many routes to an inclusive high quality education system. These include consistent levels of investment, trust in education professionals; good leadership at all levels and deep engagement by parents, partners/carers and stakeholders to support learning throughout the life-course. But what is also required is a comprehensive system of quality assurance and improvement that has at its centre the driving principles of Big Education explored elsewhere in this report – inclusion and sense of belonging, aspiration to improve and grow, innovation and creativity, and accountability to others. It is through the lens of an inclusive and democratic approach to quality assurance and improvement (QA/QI) that we explore the future of inspection in the English education system.

THE CURRENT ROLE OF INSPECTION – THE LOSS OF INDEPENDENCE AND TRUST

The current role of inspection in England can be seen as a mirror image of the wider problems of education governance. While the presenting image of Ofsted under the Coalition Government has been that of improving opportunities for all learners, inspection has become associated with controversy, arbitrary decision-making and a climate of fear. Inspection has become a very overt political instrument of ministers. The symptoms of its politicisation are there for all to see:

- Politically aligned - the current HMCI - Michael Wilshaw – has been closely tuned to the Coalition Government's political agenda, particularly in relation to speeding up conversion to academy status.
- Marketised - in which the explicit aim of inspection is to help parents choose a school and in which education institutions use inspection results to promote themselves in an education market.
- Privatised – the increased use of private training companies, such as Serco and Tribal, to provide the bulk of inspectors and in which HMIs (full-time inspectors) have played a more marginal role.
- Constantly changing standards – popularly known as 'moving the goalposts', with rapid alterations to the inspection framework that are used to justify judgments of institutions and to sudden overturning of previous judgments as in Birmingham.
- Adversarial behaviour and accusations of bias. There is serious anecdotal evidence that particular schools and the college sector - those most closely associated with the previous

> Labour government - have been singled out for harsh judgments based on very narrow criteria and often leading to dramatically different inspection outcomes over a very short period of time. At the same time, Ofsted has been slow to inspect academy chains and school sixth forms, those institutions most closely associated with the Government's policy agenda.

The result has been a crisis of trust because of the sense that inspection has become too involved with party politics; it generates a climate of fear and has lost much of its sense of independence and educational legitimacy.

Towards the end of 2014, however, the picture has grown more complex. The strong political links between the HMCI and Secretary of State became strained as Ofsted tried to row back from the extremes of policy on inspection. The use of private companies in inspection has been curtailed and HMIs (full-time inspectors) given a more important role; there has been a decision to inspect academy chains and mention is now being made of an 'improvement' perspective, the involvement of local authorities and looking at area-wide provision. There is also consultation on a new inspection framework that, amongst other things, has tried to curb the grading of particular lessons. Moreover, not all Ofsted inspectors shared the views of the HMCI and schools and colleges have reported involvement of well informed and well-meaning inspectors that have broadly got their judgments right. The current evolution of Ofsted could thus be likened to the role of Nicky Morgan (the new Secretary of State for Education) who is trying to mend fences with the teaching profession while, arguably, consolidating the main features of the Gove Education Revolution. Nevertheless, the current inspection approach, even in its latest 'adaptive form', remains unfit for the wider purposes of Big Education.

INSPECTION RE-CONCEPTUALISED AS PART OF A NEW MODEL OF QA/QI

We see a re-conceptualised inspection as a central feature of a new model of improvement and educational quality that has at its centre the democratic social partnership approach that this Inquiry has applied to all aspects of education governance and learning. This will mean inspection becoming part of a rebalanced system of national, local and institutional governance with more power being devolved to the local level; a partnership and area-based approach to change and development; a leading role being given to education professionals and the concept of self-improvement; the application of the principles of quality, improvement, creativity and innovation across all aspects of the education system, including the independent sector; the primacy of an independent

inspectorate with the reintroduction of the HMI model in a new more collaborative and democratic setting and greater democratic accountability at both national and local levels.

The main features of inspection in the new QA/QE model could be as follows:

- *A new name for a new model* - given the scale of change being envisaged there is a strong case for a retitled inspectorate (e.g. National Inspection and Evaluation Service) to mark the end of the Ofsted era and the beginning of a new system of QA/QI.
- *Focus on system improvement* – the shift from 'market transparency' to sustainable system improvement. This could mean a more diverse set of roles for a national inspectorate: promoting institutional improvement; the quality and range of area-based provision, collaborations and partnerships; teacher training and teachers; and areas of national provision such as vocational education. It would mean greater partnership working with various national agencies as well as with a reinvigorated local government. It could also mean a movement away from crude overall grading and towards a more granulated approach to key indicators (the 'spikey profile') to be used in an improvement process that has a three- or five-year time-scale.
- *Harnessing the energy of self-assessment and peer review* – the key issue would be how to help education institutions create and maintain an awareness of their performance and their role in the community. This can be assisted by a greater role for institutional self-assessment and a greater say as to which local key indicators should feature in an inspection (as is the case in Germany for example). Inspection should also utilise the rich seam of school-to-school reviews that have arisen in recent years.
- *Independence, objectivity and ethical professionalism* – the accent should be on independence and professionalism with full-time and highly trained HMIs as the main inspection body. These could work with a small number of former inspectors and secondees from schools, colleges, workplaces and the new democratic governance structures such as Local Education Boards (LEBs) proposed elsewhere in this report. There would also have to be a strengthening of the inspectorate code of conduct to reflect the guiding principles of Big Education and the role of the new QA/QI system.
- *A partnership inspection process* – partnership working would be central to the new model. This could start with the creation of a national inspection framework shaped not only by the EIS, but also other social partners at the national level in order to generate trust and stability. There would be an inspection cycle visible to all rather than 'no notice' inspections because the aim is involving institutions and localities in the improvement process rather than reducing 'inspection gaming'. Inspections could involve not only HMIs, but also key

