INDICATORS OF EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY AND GOOD RELATIONS IN EDUCATION

Research Report

March 2012

The

Equality Company

Equality Commission
FOR NORTHERN IRELAND

Contents

Executive Summary

In November 2008 the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland published *Every Child an Equal Child*, a statement on key inequalities in education and a strategy for intervention, setting out three overarching goals:

- **ACCESS -** every child has equality of access to a quality educational experience;
- **ATTAINMENT -** every child is given the opportunity to reach his or her full potential;
- **ETHOS -** the ethos of every school promotes the inclusion and participation of all children.

This project aims to inform the Commission's ongoing policy development work by using existing literature and best practice, supported by stakeholder views, to develop a framework of indicators and associated measures (both existing and potential) of equality of opportunity and good relations in education for each of the three overarching goals.

This report sets out the findings derived from key literature and the two phases of stakeholder engagement and recommends a series of indicators and associated measures. Stakeholder engagement was carried out at the beginning of the project (March 2010) and again in November/December 2010 when a Proposed Indicator Framework was available for discussion. The Indicator Framework has been revised, where possible, to take account of the diversity of views expressed at the engagement stages and a resultant final Recommended Indicator Framework is set out in this report.

Access
In line with existing good practice in regard to indicator frameworks and informed by current strategic priorities, four indicators are recommended to track progress relevant to this overarching goal. In combination these four indicators will address the multifaceted nature of access to, and within, the school:

- **Access to schools**, including choice of school type and attendance;
- **Access to subjects**, including breadth of curriculum and extra curricular activities;
- **Access to facilities**, including physical access, access to facilities and materials;
- **Access to support**, including teacher and specialist support, home and community support and external agency support.

Attainment

Five indicators are recommended to track progress relevant to this overarching goal[1]. In combination these indicators will address the multifaceted nature of attainment:

- **Public examinations**;
- **Personal development and cultural awareness**;
- **Other achievements**;
- **Teacher and learner expectations**;
- **Employability**.

Ethos

Five indicators are recommended to track progress relevant to this overarching goal:

- **Policies and procedures**, including school aims, anti-bullying policies and diversity policies;
- **Pastoral care**;
- **Communication**, with other schools and with parents/guardians;
- **Governance**, including the Board of Governors and School Council;
- **Teacher development**.

A range of quantitative and qualitative measures is suggested to facilitate the tracking of progress relevant to the three goals in summary and across all relevant Section 75 equality grounds. Data for some of these measures is currently available and the report identifies suitable sources. It also includes

---

[1] It should be noted that there are no sub-indicators proposed under this theme; each of the suggested indicators stands alone.

recommendations for ongoing indicator development work in this area and suggests actions which might be taken to address identified data gaps.

1. Background

In November 2008 the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland published *Every Child an Equal Child*, a statement on key inequalities in education and a strategy for intervention. This document stated that:

> "The Equality Commission's vision of Northern Ireland is as a shared, integrated and inclusive place, a society where difference is respected and valued, based on equality and fairness for the entire community. We consider that all children and young people must be valued equally and believe that they should be allowed the opportunity to develop to their full potential. The role of the education system should therefore be to foster and facilitate that development…… We aim to ensure that raising the performance and expectations of all children, especially those who are disadvantaged, are core elements of our education system. We consider that a key factor in achieving this aim will be to ensure that the principles and practice of equality of opportunity are mainstreamed in all our schools."

Every Child an Equal Child set out three overarching goals:
- **ACCESS -** every child has equality of access to a quality educational experience;
- **ATTAINMENT -** every child is given the opportunity to reach his or her full potential;
- **ETHOS -** the ethos of every school promotes the inclusion and participation of all children.

In order to achieve these goals, *Every Child an Equal Child* sets out a strategy for intervention based on four initiatives:

- Reviewing curriculum support materials and developing good practice guidance;

- Setting strategic actions and outcomes to reduce inequalities through equality schemes;
- Developing equality and good relations elements for the training programmes provided for student teachers, existing teachers, heads and governors;
- Developing equality and good relations indicators for schools to be used to monitor progress on embedding equality and good relations.

This research project aims to inform the Commission's programme of future policy interventions by using existing literature and best practice, supported by stakeholder views, to develop a framework of indicators and associated measures of equality of opportunity and good relations in education for each of the three overarching goals.

This document presents detailed information on findings derived from key literature and the two phases of stakeholder engagement and recommends a series of indicators and associated measures.

2. Aims and Objectives

2.1. Aims

The primary aim of the current project is to develop a framework of indicators and associated measures of equality of opportunity and good relations in education for each of the three overarching goals in *Every Child an Equal Child*. The framework must be capable of tracking progress relevant to the three goals in summary and across all relevant Section 75 equality grounds (further disaggregated by gender).

The nine Section 75 grounds are:
- religious belief;
- political opinion;
- racial group;
- age;
- marital status;
- sexual orientation;
- gender;
- people with a disability and those without;
- people with dependants and those without.

In its document *Every Child an Equal Child,* the Equality Commission identified eight priority groups of children and young people that, at that time, (November 2008) had either displayed consistent educational under-achievement or for which there was insufficient information to make that assessment[2]. This report therefore contains frequent references to issues which are particularly pertinent to these priority groups.

The priority groups are:

- Protestant working class boys;

---

[2] See ECNI (2007) Statement on Key Inequalities in Northern Ireland. ECNI: Belfast

- Irish Traveller children and young people;
- Lesbian, gay and bisexual young people;
- Looked after children and young people;
- Minority ethnic children and young people;
- Disabled children and young people;
- Children and young people with caring responsibilities[3];
- Children of new residents and migrant workers (newcomer children and young people).

2.2. Objectives

This document seeks to deliver on the following research objectives:

- To identify relevant key issues and criteria for the development of a robust framework, by way of literature review; engaging with key stakeholders and evaluating available data.
- To develop a framework of indicators and associated measures of equality of opportunity and good relations in education for each of the three overarching goals specified in *Every Child an Equal Child*. The framework must be capable of tracking progress relevant to the three goals in general and across all relevant Section 75 equality grounds (further disaggregated by gender), thus enabling the identification of new or persistent priority groups or issues.
- To make recommendations for ongoing indicator development work in this area and/or actions required to address any identified data gaps.

---

[3] To include school-aged parents

3. Methodology

The recommended indicators have been developed principally as a result of:

i) a reflection on comparative indicator frameworks as developed elsewhere;

ii) a literature review;

iii) engagement with key stakeholders, both at an early stage of the project and on the basis of draft proposals.

3.1. Comparative International Indicator Frameworks

Initially, the project team reflected on examples of indicator frameworks as developed elsewhere, in order to identify the existence of any common or recurring themes. While internationally there is growing interest in the use of indicator frameworks to track change over time, in the field of equality many of these have been restricted to a small number of grounds of difference (typically gender and/or race), or are so broad in scope that their relevance to any one domain, such as education, can be diluted.

3.1.1. UN Development Programme on Gender Equality

The UN Development Programme on gender equality (see http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/educ/indic/rapinen.pdf) has involved the development and coordination of a number of composite indices to track gender equality (under Millennium Development Goal 3: Gender Equality) across different countries, resting within an even broader framework of a total of eight Millennium Development Goals.

Education is identified as a strategic priority and is tracked by two indicators – i) the ratio of female to male gross enrolment rates in primary, secondary and tertiary education; and ii) equivalent completion rates for boys and girls. These measures in turn are linked to three further UNDP frameworks, the Gender-Related Development Index (GDI), the Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) and the Gender Equity Index (GEI). The latter includes education as one of three dimensions, with indicators measuring a) the literacy gap between men and

women; and b) enrolment rates in formal education. While of international significance, locally these indicators are too general and broad in scope to help inform the specifics of the present project.

3.1.2. EU Indicators on the Quality of School Education

In May 2000 the European Union (EU) published a report on the quality of school education (see http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/education_training _youth/lifelong_learning/c11063_en.htm) This report is based on the work of Education Ministries across all 26 EU states. It sets out 16 quality indicators to measure quality of school education in the EU. However, the indicators are not linked specifically to any equality ground or priority group. The 16 indicators[4] relate to four areas:

- Attainment (in the areas of mathematics, reading, science, information and communication technologies (ICT), foreign languages, learning to learn, and civics);
- Success and Transition (identifies pupils' ability to complete their studies by examining dropout rates, completion of upper secondary education and participation in higher education);
- Monitoring of School Education (determines the level of participation of the various stakeholders in school systems through evaluation and steering of school education and evaluation of parental participation);
- Resources and Structures (focuses on educational expenditure per student, education and training of teachers, rate of participation in pre-primary education and the number of students per computer).

While offering a potentially useful framework for the consideration of general trends in Education in the EU member countries, it was not felt that the associated measures were sufficiently detailed or sensitive to local

---

[4] These are: 1.maths; 2.reading; 3.science; 4.ICT; 5.foreign languages; 6.learning to learn; 7.civics; 8.school dropout rates; 9.completion of upper secondary education; 10.participation in higher education; 11.evaluation and steering of school education; 12.parental participation; 13.education and training of teachers; 14. participation in pre-primary education; 15. number of students per computer; 16. educational expenditure per student.

circumstances to be applied directly to the present project and in particular when set against the ECNI framework as presented in *Every Child an Equal Child*.

3.2.   Comparative Great Britain Frameworks

Since 2007 the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has been working assiduously with government, various devolved assemblies and government agencies to develop an overarching Equality Measurement Framework (EMF). The EMF aims to assess equality and human rights across a range of domains, including education and learning, in relation to at least eight equality characteristics – age, disability, ethnicity, gender, religion or belief, sexual orientation, transgender and social class.

Domain 8 (Education and Learning), is defined as, 'the capability to be knowledgeable, to understand and reason, and to have the skills to participate in society', and contains six sub-domains:

- Attain the highest possible standard of knowledge, understanding and reasoning;
- Be fulfilled and stimulated intellectually, including being creative if you so wish;
- Develop the skills for participation in productive and valued activities, including parenting;
- Learn about a range of cultures and beliefs and acquire the skills to participate in a diverse society, including learning English;
- Access education, training and lifelong learning that meets individual needs;
- Access information and technology necessary to participate in society.

These sub-domains are in turn related to one or more of the following indicators and associated measures[5]:

---

[5] Not all the indicators and associated measures were relevant to all countries (i.e. England, Wales and Scotland); some applied to one or two countries only.

Indicator 1: Basic skills

Measure 1.1: Percentage of people of working age achieving functional literacy and numeracy skills

Measure 1.2: Percentage who can speak, read and write English or Welsh very or fairly well

Indicator 2: Educational qualifications

Measure 2.1: Percentage of each age group with no educational qualifications

Measure 2.2: Percentage of each age group with degree-level qualification

Indicator 3: Participation in lifelong learning

Measure 3.1: Percentage who have participated in formal or informal learning in last 12 months

Indicator 4: Use of the internet

Measure 4.1: Percentage who have used the internet for any purpose within the last 3 months

Indicator 5: Being treated with respect in education

Measure 5.1: Percentage of those attending who say they are treated with respect at school or college.

This framework has gained broad consensual agreement across the UK. However, the Section 75 grounds covered by the Equality Commission's remit are distinct from the groups as identified by the EHRC. Furthermore, the nine priority groups identified in *Every Child an Equal Child* are of distinct interest to the Equality Commission. Hence while the EHRC's framework, indicators and associated measures were taken on board, it was determined that, in line with the original project brief, the draft framework as outlined in *Every Child an Equal Child* should continue to form the platform for future development, informed by local initiatives, stakeholder views and relevant literature.