local partners and the outcomes of inspections could be reported first to LEBs that have oversight of the quality of provision locally. A more visible and predictable system would not mean the abandonment of 'proportionality', because it could still be the case that providers or local authorities causing concern could trigger more rapid and frequent inspection, possibly involving those tasked with coordinating quality on a regional and sub-regional basis.

- *Inspection and building local capacity for change and improvement* – inspection would thus be seen as an important moment in building local capacity for change and improvement. It would provide objective snapshots of the state of education performance and purpose and offer more qualitative information for LEBs and local authority improvement teams. A reformed Ofsted would work in partnership (rather than walking away following inspection) with other local partners to support a sustainable improvement process.
- *Democratic accountability* - the new inspection service would be accountable to a Parliamentary Select Committee and, in the longer term, to a new independent National Education Council rather than directly to ministers.
- *Policy learning and international practice* – finally, these reforms would arguably bring inspection in England much closer to quality improvement models in other high performing systems and also open up the possibility of international policy learning.

Ideas for this short annex have come from work by Colin Richards; feedback from workshops on inspection at Compass education conferences; from the work of Martin Yarnit on democratic education governance; specialist writings on inspection by Dr Melanie Erhen at UCL IOE and from an NUT survey on school inspection.

5. SELECTION AND ADMISSIONS

An inclusive and diverse education system, whose prime goal is to help people learn how to live together, demands a fair and inclusive system of school admissions, otherwise society is inevitably divided and segregated with 'success' and 'failure' enshrined at a ridiculously early age. Neither students nor schools should be able to gain advantage by practicing selection. We will never have a fair and open education system in England until we ensure selection is ended and all schools are rigorously held to account for the way they admit their pupils.

SELECTION BY ABILITY

Selection by ability exists in 25% of all education authorities and continues to affect a significant proportion of English children. The 11 plus test is surrounded by a costly and inequitable private tuition industry. Around 3% of children in grammar schools are eligible for Free School Meals compared to around 17% nationally. Selective schools also take far fewer children with Special Educational Needs and from some BME backgrounds than exist in their local communities.

The majority of children who take the 11 plus test fail. They start their secondary school careers having been rejected and feeling like failures. Yet we know that children's brains continue to develop until early adulthood. All children, even late developers, can succeed. No child should be held back in this way.

We believe schools should be at the heart of local communities. Schools can bring people together rather than divide them. Selection disrupts those powerful social bonds and makes it difficult, if not impossible, to develop a pattern of strong local schools.

Year-after-year international comparisons show that the highest achieving school systems are comprehensive. So how do we complete the comprehensive revolution and achieve those excellent all-ability schools that ensure every child receives a first-rate education?

We want to see Government take the lead and make the decision to end selection at 11. The case is strong.

Legislation could be introduced to end selection on ability and aptitude over a period of ten years. This can be done gradually starting with the new intake at Year 7. No school needs to close. No

staff need change their jobs. No child's education need be disrupted and all schools could become comprehensive in a few years.

A plan for the transition to a comprehensive system in the 36 local authorities which have selective schools should ensure that:

- During the period of transition grammar schools should admit a non-selective intake of pupils year by year. The transition should take place over a number of years so that every pupil accepted into a grammar school before the transition began will complete their education in the school.
- No school would close.
- There would be no enforced changes in the staffing of grammar schools during the period of transition.
- During the transitional period the government should guarantee investment in teaching and curriculum development to ensure that the schools have the capacity and expertise to educate the intake of pupils of all abilities to a high standard.
- A procedure will exist to ensure, through liaison with the best performing comprehensive schools in the UK, that best practice is applied and any concerns about the needs of more able to succeed in the new comprehensive schools are met.
- Training should be made available to ensure that teachers in existing secondary modern and grammar schools have the necessary skills to teach pupils with a wide range of abilities and aptitudes.
- This procedure should be supervised by a named official or official body.

HIDDEN SELECTION

The diversification of the school system means that over 70 per cent of English secondary schools are also now their own admissions authorities. Even if they are nominally comprehensive, faced with the pressure of the performance tables many are willing and able to find ever more subtle and ingenious ways to pick the children who are most likely succeed and discard the most challenging.

These range from tests of aptitude, tests of faith, partial selection by ability, the creation of favourable catchment areas, the use of feeder schools and certain types of schemes that "band" pupils by ability. Often more than one of these criteria is used at the same time leading to admissions arrangements that can be opaque and hard to understand for local parents, as well as being subtly socially selective.

Moreover, parents willing to cheat the system or with the resources to rent temporary accommodation or move into more favourable catchment areas can manipulate the system to their children's advantage.

A recent survey by the campaigning group Comprehensive Future showed a dramatically different picture of local admissions arrangements around the country. In some parts of the country over 80 per cent of schools used at least one selective admissions criterion. In other parts of the country 80 per cent didn't.

Our starting point is that a future government should aim to create a fair and transparent system that works for parents and children and guards against this type of institutional manipulation.

HOW CAN WE ACHIEVE FAIR ADMISSIONS?

- Every area has different characteristics so the systems that enable high quality, all ability schools that are compliant with the Code of Practice on Admissions should be brokered locally within a local authority framework.
- All schools whether academies, maintained, voluntary aided or community schools should be obliged to comply with the same rules and be governed by the same local system of oversight. That system should be improved to promote, as far as possible, balanced intakes in all schools. One way of doing this may be to encourage fair banding across local authority areas, and the use of lotteries to make it harder for parents to manipulate the system by moving house or cheating.
- There must be a level playing field with NO exceptions to the School Admissions Code of Practice, the regulatory framework to which all schools should adhere.
- Academy schools should not be allowed to negotiate "opt outs" from certain sections of the Code in their funding agreements with central government, as is currently the case. All schools, whether academy or maintained, should be held to account through the same process of compliance.
- For the most part the "policing" of local admissions and compliance with the Code of Practice should be done by the local authority under the supervision of the Office of the Schools Adjudicator.
- Local authorities should be inspected on the rigour with which they manage compliance and be obliged to produce an annual report to the Office of the Schools Adjudicator showing that

they have challenged schools that are not complying with the Code and taken steps to crack down on unfair practices.

- The local admissions forum should be reinstated as a statutory local body, it should include local stakeholders – heads, governors, parents and local authority representatives - and this should be the place where local admissions systems are discussed, challenged and improved where necessary.
- The impact and interaction of different schools' admissions arrangements should be considered at a local level. This can be just as important as the impact of one single school's admissions arrangements on the local community.
- If the impact of several different "own admissions schools" creates a situation where local parents are unable to exercise choice reasonably or fairly, to gauge their chances of success in securing a place at their preferred school and if the convergence of different admissions arrangements has a disproportionate impact on other local schools, this could be grounds for a complaint the Office of the Schools Adjudicator.
- The powers and capacity of the Office of the Schools Adjudicator should be strengthened and it too should be held rigorously to account by Parliament. At the moment the OSA can only respond to complaints but it should have the power to mount its own investigations, to be able to consider the impact of one school's admissions arrangements on the local community of schools. Schools should also be obliged to change their admissions arrangements as soon as the OSA upholds a complaint against them.
- The local authority should be responsible for the administration of the system for all schools, including appeals and in-year admissions, to ensure that the clarity, transparency and fairness required in agreed policies is actually delivered on the ground for the benefit of parents and children.

The Code would reflect these changes but should also be strengthened by including post 16 admissions more explicitly and clearer guidance on the transition between school-based nurseries and reception classes.

6. DEMOCRATIC PROFESSIONALISM

'Big Education' will need a new kind of professionalism to support the new ways of learning and teaching.

PROFESSIONALISM - WHAT'S BEEN HAPPENING IN RECENT YEARS?

Such a professionalism is vital to nursery workers, teachers and lecturers, but is also necessary for all the professionals who work in education alongside them. Teachers' professionalism hit its nadir in the summer of 2012 when the then Secretary of State for Education, Michael Gove, removed the necessity of a teaching qualification as a requirement to teach in academies, free and studio schools and University Technical Colleges. It was his intention that all schools would in due course take the form of these new schools, which would mean that a teaching qualification would no longer be required at all. The General Teaching Council, which had been established by statute in 1998, was abolished in 2012: its closure largely not mourned by teachers. In FE, after a brief period from 2001 to 2013 when all FE college staff were required to have a FE teaching qualification (this was extended to all teaching and training staff in the FE and Skills Sector in 2007), these requirements were also dropped, along with compulsory membership of the Institute for Learning, the non-statutory professional body for FE.

The need to redefine the kind of professionalism that is acceptable to education professionals, and especially teachers, and must underpin the vision of education set out in the final report of the Education Inquiry, is made more urgent by the news in early December that the new Secretary of State for Education, Nicky Morgan, has approved the creation of a National College of Teachers. However there remains an absence of acceptable institutional arrangements that would support the development, defence and recognition of education professionalism. What is needed is a clearly-articulated, persuasive version of professionalism that can be deployed in support, defence and recognition of all education workers.

A NEW PROFESSIONALISM

A new professionalism for education professionals will be essential to support the more flexible and expanded learning, curriculum and qualifications framework and the more devolved, connective and democratic governance framework set out in Big Education.

This new education professional will be able to work and move between the learner, the education institution, the local area and the national system and, beyond these, with the new global networks

of learning that are emerging. This new education professional will be able to make the links and clarify these new vistas for education and learning. S/he will be able to help their pupils, students and learners to make the connections and navigate their learning journeys to be able to fulfil their talents and aspirations.