3.3. Comparative Northern Ireland Frameworks

One local framework that is relevant to elements of the present project is that attaching to *A Shared Future* (2007). Of particular interest are the 11 indicators linked to Priority Outcome 4 ('Increased sharing in education'). These indicators are listed below:

Indicator 4.1: Proportion of pupils enrolled in Catholic managed schools who are Protestant;

Indicator 4.2: Proportion of pupils enrolled in Controlled schools who are Catholic;

Indicator 4.3: Proportion of pupils enrolled at grant-aided schools who are enrolled at integrated schools;

Indicator 4.4: Number and proportion of first preference applications to post-primary integrated schools that do not result in admissions;

Indicator 4.5: Proportion of people who would send their children to mixed schools;

Indicator 4.6: Proportion of people who believe government encourages sharing of facilities by schools of different religions;

Indicator 4.7: Proportion of people who believe government is actively encouraging integrated schools;

Indicator 4.8: Proportion of pupils with English as an additional language;

Indicator 4.9: Proportion of enrolments from minority ethnic pupils;

Indicator 4.10: Proportion of children bullied due to race or colour, religion or disability;

Indicator 4.11: Proportion of schools delivering citizenship studies on a joint basis with another school with a good relations element.

Where appropriate, these indicators and associated measures have been accommodated within the emerging framework as they sit easily alongside the objectives underpinning *Every Child an Equal Child.*

3.4. Literature Review

Having established and confirmed the broad parameters for the Indicator Framework, a more focused review of literature was then undertaken. It was agreed that, given the resources allocated to the project, this element of the work must by necessity concentrate on key reports and documents.

The literature review includes an appraisal of published material relating to policy, strategy and performance in the education sector, with a particular focus

on Northern Ireland. Research reports that address specific aspects of equality of opportunity and good relations in schools are also included. These help to identify particular challenges faced by children and young people in various Section 75 equality categories and among the eight priority groups. Relevant literature is presented across the body of this report and a bibliography of all sources duly referenced is included at Appendix A.

3.5. Stakeholder Engagement – Phase 1

To ensure that consultation with local subject experts helped inform the emerging framework from an early stage, a wide range of key stakeholders with a direct interest in the promotion of equality of opportunity and good relations in education, and/or in relation to particular Section 75 grounds or vulnerable groups, were identified, contacted and invited to attend an initial series of facilitated workshops during March 2010. An individual workshop was arranged for representatives of the Department of Education. In addition, invitations were extended to 43 individuals from various sectors who had been identified as key stakeholders. Alternative workshop dates were made available to facilitate stakeholder attendance. A total of 34 people attended one of five workshops.

Those who were unable to attend a workshop on any of the suggested dates were subsequently contacted and asked to complete a self-report form. This form reflected on issues discussed during the workshops along with an option to make more general comments on the project. A further version of the self-report form was also sent to all School Principals across Northern Ireland (approximately 1200). A total of 25 individuals subsequently submitted self-report forms.

This initial phase of stakeholder engagement, in combination with the review of literature, was used to help produce a Proposed Indicator Framework (PIF). This was discussed internally within the Commission and the project's Advisory Group and then circulated to stakeholders in October 2010.

3.6. Stakeholder Engagement – Phase 2

In November 2010, a further phase of engagement was undertaken to gather comments on the Proposed Indicator Framework (PIF). The summary version of the PIF was circulated to those who had been contacted in the first round of consultation, as well as additional identified stakeholders. An invitation was subsequently extended to all those contacted to attend a general workshop on 17th November 2010; a total of 41 people attended this event. A further workshop for young people was held on 1st December 2010 at Spirit of Enniskillen's offices, attended by 10 individuals A one-to-one meeting was held with two representatives of the National Deaf Children's Society (NDCS) on 29th November 2010 to facilitate specific needs. In addition all were invited to submit written views via a comment form and two sets of comments were received.

Prior to this phase of the stakeholder engagement, two written submissions on an early draft of the PIF had been received from the Department of Education and Education and Training Inspectorate personnel. These comments were also taken into account as part of the feedback from the second phase of stakeholder engagement.

Chapter 5 below reflects on some of the general points made during the second phase of stakeholder engagement. Comments relating to specific indicators and measures (as set out in the PIF) are included in the text relating to that indicator (Chapters 6, 7 and 8). However, where the comments made in the second phase of engagement generally re-iterated those made during the first phase, they have not been repeated.

3.7. Recommended Indicator Framework

In this report, the key points arising from the findings of the literature review and both phases of the stakeholder engagement have been summarised in order to provide a rationale for the indicators and associated measures included in the Recommended Indicator Framework (RIF). The RIF builds on the indicators and associated measures set out in the PIF. As a result of the second phase of stakeholder engagement, amendments have been made, for example, one

indicator from the PIF has been deleted (see note on page 172) and a number of changes have been made to the measures.

This report includes an introduction to each theme and sets out the findings and discussion on each recommended indicator. Each theme concludes with a table listing the recommended indicators and associated measures.

3.8.   Populating the Indicator Framework

Where possible, the RIF seeks to maximise the use of existing data, and makes particular reference to those data sources that can provide reliable and valid sources of information for establishing baseline information, and for tracking evidence of change over time. It was agreed by the Commission that, while a practical and useable framework was important, the framework should be data independent, and as such, where a sufficiently strong rationale existed for inclusion of an important indicator/measure, it need not be excluded purely because there was no exact matching data source at present. Hence a number of the indicators and associated measures as included in the RIF are not able to be measured at this time. Where this is the case the issue is flagged both in the text and in accompanying tables[6].

3.9.   Key Data Sources

At the present time, government, and in particular the Department of Education (DE), collects a wide range of good quality data on a regular basis at both individual learner and school level. Normally this information can be cross-tabulated by a range of key variables including school type and management type, location and various Section 75 grounds. In addition, the Department of Enterprise Trade and Investment (DETI) carries out a quarterly Labour Force Survey based on a random sample of around 2,600 households, while the Central Survey Unit (CSU) carries out a young person's behaviour and attitudes survey on a three-yearly basis. In combination these sources represent the main mechanisms for collection of data for the RIF as it is anticipated with a degree of

---

[6] Relevant cells are shaded grey.

confidence that they will yield data that can be compared longitudinally in the future:

- DE - School Census (annual);
- DE - School Leavers Survey (annual);
- DE - Annual Return on Teacher Numbers (annual);
- DETI - Labour Force Survey
- CSU - Young Persons' Behaviour & Attitude (YPB&A) Survey (triennial).

In addition, useful and relevant information can also be obtained from periodic research projects:

- ARK / Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) - Young Life & Times Survey (annually since 2003);
- DE - Bullying in Schools (2002; 2007)
- Department of health, Social services and Public Safety (DHSSPS) - OC2 (annual collection of outcome indicators for Looked After Children);

Further background information on each data source is set out in Appendix B.

3.10. Associated measures

The data to populate the associated measures set out in the RIF relates to information about either Learners or Schools.

3.10.1. Information about Learners

The purpose of the RIF is to track progress relevant to the three overarching goals in *Every Child an Equal Child* in summary and across all relevant Section 75 equality grounds. The equality grounds are sub-divided where relevant (e.g. by a range of minority ethnic origins); further detail is provided in Appendix B.

In addition, the RIF is intended to address issues relevant to the 8 priority groups identified in *Every Child an Equal Child*; some of these duplicate sub-categories within the Section 75 equality grounds (for example, Irish Traveller children and young people, lesbian, gay and bisexual children and young people, minority

ethnic children and young people, disabled children and young people and children and young people with caring responsibilities). Others are not specific to the sub-categories of the Section 75 equality grounds (e.g. Protestant working class boys, looked after children and young people and children of new residents and migrant workers).

It is intended, therefore, that each measure which relates to learners should be sub-divided by the Section 75 grounds and by the additional priority groups identified in *Every Child an Equal Child*.

It became apparent during the second phase of stakeholder engagement (see Chapter 5 below) that it was of great importance to several stakeholders that the category "disabled children and young people" should be sub-divided extensively to reflect the many different types of single and multiple disabilities with which children and young people may be identified. It is therefore recommended (in Chapter 9 below) that a common framework should be developed for the classification of type of disability for the purposes of measuring impacts on children and young people with disabilities, and it is intended that this should be applied to the RIF.

3.10.2.   Information about Schools

In Northern Ireland there is a wide range of school types and management types. The School Census currently records information against 23 variables as set out in Table 1 overleaf.

In this context, "Controlled schools" (nursery, primary, special, secondary and grammar schools) are those under the management of the school's Board of Governors and the Employing Authorities are the five Education and Library Boards. "Catholic Maintained schools" (nursery, primary, special and secondary) are those under the management of the Board of Governors and the Employing Authority is the Council for Catholic Maintained Schools (CCMS). "Other Maintained schools" (primary, special and secondary) include Irish Medium schools.

Table 1: School types and management types

School type	Management type	Sub-group of management type
Nursery Schools	Controlled	
	Catholic Maintained	
Primary Schools	Controlled	
	Catholic Maintained	
	Other Maintained	Irish Medium
		Other
	Controlled Integrated	
	Grant Maintained Integrated	
Preparatory Departments	Controlled	
	Voluntary	Schools under Catholic management
		School under other management
Secondary (non-grammar) schools	Controlled	
	Catholic Maintained	
	Other Maintained	Irish Medium
		Other
	Controlled integrated	
	Grant Maintained Integrated	
Grammar Schools	Controlled	
	Voluntary	Schools under Catholic management
		Schools under other management
Special Schools		
Hospital Schools		
Independent Schools		

Where relevant, it is intended that the associated measures set out in the RIF should be sub-divided to reflect the school types and management types in this table. This will provide more detailed information against each indicator and will allow the impact of the different school and management types to be taken into account. For example, as pointed out during the second phase of the stakeholder engagement, there are several indicators/associated measures which are more relevant to children and young people at post-primary level than at primary level.

In addition, it became apparent during the stakeholder engagement and internal discussions that there was a need to take account of children educated outside the school system in Alternative Education Provision (AEP). It is therefore intended that AEP should be an additional variable within the list of school types.

3.10.3.   Sub-division of associated measures

The tables that set out the RIF for the each of three themes on pages 88-95, 127-131 and 177-182 are structured sequentially by indicator, then associated measure. Further details on the measures are provided in additional table columns. The layout and function of these columns are detailed in Table 2 below. Readers should note that the columns with information about "Learners" and "Schools" contain synopsised terms. This is simply for the sake of brevity, but they should be understood to take in the details set out in 4.10.1 and 4.10.2 above:

- School: School type and management type;
- Learner: Section 75 (S75) equality grounds and priority groups.

In addition, there are some measures which it is recommended should be sub-divided by area, for example the 5 Education and Library Board (ELB) areas. These sub-divisions are included in the column headed "Spatial Detail".

There is also a column to indicate the frequency with which existing surveys are carried out, headed "Frequency".

An example of the RIF table structure is set out in Table 2 overleaf.

Table 2: Example of Recommended Indicator Framework (RIF) table structure

Data Source	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
Lists where data on measure can be found	Details the frequency with which existing surveys are carried out	to reflect the situation in different types of school and schools with different management types	Included when area sub-divisions of the measure are recommended e.g. by Education and Library Board areas.	to reflect S75 equality grounds and priority groups identified in *Every Child an Equal Child*

3.10.4. Potential future indicators and measures

Most of the indicators, sub-indicators and associated measures in the RIF have been thoroughly researched and the wording has been determined with input from stakeholders. However, there is one indicator and several of the associated measures which have been included because of the importance attached to them by stakeholders but where further research would be required to determine their appropriateness and viability. This research is beyond the scope of the current project and so this indicator and these measures have been offered as "potential future indicators/measures" subject to further research. Where this is the case the issue is flagged both in the text and in accompanying tables[7].

The Potential Future Indicator (where no potential associated measures have been recommended) is "Other achievements" which relates to the range of achievements outside the scope of public examinations which are capable of being measured to some degree. Further research will be needed to define the range of bodies facilitating programmes aimed at developing these types of skill and the standards which they apply when making awards.

---

[7] Indicators / Measures are marked with "Potential Future Indicator / Measure" as appropriate.