PROFESSIONALISM VERSUS MANAGERIALISM

The professionalism of education workers is under serious attack from the government and its promotion of a culture of managerialism. This fosters a lack of respect for the expertise, views and commitment of professional staff and the imposition of ever-increasing workloads.

Managerialism and managerial professionalism have increasingly come to dominate education in the UK. Under this approach professionalism becomes divorced from the social and political context in which it is practiced. It relies on regulation and compliance rather than springing from the lived experience and knowledge of the participants, the professionals. Such a concept leaves aside the realities of the particular situation and context in which the professionalism is practiced.

The current government-led model of professionalism then is not fit for purpose. It is based on compliance and regulation. It is built on a model of standardised teaching and assessment; narrow forms of accountability and an aggressive inspection system robs teachers and all education professionals of the freedoms needed to be creative.

Such an education system is based on excessive paperwork and bureaucracy. It depends on a climate of fear. The government has hacked back higher education's long standing involvement in teacher education and put it on a largely in-service basis with little time taken up with underpinning theory. The result will be that future teachers will be driven to focus on the skills involved in teaching without a theoretical underpinning and understanding of the processes of teaching and learning.

The conclusion that can be drawn from government education policies across the whole gamut of is that the professionals involved are not trusted and that teaching and learning should be controlled via rules or 'standards' that in turn reflect the features and values of an audit culture. Thus managerialism will be driven into the very hearts of future teachers. In the words of Frank Coffield, *'practitioners will become regarded as licensed deliverers of nationally produced materials, targets and provision - licensed rather than as trusted public professionals'.*

THE IMPACT OF THE MARKETISATION OF EDUCATION

Above all, the current government's policy is based on market forces and competition between education and training providers. Collaboration and co-operation between providers to enable a comprehensive local curriculum offer is discouraged. These policies are reinforced by funding, inspection and performance tables. The values behind this emphasis of the government on managerialism and reliance on market forces is even more insidious. The values of managerialism are forced on to education professionals. These are in direct opposition to the long held education values of professionals. What is produced is what Stephen Ball calls 'performativity'. Conflicts and tensions between the managerialist values and education values can work, as Ball puts it, to *'eat in the soul of the professional'*. This can become a hollowing out of professionalism making it ripe for first marketisation and then privatisation.

DEMOCRATIC PROFESSIONALISM

The new professionalism that Compass is advocating is a democratic professionalism. This will have an emphasis on collaborative, cooperative action between education professionals and other education stakeholders.

- Such a professionalism is sited within a lived context of political and social realities. It is not a neutral professionalism that seeks to defend narrow, sectarian, vested interests. It is active and dynamic and seeks to build a better and more humane society.
- It seeks to defend and assert long standing educational values such as the liberating and empowering force of education and learning, equality of opportunity and inclusiveness.
- This encompasses strategies for education development, skill development and work organisation.
- The professional's responsibility reaches beyond the single site, classroom, lecture hall, laboratory or workshop and includes contributing to the institution, the system, other students and the wider community. It embraces the collective responsibilities of professionals themselves as a group and to other professions.
- Democratic professionalism involves being sensitive to a range of stakeholders, some of whose voices have been silenced in traditional professionalism.
- It seeks to demystify professional work and forge alliances between educationalists and the excluded, students, and wider communities.

- It allows different viewpoints to build a more democratic education system and ultimately a more open, more democratic society.
- It will be based on communities of practice that can acknowledge new knowledge, changing circumstances and new learners. These can produce new problems for the professional who needs the capacity to respond to new and unexpected situations.
- The key elements of this professionalism are *autonomy*: empowerment in relation to teaching and research that values individual and collective professional effort; *proactive engagement*: challenging inequality and responsibility, but not a responsibility just to the employer/management.
- It will be proactive in recognising threats in the changing political environment to preserve professional knowledge and skill, expertise and most of all professional discretion.

A new professionalism must be built from the bottom up. It must be an empowering and liberating concept and not be a return to a simple '*the state knows best'* approach. The spread of information technology and the welcome end of a culture of deference means the professional is no longer possible or preferable. People are already co-creating better health and education. The challenge is to recognise the value of a public service ethos and the special role of professionals who are trained to do their demanding job – but within this new context of empowered citizens.

A new and expansive professionalism will mean re-building trust among students, learners, colleagues and the general public so that the ability of professionals to make judgments about their own work is restored. This professional bargain or mandate means that professionals will exercise their knowledge and skills according to a set of reformed values and ethics.

Professionalism will need to embrace the concept of 'multiple professionalism' that encompasses: a level of expertise in the area of knowledge of a subject or practice: an understanding of learners and how they learn; a deep understanding of pedagogy and the organisation of assessment; understanding and ability to around the different modes of teaching and learning and, finally, the capacity to collaborate beyond the institution with social partners such as students, parents, employers and other types of professionals, in multi-disciplinary way. This multiple professionalism' would acquire a 'democratic character' in which learners are viewed as potential co-producers of knowledge and not just consumers to be prepared for examinations.

WHAT'S REQUIRED TO ESTABLISH DEMOCRATIC PROFESSIONALISM?

Expansive and democratic professionalism will need to be carefully nurtured. It will require some or all of the following:

- High thresholds for entry to the profession, as is the case in Finland.
- Teacher education becoming longer and more staged.
- The links with higher education and its role in developing an essential underpinning knowledge and theory of education processes including teaching and learning must be restored involving both a close relationship with the school and college workplace and the development of different stages of professional status.
- Professional development will be a blend of initial and continuing development.
- Such professional development will not be an add-on to existing workloads, but part of a normal workload.
- Professional development policies will be based on equal opportunities and not distributed or withheld as a reward or punishment.
- Such a professionalism will be dependent on the proper treatment of professionals with an end to macho and bullying cultures in education.
- The pay of educational professionals will be through national pay and conditions and not embarking on a race to the bottom through regional pay. In return for this there will be legitimately high expectations of how well professionals perform.
- There will be a recognition that education is stressful at the best of times and that the wellbeing of the profession should be given greater priority.
- Education quality and its improvement is a major key to future educational success. This means valuing the experience of established teachers and other professionals, as well as the new high achieving graduate and finding ways of helping all teachers and other professionals to contribute professional wisdom and ways of seeking new challenges. It is far more cost efficient to invest in the existing teacher force than rely on their replacement.
- There will need to be careful discussion and consideration of the need for establishing new professional bodies, especially for teachers and lecturers. This is imperative in the light of the acceptance of the idea of a College of Teaching.
- There must be a strong voice for education professionals (including teacher and education unions and professional associations) in the discussions, debates and decisions around education, teaching and learning. Such bodies would be essential for the exercising of democratic accountability and to support continuous professional development.

- All these requirements must apply not only those who teach in schools, but all those professionals who educate throughout the life-course*, 'from cradle to grave'*.

7. LIFELONG LEARNING AND FURTHER EDUCATION: STEPS TOWARDS A GOOD SOCIETY

We believe that the time has come to re-assert the social value of learning in helping to bring about the three inter-related educational goals of a good society:

- Economic growth and advancement.
- Social inclusion and democratic empowerment.
- Personal growth and the increase of autonomy.

We argue for:

- A cradle-to-grave system of lifelong learning, funded fairly, to enable everyone to realise their potential and to develop at the time and pace that suits them.
- A shift of power and resources away from Whitehall with greater local democratic accountability.

Lifelong learning is a key ingredient of national well-being in a democratic society, potentially providing the intellectual tools for every citizen to participate critically and positively in shaping a better future for us all, challenging narrow-thinking, prejudice and cynicism that threaten our democratic institutions. The challenges to our planet must urgently be combatted through public awareness and action. Sustainability is one of the values on which Compass's proposals are based. Not just ecological sustainability but our capability to manage and shape society in a sustainable way.

'*Learning through Life'* [xxx] has set out a strategy we endorse, particularly those measures that put learning power into the hands of disadvantaged learners through local democratic planning and through financial entitlements, such as the now almost discarded Educational Maintenance Allowance (EMA). Lifelong learning, equally importantly, can bring joy, friendship, self-esteem. Room must be found for *'Seriously useless learning'* [xxxi] as well as the utilitarian agenda that has been increasingly the focus in recent decades.

Rapid advances in digital technology can dramatically accelerate progress towards an inclusive lifelong learning system but there is a danger that digital technology will be yet another of the divides between the 'haves and have-nots'. We propose a shift in values within education to recognise and support those measures that allow digital technologies to promote a more inclusive and democratic society.

A SECOND CHANCE- THE ROLE OF FURTHER EDUCATION

Given the permanence of social and economic change, almost nobody can expect to be qualified for life or equipped for changing roles and contexts solely through their initial education. Yet for all too many, opportunities cease when they leave school. Those who do find opportunities are more likely to do so through a college of further education or a training provider. Both of these suffer from unequal treatment compared to other institutions, their funding usually the first to be cut in times of economic hardship, for example.

A crucial part of a lifelong learning framework is further education (FE), the least understood and appreciated part of our education system. It provides a lifeline for the almost 60% of young people who do not follow the 'A' level route from school to university (as well as a significant proportion of those that do follow it); skills for workers and the unemployed and a second chance for adults returning to learning later in life. The sector trains 3 million people a year playing a central role in delivering vocational education at higher levels. Equally important, it offers high quality services to young people and adults with special educational needs, to those whose first language is not English and to the 1 in 5 adults whose levels of literacy and numeracy hold them back. In the last 3 years over 1 million adults have improved their literacy and numeracy skills and gained qualifications through the FE sector.

Never funded equitably, FE has borne the brunt of recent cuts with far more predicted to come. Forced to chase any source of available funding to survive, it has become so diverse that it is hard for the general public to understand its purpose and value. Policy makers and politicians rarely have any experience of FE but that does not stop their endless meddling. Compass believes that FE needs a fresh start if we are going to get on top of the twin problems that dog our system: the poor standing of vocational education and the inadequate skills of much of the working age population. So we endorse the 157 Group[xxxii] in calling for stable structures, equal treatment (in funding and accountability), freedom to innovate and durable funding (a stable financial settlement within which to plan). All educational pathways and stages should be treated equally to bring about the 'parity of esteem' so often talked about in regard to vocational and academic education.