For several recommended indicators there are associated measures which are regarded as Potential Future Measures. These include:

1. Measure 1.1.10 Quality of schools
2. Measure 2.1.4 Quality of the curriculum delivered
3. Measure 2.2.2   Range and depth of extra-curricular activities
4. Measure 4.1.3 Quality of Special Educational Needs (SEN) support
5. Measure 4.1.4 Parental confidence in SEN support
6. Measure 4.1.8 Quality of English as an Additional Language (EAL) support
7. Measure 4.1.9 Parental confidence in EAL support
8. Measure 4.2.1 Proportion of learners who consider that they receive appropriate support from parents/guardians
9. Measure 4.2.2 Types of support offered to learners by parents/guardians
10. Measure 4.2.3 Level of community support;
11. Measure 4.3.1 Level of outside agency support;
12. Measure 6.4 Range and effectiveness of activities in school about people from different cultures and traditions
13. Measure 8.2 Proportion of learners who achieved all the targets in their Individual Education Plans by the specified end date of the Plan;
14. Measure 10.3.1 Proportion of schools with diversity policies in place
15. Measure 11.3 Quality of pastoral care
16. Measure 12.2.1 Range of types of communication with parents/guardians
17. Measure 12.2.2 Number of activities per year which schools initiate with parents/guardians
18. Measure 12.2.3 Level of involvement of parents/guardians in school activities
19. Measure 12.2.4 Parents/guardians' access to parents' associations and events
20. Measure 12.2.5 Level of parents/guardians' knowledge of schools' complaints procedures and how to use them effectively
21. Measure 14.1 Teacher development in relation to equality of opportunity and good relations.

3.11. Format of this report

This report sets out:

- an introduction to each theme;
- the findings of the research (from the literature review and the two phases of the stakeholder engagement) in relation to each indicator and sub-indicator;
- the discussion of the recommended indicator/sub-indicator, associated measures and available data in relation to each indicator and sub-indicator; and
- the conclusions, i.e. the Recommended Indicator Framework for each theme.

It should be noted that, as explained in 3.8 and 3.10.4 above, the Recommended Indicator Framework (RIF) includes three categories of indicators and associated measures –

- **Recommended (with Data):** Recommended Indicator/Measure with data currently available (at least for some Section 75 categories);
- **Recommended (No Data):** Recommended Indicator/Measure but with NO data currently available;
- **Potential Future Indicator/Measure:** Potential future indicator/measure as further research is required to determine their appropriateness, viability and relevant data sources.

4. Issues raised during Stakeholder Engagement

4.1. Phase 1

The first phase of stakeholder engagement took place in March 2010 and was designed to explore the meaning of the three overarching goals in *Every Child an Equal Child* and list the key issues relevant to each goal. Stakeholders were also asked to give their views on the key issues for children and young people in the 8 priority groups.

A wide range of specific comments was made, both at workshops and in writing, and these were highly influential in the development of the PIF. They are included in this report in Section B in the text under each individual indicator.

4.2. Phase 2

The second phase of stakeholder engagement took place in November/ December 2010 and focussed on the relevance and practicality of the indicators and associated measures set out in the PIF. Stakeholders provided detailed feedback on most of the indicators and measures and this has been reported in detail in this report in the text under each individual indicator (Section C).

Stakeholders also commented on the importance of equality of opportunity and good relations in schools and the nature of an indicator framework. These general comments have helped to frame the RIF but are not specific to individual indicators; they are summarised below.

4.2.1. Equality of opportunity and good relations in schools

Comments included:

- The overarching goals should be an integral part of a school's aims and objectives;
- 'Equality' and 'diversity' agendas must acknowledge individual needs;

- The education system must recognise that young people are diverse in their skills and aptitudes and that society's needs are diverse;
- Schools need to be active in promoting diversity and inclusion but if this is to be achieved there is a need for further teacher training;

These comments have been noted but have not resulted in specific changes to the recommended indicators and associated measures.

4.2.2. Purpose of an indicator framework

Comments included:

- The Indicator Framework represents an opportunity to improve young people's lives;
- There is a need to integrate this work with other initiatives including General Teaching Council Northern Ireland's (GTCNI) Teacher Competencies document and DE's Together Towards Improvement;
- The Extended Schools (ES) programme should be referenced as it provides a range of activities and services outside the traditional school day to help improve life chances of disadvantaged young people;
- Reference should be made to *Every School a Good School – Supporting Newcomer Pupils;*
- Indicators cannot be a 'box ticking ' exercise but should become part of Education Training Inspectorate (ETI) inspection process;
- Considerable social and educational implications attached to implementing this framework;
- The Indicator Framework must be placed in a political context as it could be seen to either endorse or criticise a segregated education system;
- The Indicator Framework should be used to effect real change in the classroom through policy development;
- A Minimum Educational Requirement (MER) is the route to successful educational change.

The links to other policy documents have been taken into account and appropriate references have been included under relevant indicators. It should be noted that it is not intended that there should be anything inherent in the indicator framework that prefers one school management system over another; it can be applied to any management type.

4.2.3. The approach set out in the Proposed Indicator Framework (PIF)

Comments included:

- Measures must accommodate the quality of the young person's experience alongside simple counts of activity;
- Attainment indicators must be sensitive to various routes to success and acknowledge that formal qualifications are only one aspect of a young person's education;
- The PIF is heavily weighted towards the post-primary sector;
- The PIF should make a distinction between strategic and operational issues;
- It would be useful if the PIF could distinguish between inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts;
- The PIF must accommodate 'value addedness' that a school brings to attainment;
- Data gathering should not place an additional administrative burden on schools;
- The limitations of the Indicator Framework should be acknowledged in the final report;
- The PIF is skewed towards policy issues and would benefit from a greater focus on the young person.

As a result of comments made during the second phase of stakeholder engagement, a number of additional measures have been included to emphasise the importance of measuring the quality of the child or young person's experience and the effectiveness of activities undertaken by schools. However, it is acknowledged that some of these might be difficult to measure at primary

school level and that some of the indicators/measures are more relevant to post primary activities.

The comments regarding strategic and operational issues and inputs/outcomes etc. are acknowledged, but the RIF does not seek to make this distinction. **It must be emphasised that the RIF has been developed to inform the Commission's programme of future policy interventions and not as a best practice guide for schools.** It was intended from the start of the project that the RIF would not place an additional administrative burden on schools but would simply help inform the development of future policies in order to address equality of opportunity and good relations in schools more effectively. However, this report does highlight opportunities (in Section F under each indicator) to extend some current surveys to obtain additional information; these are not recommendations but are provided as a guide to the type of information that would need to be gathered to populate the RIF and potential sources of data.

The issue of value addedness was considered at an early stage. However, it was determined that the RIF should include indicators and measures that apply across a school type/management type rather than at individual school level. Thus measures on value addedness have not been incorporated into the RIF, as to do so would require focusing on individual schools.

4.2.4. Terminology

A number of stakeholders questioned the use of particular terminology and pointed out that the indicator framework might have to be revised when the new curriculum is embedded in 2012. In particular, the following comments were made:

- The terms 'academic and vocational' versus 'general and applied' should be considered;
- Consideration should be given to the term 'Attitude' - 'Culture' or 'Attributes' may be more appropriate.

It is acknowledged that the terminology in the RIF may have to be revised at a later date. Wherever possible, the RIF includes general rather than specific terms. Further consideration has been given to the generic title of the third theme, as "Attitude" (used in the PIF) did not seem to find favour with stakeholders. The term "Ethos" which is used in the third overarching goal of *Every Child an Equal Child* has been adopted throughout the RIF.

5. Theme 1 – Access

5.1. Theme introduction

The first overarching goal identified in *Every Child an Equal Child* relates to Access:

Every child has equality of access to a quality educational experience.

Every Child an Equal Child (ECNI, 2008) recognises that:

> "the education system, on its own, cannot resolve structural, social and economic conditions that impede equality of educational opportunity."

It is widely acknowledged that the first step towards tackling inequalities within the education system is to ensure that the benefits of the system are widely available to all children and young people. This is a principle that underpins, either implicitly or explicitly, all other education indicators frameworks (see Burchardt et al., 2009; Moser, 2007; EU Working Committee on the Quality of School Education, 2000).

At the same time "Access" does not simply mean access to a school. In a local context the availability of schools of differing types, management structures and performance levels across Northern Ireland represents a key factor in determining equality of opportunity for all young people, and forms an integral part of both the Executive's *Ten Year Strategy for Young People* 2006-2016 (OFMDFM, 2006), the Department of Education's *Independent Strategic Review of Education* (Department of Education, 2006) and the more recent *Schools for the Future* policy (Department of Education, 2009a).

If children and young people are to have access to a quality educational experience, the facilities, materials and expertise in each school must be appropriate to their individual needs. In addition the lessons and extracurricular

activities available within the school (or within the Area Learning Community[8])
must be provided in such a way as to maximise opportunities for all children and
young people to participate fully.

Access to the services provided by the education system becomes the starting
point for engagement with schooling. For a child or young person to have
equality of access, there are a number of other factors which must be favourable.
The child/young person must be encouraged to reap the benefits of what the
school has to offer by attending regularly, by engaging in both curricular and
extracurricular activities and by being supported at home and in his or her
community. Access therefore represents a wide ranging construct which will
need to be tracked through the use of a broad range of complementary
indicators.

5.2. Recommended indicators

In line with existing good practice in regard to indicator frameworks and informed
by current strategic priorities, four indicators are recommended to track progress
relevant to this overarching goal. In combination these four indicators will
address the multifaceted nature of **access** to, and within, the school:

- Access to schools, including choice of school and attendance;
- Access to subjects, including breadth of curriculum and extra curricular
  activities;
- Access to facilities, including physical access, access to facilities and
  materials;
- Access to support, including teacher and specialist support, home and
  community support and external agency support.

The recommended indicators, together with associated measures and data
sources, are summarised in the RIF table at the end of this section (see pages
88-95).

---

[8] See Department of Education (2009). Together Towards Entitlement: Delivering the Entitlement
Framework through Area Based Planning, Department of Education: Bangor.

5.3. Indicator 1: Access to schools

5.3.1. Sub-Indicator 1.1: Choice of school

Findings

1.1(A): Rationale

Northern Ireland has a wide range of schools characterised by different types and different management models. However, historically these have encouraged separation not integration, whether on grounds of community background, disability, socio-economic status or gender (see Department of Education, 2006, Chapter 3). As stated in *Every Child an Equal Child* (ECNI, 2008), 'the history of education in Northern Ireland has been, to varying degrees, one of separate provision for boys and girls, disabled and non-disabled, Traveller and settled, and children of differing faith backgrounds'.

Wide ranging debates over parental choice in schooling, whether in terms of postcode, faith, ability, or the separation or mainstreaming of those with special educational needs, are far from unique to Northern Ireland (see Gibbons et al., 2006). However, the particular history and demographic profile of the region and its education system continue to ensure that these issues will remain a priority in terms of education policy in Northern Ireland for the foreseeable future. By way of example, various lobby groups continue to offer their support for alternative management systems that may or may not coincide with current government policy. The aspiration of this policy is made explicit in the Department of Education's *Schools for the Future*, ' to support effective and meaningful collaboration across the education system and enable children and young people to build their understanding of what they have in common as well as what defines them as being different. (Department of Education, 2009a, p.11*).

The first indicator is therefore choice of school. This indicator will provide useful background information on the relative proportion of schools of each type and management type (by geographical area), and the relative number of learners in each, sub-divided by the Section 75 grounds. It will also allow, by cross

referencing data, for the tracking of the achievements of different groups in different school types including breakdowns by school type, management type, location and gender.

Access to a quality education experience may also be influenced by the quality of individual schools. Although all schools strive to provide a high quality of education, there is a perception that some are more effective than others, and parental choice may be influenced by this perception (Gorard et al., 2003). The availability of different school types in particular geographical areas, and the extent to which places are available to all, are therefore key issues.

Every Child an Equal Child points out that, in recent years, there has been a significant growth in the provision of integrated education and there are a number of schools attracting students from all community backgrounds. The ECNI report states that, 'these factors can break down the social, gender, religious and other barriers between children' (ECNI, 2008, p.6). It will therefore be important to track this trend, particularly in terms of learners from a Catholic community background attending controlled sector schools and learners from a non-Catholic community background attending maintained sector schools.