YOUNG PEOPLE

The FE sector (which includes private training providers as well as colleges) educates more 16 to 19 year olds than schools as well as, increasingly, the 14+ youngsters who schools are more than happy to hive off. Many of these young people get a poor deal from education- a significant and currently

growing minority (referred to as NEETS - not in employment, education or training) has abandoned education and training altogether.

We support a package of measures designed to improve young people's employment prospects and to make it easier to navigate a bafflingly complex education and benefits system. These include:

- New qualifications such as the proposed National Baccalaureate would benefit the almost 60 per cent (according to 2012 figures) who do not opt for 'A' levels and university entry.
- At local level, employment training plans must be set up for all young people with mechanisms to track the progress of NEETs and the unemployed. Excellent careers advice and guidance must be closely allied to local employment opportunities. These services must target those most at risk and publish annual reviews of their performance.
- A new maintenance allowance should be introduced for 16-24 year olds taking them out of benefit regulations so they can take part in workplace learning, community service and relevant study.
- The Future Jobs Fund should be restored, enabling private, public and not for profit sectors to participate.
- Community and voluntary organisations should be given a lead role in commissioning support for young people with targeted integrated case management for those most at risk who so often fall through the cracks.
- To increase our knowledge of what works we need to establish an anonymised database of cost effective interventions (as NICE do for the healthcare sector), with analysis and dissemination of best practice.
- Whilst these measures focus largely (and urgently) on young unemployed people, similar measures must be taken for unemployed adults.

SKILLS FOR EMPLOYMENT AND APPRENTICESHIPS

Poor skill levels undermine economic vitality as well as holding back the life chances of the so-called 'forgotten 50%' of young people and their adult counterparts who hope to follow a vocational route. NIACE predicts in its October 2014 'Localism Prospectus' that *'our economy will have 13.5 million job vacancies in the next decade but with only 7 million young people entering the labour force in that period, we are heading for a major labour market imbalance.'*[xxxiii]

Too many employers in Britain think training is something the government should pay for, an attitude too long reinforced by government policies such as the 'Train to Gain' programme.

Government is not powerless to change employers' attitudes and practice but needs to have the will. Countless government reports and initiatives have been of little avail. Policy changes are required to create coherent progression pathways for individuals and to change the practices of employers:

- License to practice (which, incidentally, covers twice as many employees in the regulation-averse USA as in the UK) should be greatly extended.
- Government contracts with major companies should include provision of apprenticeships and other forms of training.
- Tax incentives such as those Richard proposed in his apprenticeship review[xxxiv].
- Vocational strategies to be a required component of industrial strategies.
- Local Enterprise Partnerships (in conjunction with Local Education Boards) required to develop a vocational plan for their area.
- Much improved and impartial careers information, advice and guidance must be re-instated, particularly for those contemplating following a vocational route.
- To simplify the confusion that holds many employers back we propose the development of a single lead agency for skills and employment that can work confidently with large employers, group training associations, small and medium enterprises.

Whilst we support much of the Husbands report on apprenticeships[xxxv], we do not endorse his proposal that employers be given responsibility for resources and qualifications. Research indicates that most do not want this. Only the largest have the capacity to participate fully and they already have considerable influence. We also know from research that the vast bulk of adult training takes place informally within the workplace and that employers are not always good at either providing that training or making use of their talent pools. Externally provided training should, therefore, *'assist employers to re-engineer their work processes in a manner that expands the range and quality of learning opportunities inherent in day to day routines, thereby improving training whilst producing more effective work processes'*[xxxvi] according to Keep and Mayhew.

Apprenticeships deserve a particular mention – with all the main political parties offering them as the preferred solution to skills development and greater parity of esteem with academic routes. How realistic is this vision? We fear it is not at all. With only 7per cent of young people pursuing this route, often due to shortage of apprenticeship places, and with recent (Nov 2014) provisional government figures showing an overall 13 per cent decline in places in 2013/14 (compared with 2012/13) within which the greatest fall was in the 25+ group where starts fell by 29 per cent, much more must be done.

Too few apprenticeships are based on rigorous or expansive learning, on and off the job, too narrowly focused on skills for specific roles, lacking in under-pinning theory and generally too short in duration. The measures set out above should help in stimulating demand and a positive response by employers. In addition, we endorse the German model of longer, more rigorous apprenticeships.

We also support the conclusions of the Commission on Adult Vocational Teaching and Learning[xxxvii]. With its emphasis on a *'clear line of sight to the real work context'*, and the dual professional role of teachers and trainers who combine occupational and pedagogical expertise. We believe that the professionalism of teachers must not be diluted by the employment of untrained staff and that there must be a culture of continuous professional development. Learners, both young people and adults, require no less than school children – a fully professional workforce that continuously updates and improves its skills and knowledge.

CAREERS EDUCATION AND GUIDANCE

Few young people and even fewer adults receive high quality, independent careers education or guidance that would enable them to make the right lifetime choices and mid-life changes that would benefit themselves and the economy. We agree, therefore, with the Association of Colleges in their 2015 Manifesto[xxxviii] that careers education (deeper than guidance and advice alone) should be re-introduced into the school curriculum and local advice hubs developed (as proposed by the National Careers Council Report[xxxix]). These should provide services to support the 'mid-life career review programme' that NIACE argues for in its 2015 Localism Prospectus.

ADULT AND COMMUNITY LEARNING (ACL)

Adult and community education has struggled to survive in the new, skills-focused world with the ACL fund frozen at a meagre £210m for more than a decade. We pay tribute to organisations such as the Workers' Educational Association (WEA), National Institute for Adult Continuing Education (NIACE), the more recently formed U3A and Unionlearn that are amongst those trying to uphold the proud history of working class education dating back to Victorian times. Whilst supporting what these are doing, Compass wants to see the renewal of an invigorated citizens' learning movement, one that builds on the possibilities of social networks and digital learning to contribute to a stronger democracy and a Good Society.

CITIZENS' LEARNING

We support the creation of Citizens' Learning Networks through which people can develop critical thinking skills together and apply them to the many problems that beset them and, equally important, enjoy the sheer pleasure of '*seriously useless learning'*. Such networks (virtual and face to face) are likely to be autonomous and largely independently funded – new forms of mutual or cooperative organisation drawing on public contributions in cash and/or kind from local authorities and other local bodies. A key characteristic of the Networks would be a relentless engagement with the big issues defined by ordinary people and through dialogue to identify principles, causes and solutions. This is what we mean by a citizens' curriculum. Their success would be judged by the extent to which they demonstrated the relevance of learning in enabling people to bring about collective action for social change.

Citizens' Learning Networks could complement recent proposals by NIACE for a Citizens' Curriculum – *'a life skills/citizens' curriculum approach involves developing learners' language, literacy and numeracy skills in an interlinked way, alongside and within other life skills, which include health, civic, digital and financial capabilities.*' A modicum of funding could facilitate the development and coordination needed to establish and maintain these independent forms of lifelong learning.

Meanwhile ACL has provided a range of services that make a huge difference to people's lives and must be maintained and strengthened. There is growing evidence about the beneficial impact of literacy, numeracy and problem solving and adult learning in general. [xl] Yet funding in England for adult literacy, numeracy and ESOL (ALNE) has shrunk and access to free provision has been curtailed – all from a relatively low base. Also essential to the social justice agenda is family learning but that has suffered a similar fate. Research has shown that educational interventions that involve the whole family can make a huge difference not only to the aspirations and attainment of children but to the skills, confidence and ambition of their parents or carers.

Several measures would enable more people to enjoy the benefits of adult learning including:

- Re-establish a wider entitlement to adult learning regardless of age, employment or benefits status with a statutory entitlement to some programmes such as ESOL.
- Fully integrate ALNE into workplace and community contexts with fully trained professionals and volunteer support.
- Support flexible, self-organised models of learning such as those described as Citizens' Learning Networks. Integrate digital literacies into provision.
- Invest strongly in family learning programmes, continuing to research best practices.

- Improve guidance to enable individuals to orientate and help them invest through an approach built around reciprocity and mutual support rather than commercial loans.

STRENGTHENING THE LOCAL DIMENSION – PLANNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Compass advocates redefinition of roles and responsibilities for educational planning and accountability with a decisive devolution of responsibilities and resources to democratically constituted bodies and an end to the government micro-management that has characterised recent years. We argue for the creation of local education plans and for local scrutiny committees to be turned into Local Education Boards, representing all the stakeholders, charged with ensuring the accountability of publicly funded education providers to their communities and to Parliament.[xli] We see the planning of and accountability for lifelong learning and further education within this framework with colleges of further education playing a significant role.

FUNDING

The over-riding principles of funding lifelong learning and further education within it in a good society must be parity of access for all learners, in entitlement to grants and loans, with the right to take this up at whatever point in the life course is most suitable to the individual. There should also be funding according to need: greater at entry and foundation levels and for disadvantaged young people and adults.

In many ways the inverse is true and always has been though it has worsened of late. In recent years funding up to the age of 16 has been protected and this has significantly affected institutions such as colleges and work-based training providers whose population is almost entirely 16 plus. Funding of 17 year olds is 22 per cent lower than that of 11-16 year olds and 18 year olds fare even worse.

- The ring-fence must be extended to 18 year olds in the first instance.
- Education Maintenance Allowance, a successful incentive and support system for the poorest learners, must be reintroduced.
- We endorse the AoC's call for a 'once in a generation review' of funding needs and criteria for distribution based on the principles set out above.[xlii]
- There must be scope for the planning role of Local Education Boards to influence funding locally. Local decision-making will lead to better use of scarce resources.