Prior to the final implementation of the new strategy, *Cohesion Sharing and Integration* (OFMDFM, 2010), the existing policy and strategic framework for good relations in Northern Ireland, *A Shared Future* (OFMDFM, 2005), states that:

> "the exercise of parental choice is central and both integrated and denominational schools have important roles to play in preparing children for their role as adults in a shared society."

The report of the independent strategic review of education (The Bain Report), *Schools for the Future: Funding, Strategic, Sharing* (Department of Education, 2006) includes the recommendations that:

"Communities need schools that reflect diversity of aspiration and choice, and which, taken together, are effective in meeting the needs of all pupils, are educationally and financially viable, and are sustainable in the long-term." (p.103);

"... in undertaking its functions in relation to the planning of the schools' estate, the ESA should be required to maximise opportunities for integrating education within a system of sustainable schools." (p.103)

Furthermore, the issue of parental choice with regard to inclusive or exclusive education of children with special educational needs, continues to have a high priority, most recently revealed in exchanges over the Explanatory Memorandum as issued by government in response to the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (see NI Human Rights Commission, 2009).

A further quite different factor relating to this indicator concerns attendance on a voluntary basis at pre-school education facilities. There is consistent evidence that those children who attend pre-school education begin their school careers at an advantage (Sammons et al., 2004) and continue to benefit, not only throughout their school careers, but also into the world of employment (Goodman & Sianesi, 2005). In comparison, those who do not have these opportunities will be disadvantaged throughout life, thus widening inequalities in society as opportunities for pre-schooling are not evenly distributed. Within Northern Ireland, Melhuish et al. (Department of Education, 2006) confirmed the long term benefits attached to pre-school attendance and also noted that the take-up of places was not even. They recommended that future policy should address this imbalance - 'Increasing the take-up of pre-school places by parents who would not usually send their children to pre-school (usually found in geographical clusters) would provide vulnerable groups of children with a better start to school and reduce their risk of developing SEN.' (p.vi)

Reflecting on these policy initiatives and related literature, both locally and internationally, it is clear that there is a strong imperative to focus attention on school choice.

1.1(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

Across all workshops and within four individual comment forms, a range of stakeholders[9] argued strongly that the current education structure, including academic selection, can present a barrier to equality of opportunity. In particular, it was argued by participants in three workshops and by two respondents who submitted comment forms that parental income and the provision of suitable schools can affect access to a quality educational experience. For example, they suggested that it is more challenging for those from low socio-economic backgrounds (including Protestant working class boys) to access grammar schools. Newcomer families may also find it difficult to understand the education system and may therefore have a limited choice of schools (a point raised in three workshops and by two respondents who submitted comment forms). For example, it was argued by one individual that they may have difficulty accessing grammar schools. It was also felt by one participant that there may also be problems with verifying the achievements of children and young people in their former country of residence.

One respondent with a particular interest in Irish medium education who submitted a comment form drew attention to perceived limitations in terms of access to Irish medium education.

Concerns were expressed in at least one workshop about the (1) placements of children and young people with Special Education Needs (SEN) in special schools (which may have a limited curriculum because of small numbers) or (2) mainstream schools where they may not receive as much support as they need. This second point was also raised by three respondents who submitted comment forms. More generally it was argued by some participants that choices for disabled children and young people are also limited by the availability of accessible transport and the distribution of special schools.

Several stakeholders confirmed the view that a lack of participation in pre-school education can result in a growing gap developing in terms of achievement, and

---

[9] From both voluntary/community groups and from those working within the education sector itself.

that this gap widens as the child moves through the various Key Stages. This was further emphasised by two respondents who submitted comment forms and referred specifically to the lack of buy-in to pre-school provision from some of the priority groups. Workshop participants suggested that there is research evidence from the Early Years project in the Shankill Road area of Belfast that pre-school take up is often low among Protestant working class boys. It was also suggested that there is evidence that there is a low level of uptake of pre-school provision by Irish Traveller children.

1.1(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

Wide ranging views were expressed in both the general workshop and the young people's workshop confirming the significance of choice of school, but also highlighting the need to be able to identify types of school by a range of factors including geographical location and catchment area, and the distance that children would have to travel to the school of their choice. This issue was especially highlighted in the young people's workshop in relation to rural areas and provision of special schools.

It was argued by one respondent that inclusion in pre-school provision is crucial to the development and integration of children with a disability, especially where the disabilities include deafness. Another respondent who submitted written comments argued that the reasons for refusal of pre-school placement could be varied and these should be reflected upon.

Discussion
1.1(D): Recommended Indicator

The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- parental choice of schooling is likely to remain a priority in terms of education policy in Northern Ireland for the foreseeable future;
- access to a quality education experience may be influenced by the quality of individual schools;

- the availability of different school types and management types in particular geographical areas, and the extent to which places are available to all, are key issues;
- in recent years there has been a significant growth in the provision of integrated education and it is important to track this trend;
- the issue of parental choice with regard to inclusive or exclusive education of children with special educational needs continues to have a high priority;
- choices for disabled children and young people may also be limited by the availability of accessible transport and the distribution of special schools;
- those children who attend pre-school education not only begin their school careers at an advantage but continue to benefit throughout their school careers and into employment;
- the reasons for refusal of pre-school placement can be varied and need to be taken into account.

It is therefore recommended that *"Choice of School"* should be a key indicator with particular attention being paid to spatial distribution, integrated education, placement of children with special educational needs, travel times and pre-school provision. The issue regarding the quality of individual schools is acknowledged but it is considered that it may be difficult to define measures relating to quality which can be measured across a range of schools. It is recommended that quality of schools should therefore be a Potential Future Measure subject to further research to determine the appropriateness and viability of the measure.

This indicator was included in the PIF and no differing opinions were raised during the second phase of the engagement process. However, as a result of the second phase of engagement, some of the associated measures have been extended and clarified, as set out below. In particular, the measures relating to pre-school provision have been included under this indicator instead of under Indicator 1.2, as in the PIF. The addition of a measure on reasons for refusal of first choice pre-school placement, included in response to comments expressed by a stakeholder, has resulted in the measures being more relevant to 'choice' than 'attendance'.

1.1(E): Associated Measures

Having established the rationale for inclusion of this indicator it is necessary to identify measures that are able to provide baseline information and track change effectively over time. Taking on board the comments from both phases of engagement and relevant literature, it is proposed that the following measures, acting in combination, will achieve this objective and will yield valid information relevant to all noted considerations:

1.1.1 Number of schools by school type and management type[10], Board area and catchment areas;

1.1.2 Proportion of learners (enrolments) by school type and management type, by Board area, S75 grounds and priority groups;

1.1.3 Proportion of children in pre-school education, by S75 grounds and priority groups;

1.1.4 Proportion of learners from a Catholic community background attending controlled sector schools, by Board area, S75 grounds and priority groups;

1.1.5 Proportion of learners from a non-Catholic community background attending maintained sector schools, by Board area, S75 grounds and priority groups;

1.1.6 Number and spatial distribution of special schools, by Board area;

1.1.7 Number, spatial distribution and travel times of children with special needs attending mainstream schools and special schools by Stage and SEN Category[11] including multiple disabilities;

1.1.8 Demand for places at schools as indicated by schools which are at capacity or over-subscribed as first choice, by school type and management type and by Board area;

1.1.9 Proportion of children refused first choice of pre-school placements, by S75 grounds and priority groups;

1.1.10 Quality of schools (Potential Future Measure).

---

[10]For details of school types and management types, see section 3.10.2 on p.17
[11] See http://www.deni.gov.uk/sen_categories.pdf

1.1(F): Available Data

Measure 1.1.1: Number of schools and

Measure 1.1.2: Proportion of learners (enrolments)

The annual School Census currently provides detailed information on school type and management type and the relative proportion of pupils in each, by six of the Section 75 grounds (religious belief, age, gender, marital status, disability, race/ethnic origin). This data set would facilitate partial analysis of each of the above measures. However, the Census does not record data under three of the Section 75 grounds, namely political opinion, sexual orientation and those with dependants. Hence data relating to two of the eight priority groups will not be available from this source:

- Lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) children and young people; and
- Children and young people with caring responsibilities.

The information on the number of schools and proportion of learners can be used to analyse the choice of schools available in any given area. Information could be made available at Board level but it would also be possible to analyse by smaller geographical units (such as local government districts, super output areas) if information on the enrolment at particular types of school by children and young people in a particular ground or priority group was of interest.

Measure 1.1.3: Proportion of children in pre-school education

The School Census provides information on the number of children in funded pre-school education and thus could be used, with other datasets, to derive a proportion. This information will allow for tracking over time, and with other measures to consider whether pre-school education has a positive effect on the achievements of children and young people in particular priority groups. The OC2 indicator collection provides more detail on looked after children and young people[12].

---

[12] For further information on OC2 indicators for looked after children, go to http://www.dhsspsni.gov.uk/index/stats_research/stats-cib/statistics_and_research-cib-work_areas/oc2_guidance_0809.pdf

Measure 1.1.4: Proportion of learners from a Catholic community background attending controlled sector schools and

Measure 1.1.5: Proportion of learners from a non-Catholic community background attending maintained sector schools

The annual School Census can also provide information on learners from a particular community background attending schools in specific sectors. This will also allow the proportion of children and young people from a specific community background attending schools where they are in the minority to be measured. This may also be a useful measure to cross reference with other measures in the RIF.

Measure 1.1.6: Number and spatial distribution of special schools

The School Census can provide information on the number and location of special schools..

Measure 1.1.7: Number, spatial distribution and travel times of children with special needs attending mainstream schools and special schools by Stage and SEN Category[13] including multiple disabilities

With regard to Special Educational Needs (SEN) children, the Department of Education provides detailed guidance on the recording of Special Educational Needs, and from 2006 this information has been included in the annual School Census. This includes the category of disability and the stage at which the child's needs are being met (Stages 1 – 5). However, the School Census does not currently provide information on travel times. Some academic work has been undertaken on mapping of travel times to school but this information is not currently available.

Measure 1.1.8: Demand for places at schools as indicated by schools which are at capacity or over-subscribed as first choice

In the past the Department of Education has collected information about over-subscription of schools at the end of the first preference stage of the transfer

---

[13] See http://www.deni.gov.uk/sen_categories.pdf

procedure. However, as a result of changes to the transfer policy, it has become more difficult to collect the information and no analysis of first preference applications was conducted in 2011. It is therefore likely that data on this measure will be unavailable in future.

Measure 1.1.9: Proportion of children refused first choice of pre-school placements

At the present time, no data sources are available to track this measure.

Note on measures

At the present time, no suitable central data sources are available to track the reasons why young people may have been refused entry to a school or pre-school placement (e.g. capacity, qualifications).

While these measures can give an indication of the choice available, it does not help inform an understanding of the decision-making processes underlying the choices actually made by children and their families, for example with regard to selecting integrated or special needs schools. Measure 1.1.8 may yield some information on the demand for certain types of school but not on individual decision-making or choice. No proxy measures are currently available to determine why school choices are being made, and this may be a research topic that is worthy of further investigation either through bespoke research or the addition of questions to regional surveys including the Continuous Household Survey or the Life and Times Survey.

Measure 1.1.10 Quality of schools (Potential Future Measure)

It is recommended that quality of schools should be included as a Potential Future Measure subject to further research to determine the appropriateness and viability of the measure.