CONCLUSION

Our focus in this appendix is on further education and adult learning, as a key component of a lifelong learning system, one that serves the needs of millions of young people and adults each year, most of whom are working class, but that suffers from a combination of neglect and meddling. Our concern throughout has been to ensure that education contributes to the building of a more equal, inclusive and sustainable society, and that its management at every level reflects our commitment to a more democratic and collaborative order. This will require a series of cultural shifts particularly to the status that we accord to vocational education. It means recognising the importance of education that:

- Promotes social justice and cohesion.
- Develops skills for work.
- Opens up opportunities for young people who have not chosen the A level route to university, and 'second chance' adults.
- Offers learning throughout life and a critical understanding of the world to help people to both shape as well as adapt to change in their own lives and the reality around them – to use learning to create a more just society.

WE WARMLY WELCOME COMMENTS ON THE IDEAS AND POLICIES IN THESE APPENDICES IN ORDER TO FURTHER DEVELOP OUR THINKING. READERS CAN CONTRIBUTE COMMENTS AND IDEAS AT WWW.COMPASSONLINE.ORG.UK/EDUCATION-INQUIRY/

ENDNOTES

[i] Save Childhood Movement (2014) *Manifesto for the Early Years- Putting Children First.*

[ii] IPPR (2013) Early Developments: *Bridging the gap between evidence and policy in early-years education*. Contains a wealth of research evidence illustrating this and many other points.

[iii] Feinstein, L (2003) *'Inequality in early cognitive development of British Children in the 1970 cohort'*, Economica 70.

[iv] See Compass (2015) *Big Education* Part 3. Transforming Education in England and Wales

[v] Described in Compass (2015) *Big Education*

[vi] Save Childhood Movement (2014) *op cit*

[vii] DfE, (2014) '*Students' educational and developmental outcomes at age* 16'. (The EPPSE longitudinal study of 3000 children)

[viii] Waldgrave, H.(2014) *Centres of Excellence? The Role of Children's Centres in Early Intervention.*

[ix] NIACE (2013) '*Family Learning Works*'

[x] Alexander, R. (ed) (2010) *Children, Their World, Their Education: Final Report and Recommendations of the Cambridge Primary Review*

[xi] Compass, (2015) *Big Education op cit*

[xii] DCSF (2009) *The Independent Review of the Primary Curriculum*.

[xiii] Save Childhood Movement (2014) *op cit*

[xiv] OECD (2012) Starting Strong 111: A Quality Toolbox for Early Childhood and Care.

[xv] NAO (2012)

[xvi] IPPR op cit

[xvii] Save Childhood movement Manifesto (2014) [The 11th principle, page 4]

[xviii] Nutbrown, C. (2012) *'Foundations for Quality: the independent review of early education and childcare qualifications'*

[xix] IPPR (2013) Section 2.8, *The Role of Ofsted.*

[xx] Compass (2015) Big Education Appendix 4 Quality Assurance and Improvement: the Future of Inspection

[xxi] Doyle et al, (2007) Early Childhood Intervention: Rationale, timing and Efficacy; and in the USA Schweinhart et al (2011) The HighScope Perry Preschool Study Through Age 40.

[xxii] Save the Children Fund (2013) Too young to Fail

[xxiii] IPPR (2013) op cit

[xxiv] George Mitchell School http://www.georgemitchellschool.co.uk/

[xxv] Bealings School http://www.bealings.org.uk/information/aims-values/

[xxvi] Harpenden Free School http://www.harpendenfreeschool.org.uk/index.php

[xxvii] Corelli College http://www.corelltcollege.org.uk

[xxviii] Woodrow First School http://teamwoodrow.wordpress.com/about/

[xxix] Rosendale http://www.rosendale.cc

[xxx] NIACE, 2009

[xxxi] Seriously Useless Learning: the collected TES writings of Alan Tuckett with an introduction and narrative by Ian Nash, NIACE 2014[xxxi] NIACE, 2009

[xxxi] Seriously Useless Learning: the collected TES writings of Alan Tuckett with an introduction and narrative by Ian Nash, NIACE 2014

[xxxii] Future Colleges- rising to the skills challenge, 157 Group, Oct 2014

[xxxiii] 2015 Localism Prospectus, NIACE, 2014.

[xxxiv] The Richard review of apprenticeships, BIS, 2012

[xxxv] A revolution in apprenticeships: a something for something deal with employers, Husbands review of vocational education and training, Labour Party Policy review, 2013

[xxxvi] Moving beyond skills as an economic and social panacea, in Work, Employment and Society Vo 24, No 3, 2010

[xxxvii] It's about work – the report of the Commission on Adult Vocational Teaching and Learning, LSIS, 2013

[xxxviii] Manifesto 2105, Association of Colleges, Nov 2014

[xxxix] Taking action: Achieving a culture change in careers provision, National Careers Council, 2014

[xl] OECD PIACC Skills Outlook 2013, p. 240; Feinstein and Sabates (2007), Public Value of Adult Learning: Skills and Social Productivity at http://www.niace.org.uk/lifelonglearninginquiry/docs/Feinstein-Sabates12.pdf

[xli] See Appendix 1 of this report, Democratising the governance of local education

[xlii] Manifesto 2105, Association of Colleges, Nov 2014