5.3.2. Sub-Indicator 1.2: Attendance

Findings
1.2(A): Rationale

It is not sufficient for a child or young person simply to have gained equality of access to a quality educational experience; he or she must then be able to receive the full benefits of what the education system has to offer through a pattern of regular attendance. Available research would suggest that certain marginalised Section 75 groups are at greater risk of missing schooling for a number of reasons, both authorised and unauthorised. For example, the ECNI *Equality of Opportunity for Travellers in Education* report (ECNI, 2006) revealed that both attendance and attainment were areas for concern at schools with high proportions of traveller children (p.29), a finding confirmed by other research (Reynolds et al., 2003; Hamilton et al., 2007) which also highlighted many cultural issues associated with interrupted patterns of attendance. The Education & Training Inspectorate report (2008) into Traveller education concluded, 'Young people from the Travelling community in the primary sector make progress commensurate with their peers, but as a result of increasingly poor attendance as they reach school leaving age, they do not achieve the standards and external accreditation of which they are capable.' (p.12)

Further, those who experience bullying or harassment at school may be less inclined to attend on a regular basis. This was confirmed by the SHOUT report on young LGB men and women which revealed that around 25% of those interviewed had played truant having been bullied at school because of their sexual identity (see SHOUT report, p.12). Furthermore, research funded by the EHRC suggests that children and young people can experience bullying in school because of having LGBT parents (See Burchadt et al, 2009). Attendance at school on a regular basis is therefore not only important for increasing the prospects of educational achievement but it may also be a useful barometer for measuring the extent of marginalisation of individuals and groups. For example, a recent UK study of 66 young people who had been in care during their school years revealed that 41 had been excluded from schools for periods

lasting between one day and two years, 22 had been excluded for more than 60 days, and two had no secondary education at all (Barnardo's, 2006, p. 5). By contrast, among those children who were not in care, the majority of parents (93%) said their child had never been excluded from school, and of those who had, 83% said it was for less than a week.

In many other ways, attendance statistics can be reflective of a wide range of social and economic factors that can impact on a child or young person's ability either to be physically present or to be in a receptive frame of mind when in class. Obvious examples include responsibilities in the home (e.g. caring for a parent or elderly relative) and changes or disturbances in the home environment (e.g. moving to a new country or place of residence on a frequent basis). Changes of school may be particularly disruptive as a child or young person inevitably works through a period of readjustment, a problem frequently encountered by Traveller children. Young carers are often invisible within the school system and yet according to the UK *2004 Young Carers* report, at the time of reporting, of the 6178 young carers surveyed 34 per cent were missing school and 40 per cent in total were either missing school or had other indicators of educational difficulties (Dearden & Becker, 2004, p.11).

1.2(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

It was maintained by one workshop participant from the education sector that access is also affected by pupils changing school mid year, especially where the administrative processes take time to complete. Two respondents who submitted comment forms who have a particular interest in looked after children and one School Principal emphasised that these children tend to change placements more often and it was suggested by one workshop participant that Traveller children may also be disadvantaged because of placement changes.

Stakeholders expressed concern about the poor attendance and frequent changes of school experienced by Irish Traveller children and young people. The actual tracking of migrant Traveller children was also highlighted as a logistical problem within the education system at present, rendering many 'invisible'. It was also suggested by some participants that Protestant working

class boys often have low levels of attendance at school and it was suggested in two workshops and two comment forms that newcomer children and young people may have low attendance records.

Across all workshops and in four comment forms, anecdotal evidence was cited regarding the problems faced by looked after children/young people. It was suggested that they may tend to move between schools frequently and often in very difficult circumstances. The same participants argued that lack of consistency in schooling may be a key factor in respect of both achievements and emotional well-being.

1.2(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

There were no significant comments about this indicator during the second phase of stakeholder engagement and it appears that the indicator and associated measures were generally acceptable.

In relation to placement changes, written comments from one respondent indicated that these could be for a wide variety of reasons and are not confined to looked after children.

Discussion

1.2(D): Recommended Indicator

The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- certain marginalised Section 75 groups are at greater risk of missing schooling for a number of reasons, both authorised and unauthorised; attendance at school on a regular basis is therefore not only important for increasing the prospects of educational achievement but it may also be a useful barometer for measuring the extent of marginalisation of individuals and groups;

- attendance statistics can be reflective of a wide range of social and economic factors that can impact on a child or young person's ability

either to be physically present or to be in a receptive frame of mind when in class and so attitudes to attendance are a key factor;

- access is also affected by pupils changing school mid year and this can have particular impacts for children and young people in some of the priority groups.

It is therefore recommended that *"Attendance"* should be a key indicator with particular attention being paid to attendance records at different types of school, and placement changes during the academic year.

This indicator was included in the PIF and no counter opinions were raised during the second phase of the engagement process. However, as a result of the second phase of engagement, some of the associated measures have been extended and clarified, as set out below. It should be noted that, as explained above, the associated measures relating to pre-school provision have been moved to Indicator 1.1 as they appear to be more relevant to choice.

1.2(E): Associated Measures

In order to effectively operationalise this indicator, the following measures were chosen as, acting in concert, they are able to address issues raised in the literature and by stakeholders:

1.2.1 Proportion of placement changes in the last academic year, by school type and management types and by S75 grounds and priority groups;

1.2.2 Overall authorised absence rate, by school type and management type and by S75 grounds and priority groups;

1.2.3 Overall unauthorised absence rate, by school type and management type and by S75 grounds and priority groups;

1.2.4 Young people's attitudes to attendance, by S75 grounds and priority groups.

1.2(F): Available Data

Measure 1.2.1: Proportion of placement changes in the last academic year

At the present time, no data sources are available to track this measure, with the exception of the OC2 indicator collection[14] which provides this information only for looked after children and young people.

Measure 1.2.2: Overall authorised absence rate and

Measure 1.2.3: Overall unauthorised absence rate

The School Census provides detailed information on authorised and unauthorised absence rates of children and young people at primary and post-primary level (by six of the Section 75 grounds as outlined above). The absence rates are calculated as percentages (based on 100% representing attendance on all half-day sessions throughout the academic year). The most common reason for absence is illness but other authorised absences include bereavements, suspension, agreed family holiday, medical/dental appointments, religious observance and Traveller absence. Unauthorised absences include family holidays which have not been agreed, lateness (after registration closed) as well as unknown reasons. The OC2 indicator collection provides more detail on absences by looked after children and young people.

This information will allow for tracking over time to indicate whether children and young people in particular priority groups have significantly poor attendance records and, by cross referencing, whether low attendance has a negative effect on achievements.

Measure 1.2.4: Young people's attitudes to attendance

The YPB&A Survey includes questions on young people's attitudes to attendance, including:

- My school is a place where I feel restless and want to be somewhere else (agree, disagree etc.);
- My school is a place I really like to go each day (agree, disagree etc.);

---

[14] See http://www.dhsspsni.gov.uk/index/stats_research/stats-cib/statistics_and_research-cib-work_areas/oc2_guidance_0809.pdf

- How often do you find that school is boring?
- How many days did you skip/scheme/bunk/truant/mitch/skive classes or school this term?
- Have you ever been expelled or suspended from school?

The YPB&A Survey can be analysed for five of the Section 75 grounds (religious belief, age, gender, disability and racial/ethnic origin) at post-primary level only. It does not record any data on political opinion, marital status, sexual orientation or those with dependants; nor does it record social class or whether the young person is looked after. Hence data on the following five of the eight priority groups will not be available from this source:

- Protestant working class boys
- lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) children and young people;
- looked after children and young people;
- children and young people with caring responsibilities; and
- newcomer children and young people.

5.4. Indicator 2: Access to Subjects

5.4.1. Sub-Indicator 2.1: Breadth of curriculum

Findings
2.1(A): Rationale

In an education system with a wide range of school types and management types, it is perhaps inevitable that some schools will offer an educational environment that is more suited to some learners than others. It is also to be expected that some schools will perform better than others in relation to criteria such as levels of general and applied attainment. However, in order to promote equality of opportunity, it is important that all schools should offer the same basic opportunities to learners, particularly in terms of the core curriculum subjects on offer.

Recognising this imperative, the Department of Education has recently launched its *Entitlement Framework for 14-19 Year Olds* (Department of Education, 2010). This framework includes an explicit aim to ensure, 'that young people, from the age of 14, can have access to a broader, better balanced range of courses and pathways that are relevant to their needs and interests and can help them succeed as adults in life and at work' (p.1). It also makes a commitment to provide all learners with access to the full curriculum, either within their own school or within their Area Learning Community.

In further support of the Entitlement Framework, the Department's *Policy for Sustainable Schools* (Department of Education, 2010a) once more emphasises the need for a broad and relevant curriculum to be provided for pupils, with an emphasis on literacy, numeracy and preparation for the world of work.

In further advice[15], the Department recommends that decisions on the curriculum should reflect at all times the career needs and aspirations of the pupils within

---

[15] See http://www.deni.gov.uk/annex_b_-_indicators_of_effective_performance.pdf

the school, and guarantees access for all pupils to a minimum number and range of course choices[16] one third of which should be of a professional or technical nature.

Given longstanding historical imbalances in employment opportunities and the labour market across Section 75 grounds including gender, disability and ethnic origin, these initiatives have the potential to ameliorate such inequalities - but at the same time the need to track evidence of change over time is imperative in order to see whether the aspiration translates into reality.

2.1(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

Several participants in each workshop mentioned the inability of all schools to provide the widest possible subject choice to all pupils, particularly in special schools and Irish medium schools where the numbers are sometimes too low to enable certain subjects to be offered. This issue was also raised by the Principal of a special school and two other respondents who submitted comment forms. It was also suggested by a smaller number of participants in one workshop that schools in working class areas may have a limited choice of subjects.

Discussion in each workshop touched on the link between religion and education in schools in Northern Ireland. It was argued that this link may result in some schools limiting the breadth of religious education available to all learners. Also, it was suggested by one participant that parents/guardians may often opt for voluntary exclusion from certain subjects which do not reflect their culture and religion.

2.1(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

Comments in both the general workshop and the young people's workshop tended to refer to the need to look at the quality of the curriculum that was delivered, along with the number and range of courses on offer. Young people commented on the wide range and differing natures of Area Learning Communities and commented that it would be difficult to compare young people's

---

[16] Eventually this will be 24 courses at Key Stage 4 and 27 courses at post-16 – see http://www.deni.gov.uk/annex_b_-_indicators_of_effective_performance.pdf

perceptions of their effectiveness; it was also pointed out that it would be difficult to define what is meant by "effectiveness", as it a subjective term.

Discussion
2.1(D): Recommended Indicator
The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- in order to promote equality of opportunity, it is important that all schools should offer the same basic opportunities to learners, particularly in terms of the core curriculum subjects on offer;
- the *Entitlement Framework for 14-19 Year Olds (DE, 2010)* makes a commitment to provide all learners with access to the full curriculum, either within their own school or within their Area Learning Community;
- not all schools are able to provide the widest possible subject choice to all pupils. Special schools and Irish medium schools, where the pupil numbers are sometimes too low to enable certain subjects to be offered, were particularly identified in this context;
- the link between religion and education in schools in Northern Ireland may result in some schools limiting the breadth of religious education available to all learners;
- there may be a need to look at the quality of the curriculum that is delivered, along with the number and range of courses on offer.

It is therefore recommended that *"Breadth of curriculum"* should be a key indicator with particular attention being paid to what is offered within school premises and young people's perceptions of the breadth of the curriculum in the light of the commitment in the *Entitlement Framework*. It is acknowledged that the quality of the curriculum that is delivered may also be a significant factor but it may be difficult to define appropriate measures which can be measured across a range of schools. It is therefore recommended that quality of the curriculum delivered should be a Potential Future Measure subject to further research to determine the appropriateness and viability of the measure.

It is recommended that no measures relating to the breadth of religious education should be included for this indicator as this would tend to reflect more on the attitudes of individual schools than on access to the core curriculum.

2.1(E): Associated Measures

On the basis of existing literature and comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time it is recommended that associated measures could include:

2.1.1   Proportion of full (entitlement) curriculum offered within school premises, by school type and management type[17];

2.1.2   Young people's perceptions of the breadth of subject choice, by S75 grounds and priority groups;

2.1.3   Young people's perceptions of the effectiveness of Area Learning Communities, by S75 grounds and priority groups;

2.1.4   Quality of the curriculum delivered (Potential Future Measure)

2.1(F): Available Data

Measure 2.1.1: Proportion of full (entitlement) curriculum offered within school premises

It has not been possible to identify a source of data for this measure. However, if information could be obtained in future, for example through the School Census, it would be useful to be able to substantiate the views put forward by stakeholders regarding the restrictions on the curriculum within certain types of school. Although all subjects are available within the Area Learning Community, some children and young people (particularly those with disabilities) may find it difficult to travel or may not experience the same quality of environment when outside their own school.

---

[17] For details of school types and management types, see section 3.10.2 on p.17

Measure 2.1.2: Young people's perceptions of the breadth of subject choice

There is a standard module in the YPB&A Survey which addresses aspects of subject choices. The following questions provide information on young people's perceptions of the curriculum:

- I have a good choice of subjects;
- I am able to study subjects in which I am interested;
- I am able to study subjects which I am good at;
- I chose subjects with a career in mind.

The YPB&A Survey can be analysed for five of the Section 75 grounds (religious belief, age, gender, disability and racial/ethnic origin) at post-primary level only. It does not record any data on political opinion, marital status, sexual orientation or those with dependants; nor does it record social class or whether the young person is looked after. Hence data on five of the eight priority groups will not be available from this source:

- Protestant working class boys
- lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) children and young people;
- looked after children and young people;
- children and young people with caring responsibilities; and
- newcomer children and young people.

The YPB&A survey could be extended to capture data by further S75 grounds where deemed appropriate.

Measure 2.1.3: Young people's perceptions of the effectiveness of Area Learning Communities

At the present time, no data sources are available to track this measure. The YPB&A could be extended to capture opinion on Area Learning Communities.

Measure 2.1.4 Quality of the curriculum delivered (Potential Future Measure)

It is recommended that quality of the curriculum delivered should be included as a Potential Future Measure subject to further research to determine the appropriateness and viability of the measure.

5.4.2. Sub-Indicator 2.2: Extracurricular activities

Findings

2.2(A): Rationale

The range of opportunities offered by the educational system includes extracurricular activities. These are particularly important in terms of encouraging children and young people to develop a wide range of interests and interpersonal skills which will be valuable in later life. However, there is no statutory framework regulating extracurricular activities comparable to that for the mainstream curriculum and so the opportunities for children and young people are likely to vary from school to school.

There are also factors which restrict the access to extracurricular activities for some children and young people. For example, those who have either work commitments or caring responsibilities, or who are dependent on public transport which leaves at a set time, are restricted in their ability to access after-school activities. Indeed, in their 2007 report, '*Supporting Children Who Are Young Carers*' the Children's Society specifically identify 'May be unable to attend extracurricular activities' as one of 11 characteristics of young carers' educational experience. Some disabled children and young people may face additional challenges in participating in some activities based on physicality. Consultation research with Irish Travellers has found that, more generally, 'Traveller children tend to be [relegated] to minor roles in school activities and do not fully participate in the broad range of extracurricular activities.' (ECNI, 2006, p.16).

In combination, the lack of opportunity and/or ability to engage with extracurricular activities is likely to have a negative impact on the development of many personal competencies and the ability to broaden life experiences. As with attendance (Indicator 1.2), engagement with extracurricular activities is also likely to offer itself as a useful index of general engagement with the school and its culture. This indicator could potentially be a mechanism for identifying those who find themselves on the margins of this culture.

2.2(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

There was broad and strong agreement among stakeholders at all workshops and in seven comment forms that high levels of participation in extracurricular activities are likely to make a difference to achievement, particularly in terms of developing a child as a whole person and equipping them for the world of work. Stakeholders acknowledged that the range of extracurricular activities offered will vary from school to school and it was suggested that the availability of transport may make a difference to participation levels.

In relation to particular priority groups, stakeholders suggested that some children and young people may find it difficult to access activities on offer. The following issues were identified:

- One participant argued that there tends to be a low level of participation by Irish Traveller children and young people, especially where they travel long distances to school;
- It was further argued by two participants and in one comment form that it can take longer to obtain permission for a looked after child/young person to participate in an activity;
- Participants in the majority of the workshops and in two comment forms argued that extracurricular activities are not always physically accessible to disabled children and young people, and suitable alternatives are not always offered;
- Many participants suggested that children and young people with caring responsibilities have fewer opportunities to participate in activities outside normal school hours, because of their responsibilities and potential financial restrictions;
- It was argued by one participant that newcomer children and young people tend not to mix with local children, and they can therefore become dependent on support teachers or peers from the same community. This view was supported by the comments of a School Principal with a significant number of newcomer children within their school;

- Several participants in two workshops mentioned anecdotal evidence suggesting that many LGB young people do not participate fully in the life of the school because they feel that culturally the school is a hostile environment. This was also stated by one respondent who completed a comment form who is involved in supporting LGB young people;
- Two participants maintained that Protestant working class boys have a low level of participation in extracurricular activities.

2.2(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

Stakeholders were overwhelmingly supportive of including indicators attached to those aspects of the curriculum that provide young people with experiences over and above formal qualifications. While it was recognised that tracking these extra curricular activities would not be straightforward, it was felt that their significance to future life chances was so important that these indicators warranted inclusion.

Discussion in both the general workshop and the young people's workshop tended to focus on the availability of extracurricular activities for marginalised groups and, in particular, children and young people with special needs. It was felt important that measures relating to the range and depth of activities should be included in the indicator framework by several respondents. In addition, one respondent felt the term 'extracurricular' was too broad and required refinement, and also that the measure should be cognisant of issues such as the availability of extended school provision and other youth service provision in the area.

Discussion
2.2(D): Recommended Indicators

The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- extracurricular activities are particularly important in terms of encouraging children and young people to develop a wide range of interests and interpersonal skills which will be valuable in later life;
- high levels of participation in extracurricular activities are likely to make a difference to achievement;

- there are specific factors which restrict the access to extracurricular activities for some children and young people; for example, those who have either work commitments or caring responsibilities, or who are dependent on public transport which leaves at a set time;
- the range and depth of extracurricular activities offered will vary from school to school.

It is therefore recommended that *"Extracurricular activities"* should be a key indicator with particular attention being paid to participation by learners and range and depth of the activities offered. (In this context "range" relates to the different types of activity offered and "depth" to the level at which each activity is pursued - for example, basic, intermediate, advanced.) It is considered that range and depth of activities could be measured across each school type and management type and would not, therefore, reflect on the performance of an individual school, but further research would be necessary to compile a comprehensive list of the types of activity offered and to agree definitions of the level at which activities are pursued. It is recommended that range and depth of extracurricular activities should therefore be a Potential Future Measure subject to further research to determine the appropriateness and viability of the measure. As a result of the second phase of engagement, some of the associated measures have been extended and clarified, as set out below.

2.2(E): Associated Measures

On the basis of existing literature and comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time the following associated measures are recommended:

2.2.1   Proportion of learners participating in extracurricular activities, by school type and management type[18] and by S75 grounds and priority groups;

2.2.2   Range and depth of extracurricular activities by school type and management type (Potential Future Measure)

---

[18] For details of school types and management types, see section 3.10.2 on p.17

2.2(F): Available Data

Measure 2.2.1: Proportion of learners participating in extracurricular activities

It would be helpful to monitor participation by learners in extracurricular activities, especially by those in the priority groups. This could extend to a raft of activities including those that are scheduled outside the classroom but within the school day, as well as activities that extend beyond the school day but are on school premises (e.g. clubs and societies, field trips), and finally activities that are arranged to complement school life (e.g. Duke of Edinburgh award scheme, President's Award, business ventures, sport). No direct source of data has been identified but there is a module in the YPB&A Survey on sport and physical activity which includes the following questions –

- How many days in a school week do you normally stay behind at school for sports or other physical activities?
- Are you a member of a school club or team that involves you taking part in sport or physical activity?

This section could be extended to include further detail of the nature of a wider range of extracurricular activities, their availability and uptake. Also, bodies such as the Princes' Trust, Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme and Presidents' Award could be encouraged to gather further monitoring information on those who take part, while schools could record more information on engagement in sporting and other extracurricular activities through the School Census.

In 2007 the Young Life & Times Survey enquired about young people's hobbies, asking how much time per week they spent on hobbies and leisure time activities and asking them to name up to three hobbies they engaged in. The results showed that 64% of respondents spent over five hours per week on hobbies and that sport was by far the most commonly reported hobby. The YPB&A survey questions on sports are therefore particularly relevant, even though they do not include the wide range of extracurricular activities offered by schools which fall outside the definition of sports or physical activities.

The YPB&A Survey can be analysed for five of the Section 75 grounds (religious belief, age, gender, disability and racial/ethnic origin) at post-primary level only. It does not record any data on political opinion, marital status, sexual orientation or those with dependants, nor does it record social class or whether the young person is looked after. Hence data on five of the eight priority groups will not be available from this source:

- Protestant working class boys
- lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) children and young people;
- looked after children and young people;
- children and young people with caring responsibilities; and
- newcomer children and young people.

The YPB&A could consider encompassing additional S75 grounds in future.

Measure 2.2.2: Range and depth of extracurricular activities (Potential Future Measure)

At the present time, no data sources are available to track this measure. Further research would be necessary to compile a comprehensive list of the types of activity offered (range) and to agree definitions of the level at which activities are pursued (depth); this measure is therefore regarded as a Potential Future Measure.

There would be opportunities to extend both the YPB&A survey and School Census to gather further information on the range of activities that are made available within and outside school times, including engagement with school sport, and this data could be supplemented by monitoring information from bodies including the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme and President's Award, should this become available.

5.5. Indicator 3: Access to facilities

5.5.1. Sub-Indicator 3.1: Physical access

Findings

3.1(A): Rationale

One of the key factors restricting the ability of an individual school to provide a quality educational experience is the physical infrastructure of the school itself. This factor has a particular impact on some disabled children and young people and hence this indicator has been developed to track the progress made towards accommodating their needs.

The Special Educational Needs and Disability (Northern Ireland) Order 2005 brought schools within the scope of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995. This means that it is now unlawful for bodies responsible for the provision of education to treat disabled people less favourably for a reason related to their disability and that they must make 'reasonable adjustments' to ensure, where reasonable, education is fully accessible to disabled people.

Schools are required to produce a written strategy to explain how, over time, they intend to improve physical accessibility to school premises. It is therefore considered that it would be useful to be able to track the physical accessibility of school buildings.

3.1(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

Concern was raised in three workshops and six comment forms about access to buildings and facilities for children and young people with disabilities and other special educational needs. Typically discussion focused not only on physical access to classrooms and equipment but also on the environment in which a subject is offered. For example, one workshop participant and one respondent with specialist knowledge pointed out that children and young people with hearing difficulties may need access to an appropriate acoustic environment.

Two respondents who submitted comment forms mentioned that this issue is also affected by the attitude of the school in terms of what alternative is offered to a pupil who cannot take part in an activity.

3.1(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

There was a general acceptance of the need for this indicator during the phase 2 engagement process. However, a number of respondents in both the general workshop and the young people's workshop, and two respondents who submitted written comments, maintained that there was a need to include a more detailed consideration of the functional areas that were or were not accessible within schools, and whether this lack of access was a temporary or permanent condition. The 'fitness for purpose' of the school environment was suggested as a possible measure by a participant in the general workshop.

Discussion

3.1(D): Recommended Indicator

The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- the physical infrastructure of a school may have a particular impact on some disabled children and young people;
- schools are required to produce a written strategy to explain how, over time, they intend to improve physical accessibility to school premises.

It is therefore recommended that *"Physical Access"* should be a key indicator with particular attention being paid to access to buildings and the provision of reasonable adjustments. The suggestion by one workshop participant that 'fitness for purpose' should be included as an associated measure has not been acted upon at this time, as it is considered that it would be difficult to define the term and that the indicator would be better represented by measures about failure to meet standards.

This indicator was included in the PIF and no alternative opinions were raised during the second phase of the engagement process. However, as a result of

the second phase of engagement, some of the associated measures have been extended and clarified, as set out below.

3.1(E): Associated Measures

On the basis of existing literature and comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time it is recommended that associated measures could include:

3.1.1   Proportion of schools with one or more areas (e.g. common rooms) and classrooms inaccessible to learners with physical disabilities and whether lack of access is temporary or permanent by school type and management type[19];

3.1.2   Proportion of schools unable to provide reasonable adjustments for learners with disabilities[20] by school type and management type;

These measures are specific to children and young people with disabilities.

3.1(F): Available Data

Measure 3.1.1: Proportion of schools with one or more areas (e.g. common rooms) and classrooms inaccessible to learners with physical disabilities and whether lack of access is temporary or permanent and

Measure 3.1.2: Proportion of schools unable to provide reasonable adjustments for learners with disabilities

It has not been possible to identify a specific source of data for these measures. However, the Southern Education and Library Board does control a database, hosted by the Belfast Education and Library Board, called the Manhattan Database, which lists school premises and their disability accessibility. The nature and scope of this audit has yet to be identified but, more generally, the results of disability audits carried out on school premises could perhaps be made available to identify the range of disabilities that can be accommodated by schools in geographical areas, by school type and management type. At the

---

[19] For details of school types and management types, see section 3.10.2 on p.17
[20] It should be noted that the term "disabilities" encompasses chronic illness

same time it is recognised that this is a very difficult indicator to quantify and it is suggested that further research may be required to identify the types of disability that a school can accommodate, and the reasonable adjustments that can be made.

SENDO requires schools to make reasonable adjustments for children and young people with disabilities. Capital costs for improving physical accessibility in Controlled and Maintained schools are financed by ELBs whilst schools in other sectors are grant aided by the Department of Education. There appears to be no comprehensive list of accessible/inaccessible classrooms; schools bid for funding for adaptations as and when required.

An alternative indicator would be the capital spend on adaptations which the Boards and the Department should be able to provide. However, it would be difficult to track progress through such an indicator, as it would not be immediately obvious why spend had increased or decreased year on year.

5.5.2. Sub-Indicator 3.2: Facilities and materials

Findings
3.2(A): Rationale

A further aspect of physical access is the availability of facilities and materials within a school. If all children and young people are to have equal access to a quality educational experience, then there must be some degree of equality of access to those tools which are recognised as improving the quality of the experience. A particular issue is the availability of on-line educational materials and the level of access which children and young people have to these within the school environment. UK-wide research would suggest that the extent of access to ICT within schools generally can vary considerably, reflecting local circumstances (for a review, see http://research.becta.org.uk/upload-dir/downloads/page_documents/research/ICT_support_bibliography.pdf)

In addition, there are considerations relating to the relevance and accessibility of materials used in schools. There is a strong argument for increasing the availability of materials in alternative formats to more fully embrace the greater diversity of cultural and social backgrounds now represented within schools in Northern Ireland. While no recent research could be found to identify the extent of either need or provision in Northern Ireland, stakeholders consulted as part of this project pointed out that educational materials in Northern Ireland still tend to be predominantly white, Christian and heterosexual. In acknowledgment of demographic changes, the recent Department of Education 'Schools for the Future' Policy (Department of Education, 09a) acknowledges the need for education to provide every opportunity for young people to be prepared for life in a diverse society. 'This should equip them to explore issues around diversity and how people of differing political, religious, ethnic and cultural traditions can live together in mutual respect and with a common understanding of our interdependence as equal members of society'. (p.14).

There are considerable difficulties in assessing the progress being made by schools towards promoting equality of opportunity in relation to access to

facilities such as ICT, and promoting good relations by embracing diversity within the materials used. However, this indicator has been included to emphasise the importance of these factors in delivering a quality educational experience.

3.2(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

Participants in one workshop referred to the significant impact that access to facilities such as ICT can create; for example, access to on-line materials tends to be more sophisticated at post-primary level.

One respondent who completed a comment form and who is involved in supporting lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) young people pointed out that there are very few materials in Northern Ireland that have LGB role models. In comparison, materials in England, Wales and Scotland actively mention gay, lesbian and bisexual people in the school curriculum.

Similarly, it was suggested by one respondent who submitted a comment form, and who is involved in supporting minority ethnic children and young people, that there is a lack of positive role models reflecting minority ethnic groups in educational materials.

3.2(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

One participant in the general workshop stated that she would like to see the breakdown of facilities by school type. Two respondents who submitted written comments also mentioned that they would prefer to see greater detail of on-line support (e.g. time, duration and activity). The need to highlight accessibility of on-line materials for those with sensory loss was also noted by one respondent.

Discussion
3.2(D): Recommended Indicator

The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- research shows that the extent of access to ICT within schools can vary considerably, reflecting local circumstances and so measures should be sub-divided by school type;
- there are different types of on-line support and there is a need for greater definition;
- there are concerns regarding the relevance and accessibility of other (non ICT) materials used in schools.

It is therefore recommended that "***Access to facilities and materials***" should be a key indicator with particular attention given to access to on-line materials and the diverse nature of materials. This indicator was included in the PIF and discussed during the second phase of the engagement process. As a result, some of the associated measures have been extended and clarified, as set out below.

3.2(E): Associated Measures

On the basis of existing literature and comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time it is recommended that associated measures should include:

3.2.1   Extent of access to on-line educational materials within the school (time, duration and activity), by school type and management type[21] and by S75 grounds and priority groups;

3.2.2   Proportion of teaching materials where examples are culturally diverse, by school type and management type.

3.2(F): Available Data

Measure 3.2.1: Extent of access to on-line educational materials within the school (time, duration and activity)

At the present time, no data sources are available to track this measure. While all schools will have access to on-line facilities via the C2k network, this does not necessarily equate with young people actually accessing these resources. It may

---

[21] For details of school types and management types, see section 3.10.2 on p.17

be possible to track usage of C2k directly, although at this time the extent of monitoring is unclear. A measure such as the YPB&A survey could potentially be used to identify the extent to which young people engage with online materials within school, and the extent to which those with a disability genuinely access online support.

Measure 3.2.2: Proportion of teaching materials where examples are culturally diverse

At the present time, no data sources are available to track this measure; however, the School Census could be extended to include questions that would address this issue.

5.6. Indicator 4: Access to support

5.6.1. Sub-Indicator 4.1: Teachers and specialist support

Findings

4.1(A): Rationale

A key factor in the provision of a quality educational experience is the availability of well-informed, committed and inspirational teachers. The teaching profession in Northern Ireland is highly regulated and, over the years, teacher development has been afforded a high priority, in terms of both support and finance. Despite this investment, recent research has suggested that teacher education and training traditionally may not have placed sufficient emphasis on equality or diversity issues with teachers not well prepared for dealing with these matters in the classroom (Elwood et al., 2003). Other research indicates that a certain lack of enthusiasm exists among student teachers for inclusive learning environments, in particular in relation to those learners with special educational needs (Lambe & Bones, 2006a & b). At the same time, the 2007 publication from the General Teaching Council for Northern Ireland entitled *Teaching: The Reflective Profession* lists among its core teaching competences for the profession, '8. a knowledge and understanding of the need to take account of the significant features of pupils' cultures, languages and faiths and to address the implications for learning arising from these.' (GTCNI, 2007, p.14) (see Appendix D for a list of all relevant competences.)

The number of learners for whom teachers are responsible will always limit their ability to provide a quality educational experience appropriate to each child or young person, regardless of how well prepared and trained they may be. Pupil/teacher ratios and average class sizes have been issues of contention across the UK for many years and are likely to remain so in light of the current economic downturn. There is a perception that the benefits to children and young people are directly proportional to the amount of individual attention they

receive from a teacher. The teacher/learner ratio is therefore a key factor in terms of the ability of a school to provide high quality education. Despite an acknowledgement that given falling school rolls there may be an over-provision of teachers in some schools in Northern Ireland, recent government policy proposals (see Department of Education, 2010a & b) have not signalled a need for significant change in the current staff student ratios within schools.

Furthermore, there are children and young people who require additional support within the school environment in order to benefit from teacher support to the same degree as others. For example, children and young people who have been assessed as having Special Educational Needs (SEN) will require additional support from SEN assistants. Equally, children and young people who have English as an Additional Language (EAL) may also need additional support from EAL assistants, depending on their level of command of English. Hannson et al. (2002) found that, while the numbers of school age young people from minority ethnic backgrounds was small, their distribution was very uneven across the region and this in turn reflected in, 'considerable differences in the nature and level of development of support structures.' (p.i). Since 2002 it is likely that the demographic profile will have changed significantly. A more recent research report *(Migrant Workers in Northern Ireland)* found that while most migrant workers were content with the language support offered within schools for their children, 'Migrant workers who could not speak English expressed concerns about the lack of effort which schools made to translate documents requiring their attention.' (Bell, Jarman & Lefebvre, 2004, p.97). There was also a lack of understanding among parents of how the school management system operated, and a feeling that some young children had experienced racism from both fellow pupils and their teachers. In contrast, a more recent report (Bell, Caughey, Hansson, Martynowicz and Scully 2009) found that the majority of school-aged children of migrant workers were very satisfied with the level of support that they had received.[22]

---

[22]http://www.delni.gov.uk/a_report_on_the_experiences_of_migrant_workers_in_northern_ireland.pdf

These specific concerns aside, the same principle that applies to teachers also applies to SEN and EAL assistants. As with teachers, the quality of this support is important (Moran & Abbott, 2002) but a key factor is the number of assistants and the amount of individual attention that learners receive from them. *The Department of Education Policy for School Improvement* (Department of Education, 2009c) states that effective support must remain in place to meet the additional education and other needs of pupils and to help them overcome barriers to learning. This has particular significance for SEN and EAL pupils who may need access to extensive specialist support.

Access to teacher and specialist support, in terms of the ratio of staff provision to learners, is an important indicator of the progress being made towards equality of access.

4.1(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

There was wide agreement among stakeholders in all workshops that both the quantity and quality of teaching had a major effect on a child/young person's ability to achieve their full potential.

Several participants in one workshop expressed concerns about the probability that teachers in schools with a high percentage of Protestant working class boys are not from the local community. In contrast these participants felt that a greater proportion of teachers in maintained schools are from the local community, and that they therefore have a greater holistic understanding of the community within which pupils live.

Stakeholders in each workshop and seven respondents who submitted comment forms suggested that the level of achievement of many children and young people in the priority groups depends most heavily on the amount of specialist support available to them. They felt that this specialist support must be provided at an early stage. Particular mention was made of EAL support because the demand has increased significantly in recent years. Several participants maintained that, although a majority of minority ethnic children and young people have good language skills, there may be some who require EAL assistance. In all

workshops it was suggested that the main issue to accessing support is the language barrier and that robust EAL support is required to overcome this. One School Principal who submitted a comment form said that this support was important at both primary and post-primary levels. One School Principal with a significant number of newcomer children within their school said that, in many cases, EAL support is essential especially from the outset (i.e. when the child enrols at the school). This Principal felt that if early language support is provided, newcomer children and young people can often integrate fairly quickly into mainstream classes.

Stakeholders also agreed that there is a need for a high level of specialist support for disabled children and young people, including non-teaching staff. There were a number of comments in forms submitted by School Principals and education bodies about resources available for supporting SEN children and young people in mainstream schools. There were also comments about problems with identifying special needs quickly and the length of time it takes to develop a statement.

4.1(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

In relation to teacher: pupil ratios, one respondent who submitted written comments questioned the relevance of such a measure for young people as they grow older. The respondent further pointed out that, for all age groups, it is the quality of teaching and the skills of the teachers to address the individual needs of the child that are important.

Three participants in the general workshop and four respondents who submitted written comments expressed concerns regarding the purpose and focus of measures relating to the quantity of specialist support available in schools. There was a general concern that the measures needed to be better defined and specific comments included:

- the SEN statement focuses on the skills of the teacher and provision of classroom assistance may not necessarily be part of the

recommended package of support for an individual child or young person;

- the current focus is on building the capacity of teachers to support newcomer children and young people rather than relying on specialist EAL support, as this support only lasts for the 3 year duration in which the children are considered to be newcomers;

- measures relating to the number of learners supported by classroom assistants are not indicative of outcomes and the quality of such support is a key factor;

- parental confidence in teacher and specialist support should be included as a measure in line with the recommendations of the Lamb Inquiry in Great Britain (See Department for Children, Schools and Family, 2009);

- although funding is a key concern, measures for monitoring expenditure on specialist support would not provide useful information as support is used in many different ways.

A further point was made by a participant in the general workshop regarding children and young people who have a SEN but are educated through Alternative Education Provision (AEP). This participant suggested that statemented children and young people often perform better in AEP, despite lower levels of SEN funding, because of the focused nature of their education. Additionally, it was suggested that, throughout the recommended framework, children and young people in AEP should be included in the measures associated with relevant indicators.

Discussion
4.1(D): Recommended Indicator
The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- the number of learners for whom teachers are responsible may limit their ability to provide a quality educational experience appropriate to

each child or young person, although this may be less of a factor as young people grow older;

- some children and young people require additional support within the school environment in order to benefit to the same degree as others, particularly children and young people with a SEN statement and those who have English as an Additional Language;
- the level and quality of specialist support can have a significant effect on the level of achievement of children and young people in the priority groups;
- measures relating to specialist support need to be well defined and address quality as well as quantity, including parents/guardians' perceptions of quality.

It is therefore recommended that "*Access to Teachers and Specialists*" should be a key indicator with particular attention being paid to both numbers and quality of such support. However, it is acknowledged that further research will be required to determine how quality of support can be defined and measured across a range of schools. For this reason the quality measures are recommended as Potential Future Measures.

As a result of the second phase of stakeholder engagement, the associated measures for this indicator have been revised and clarified, as set out below.

4.1(E): Associated Measures

On the basis of existing literature and comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time it is recommended that associated measures could include:

4.1.1   Pupil / teacher ratios, by school type and management type[23];

4.1.2   Number of SEN assistants (FTE[24]), by school type and management type;

4.1.3   Quality of SEN support, by school type and management type (Potential Future Measure);

---

[23] For details of school types and management types, see section 3.10.2 on p.17
[24] Full Time Equivalent

4.1.4 Parental confidence in SEN support, by school type and management type (Potential Future Measure);

4.1.5 Proportion of learners supported by SEN assistants, by school type and management type;

4.1.6 Number of EAL assistants (FTE[25]), by school type and management type;

4.1.7 Proportion of learners supported by EAL assistants, by school type and management type;

4.1.8 Quality of EAL support, by school type and management type (Potential Future Measure);

4.1.9 Parental confidence in EAL support, by school type and management type (Potential Future Measure).

4.1(F): Available data

Measure 4.1.1: Pupil / teacher ratios

The Department of Education routinely publishes Pupil/Teacher Ratios by school type and management type based on information obtained from the School Census and the Annual Return on Teacher Numbers.

Measure 4.1.2: **Number of SEN assistants (FTE[26])**

It would be useful to monitor the level of support for children and young people with Special Educational Needs by school type. The recording of the number of SEN assistants will give some general indication of the availability within each school environment, and will allow for further analysis of the ratio of SEN assistants to pupils within each school type, should this be required in the future. However, this statistic alone will reveal little about the quality of support.

While this figure is available from each of the Boards for Controlled and Maintained Schools, each SEN assistant may support a different number of learners depending on the level of need and resources available. For example, some learners may need one-to one support whilst others may be supported in groups of 10-12. The number of SEN assistants by school type will not therefore provide tracking information on whether all learners who require support are

---

[25] Full Time Equivalent
[26] Full Time Equivalent

receiving an appropriate level, which was the specific concern which gave rise to the suggested indicator. In the future, it may be possible to devise a measure to assess the effectiveness of the support, but it is not currently possible to do so.

Measure 4.1.3: Quality of SEN support (Potential Future Measure)

At the present time, no data sources are available to track this measure although various stakeholders did feel that it was important to consider both the quantity and quality of SEN support. To determine the quality of support, i.e. the effectiveness of the support and the impact on those receiving it, may not be straightforward and will require additional primary research. Monitoring of the performance of young people with Special Educational Needs in receipt of various types of support may yield interesting data in this regard but again this may require dedicated and focused primary research to be carried out. This measure is therefore regarded as a Potential Future Measure.

Measure 4.1.4: Parental confidence in SEN support (Potential Future Measure)

While no data sources are available to track this measure at the present time, it has been included because of the arguments advanced by one stakeholder organisation and in line with the recommendations of the Lamb Inquiry in Great Britain (Department for Children, Schools and Family, 2009). Once more, this measure may require primary research to capture parents' views on the quality, accessibility and appropriateness of the support offered to their children, as no existing data source could be adapted to capture this information. This measure is therefore regarded as a Potential Future Measure.

Measure 4.1.5: **Proportion of learners supported by SEN assistants**

It would be useful to track the proportion of learners supported by SEN assistants. This data is currently collected at an area level by the five Education and Library boards, but no central data source exists. It should also be noted that Special Schools allocate assistants by class, so the relevant indicator would be the proportion of learners in the school with SEN statements. Additionally, the Boards sometimes use teaching support, rather than SEN assistants, for pupils with Special Educational Needs, which would not be included in this indicator.

Measure 4.1.6: Number of EAL assistants (FTE[27])

At the present time, no data sources are available to track this measure. This information could be collected through the annual School Census.

Measure 4.1.7: Proportion of learners supported by EAL assistants

At the present time, no data sources are available to track this measure. This information could be collected through the annual School Census.

Measure 4.1.8: Quality of EAL support (Potential Future Measure)

At the present time, no data sources are available to track this measure. To determine the quality of support, I.e. the effectiveness of the support and the impact on those receiving it, may not be straightforward and may require additional primary research. This measure is therefore regarded as a Potential Future Measure.

Measure 4.1.9: Parental confidence in EAL support (Potential Future Measure)

At the present time, no data sources are available to track this measure. Once more, this measure may require primary research to capture parents' views on the quality, accessibility and appropriateness of the support offered to their children, as no existing data source could be adapted to capture this information. This measure is therefore regarded as a Potential Future Measure.

---

[27] Full Time Equivalent

5.6.2. Sub-Indicator 4.2: Home and community support

Findings
4.2(A): Rationale

Access to a quality educational experience does not end when the child or young person leaves the school premises. The support and encouragement which learners receive at home plays an important role in their educational development. Indeed, the recent Department of Education policy *Schools for the Future: A Policy for Sustainable Schools* (Department of Education, 2009a) emphasises the need for a school to be connected to its local community and for the school and its teachers to be held in regard by parents/guardians and the local community.

At a most basic level the child or young person needs time and a suitable environment in which to complete homework and other out of school assignments. In terms of motivation and the emotional well being of the child or young person, there is a need for a supportive environment in which education is valued. The child or young person's home and the community in which s/he lives are therefore key factors in terms of their opportunity to maximise the benefits of what is offered within the school.

There are a number of children and young people who are less likely than others to have access to a supportive home environment. These include looked after children and young people (Barnardo's, 2006) and those with caring responsibilities for household members (Dearden & Becker, 2004). For example, the majority of young people who had been in care during their school years as interviewed in the *Failed by the System* survey said no-one had ever attended a parents' evening on their behalf. Nearly half of those interviewed stated they had never received praise or encouragement if they did well at school (Barnardo's, 2006, p. 5).

Research suggests that beliefs about Irish Travellers' negative cultural attitudes towards formal education are largely unfounded (Reynolds et al., 2003, p.410).

However, Traveller children are often encouraged to play an active role in the economic and social life of their community from an early age. This can often lead to a gradual process of disengagement from school throughout adolescence (Reynolds et al., 2003, p.411)

Across all Section 75 grounds there are likely to be groups of parents/guardians who are less likely than others to take a close interest in school life for a variety of reasons. These groups could include those with language difficulties, and those who do not place a high priority on formal education for their children. As one example, *Every Child an Equal Child* (ECNI, 2008) has identified traditional cultural forces operating within certain Protestant working class communities that serve to place a higher value on vocational skills than general qualifications. This often reflects in a profile of under-performance at school among school age boys from these communities. With the decline of the manufacturing base in Northern Ireland, this historical trend has led to greater economic disadvantage among this group. In the words of the DETI *Taskforce Report on Protestant Working Class Communities* (DETI, 2004), 'Some professionals involved in the provision of education in Protestant working class areas advise that, by the time they get to primary school, many pupils have already established poor behaviour patterns and demonstrate a low level capacity to engage positively with purposeful and structured learning. The level and quality of family based support for the education of these children is often very poor.' (p.12).

Family and cultural influences on children's education are likely to be varied within and between communities. There is a need to identify the specific role that these forces may play in determining educational achievement. Hence this indicator has been developed to allow tracking of the role which the home and community play in encouraging the child or young person to access all the opportunities which the education system offers.

4.2(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

Stakeholders in three workshops and respondents who submitted comment forms (including six School Principals) emphasised the importance of support

from parents/guardians and the local community in which the child lives, particularly in terms of positive attitudes to education and individual schools. There was broad agreement across all workshops and in six comment forms that a key factor affecting Protestant working class boys is the lack of appropriate role models, both at home and in the local community. It was argued that in the local community a low value was sometimes placed on education as a way of enhancing life prospects (and in stark contrast with equivalent Catholic communities).

In three workshops participants voiced a perception that the Irish Traveller culture is seen to place a low value on education and focuses instead on life skills and independence. This was also raised by two respondents who submitted comment forms. This, it was argued, may have an effect on both attendance and achievements among Traveller children.

Within these discussions, two participants mentioned that children and young people with caring responsibilities may have lower levels of parental support depending on the nature of their responsibilities.

4.2(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

One respondent who submitted written comments called for clarification around the term 'appropriate support' and agreed that further research was called for on what was actually meant by support provided by parents and the wider community. One participant in the general workshop pointed out that it would be difficult to measure the percentage of learners who consider that they receive appropriate support from parents/guardians at primary level, and that a better quality of information could be obtained form the school/teachers.

Discussion
4.2(D): Recommended Indicator

The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- DE policy emphasises the need for a school to be connected to its local community, and for the school and its teachers to be held in regard by parents/guardians and the local community;
- there is a need for further research to identify the specific role that family and community influences may play in determining educational attainment.

It is therefore recommended that *"Home and Community Support"* should be a key indicator. However, it is suggested that further work needs to be done to determine the appropriateness and viability of these measures and they are therefore regarded as Potential Future Measures.

4.2(E): Associated Measures

On the basis of existing literature and comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time it is recommended that Potential Future Measures could include:

4.2.1 Proportion of learners who consider that they receive appropriate support from parents/guardians, by S75 grounds and priority groups (Potential Future Measure);

4.2.2 Types of support offered to learners by parents/guardians (Potential Future Measure);

4.2.3 Level of community support (Potential Future Measure).

4.2(F): Available Data

Measure 4.2.1: Proportion of learners who consider that they receive appropriate support from parents/guardians (Potential Future Measure)
Measure 4.2.2: Types of support offered to learners by parents/guardians (Potential Future Measure) and
Measure 4.2.3: Level of community support (Potential Future Measure)

It would be useful to monitor the level of parental and community support which children and young people enjoy in relation to their school education and what

this support comprises. While stakeholders were not specific as to what 'appropriate support' could include, it may extend to practical support with homework, financial support for school trips etc., engagement with the school (e.g. parents' evenings).

It may also encompass a home environment and/or a community culture that is generally supportive of the young person's educational career in less tangible but no less significant ways, such as verbal encouragement and support.

It has not been possible to identify a valid and reliable source of data for this specific type of information; further research would be required to establish appropriate and viable measures and these three measures are therefore regarded as Potential Future Measures.

However, it should be noted that the YPB&A survey includes a module on social support which includes the following questions on parental support, which may form the basis for Measure 4.2.1:

- I would now like you to think about your family and friends (by family I mean those that live with you, as well as those who live somewhere else). Here are some comments that people have made about their family and friends. Please say whether or not they are true for you.
    - I have family/friends who do things to make me happy
    - I have family/friends who make me feel loved
    - I have family/friends who can be relied on no matter what happens
    - I have family/friends who would see that I am taken care of if I need to be
    - I have family/friends who accept me just as I am
    - I have family/friends who make me feel an important part of their lives
    - I have family/friends who give me support and encouragement.
- If I have problems at school, my parents/guardians are ready to help me;
- My parents/guardians are willing to come to school to talk to my teachers;
- My parents/guardians encourage me to do well at school;

- My parents/guardians expect too much of me at school.
- Which, if any, of the following groups of people encouraged you to think about going to FE College or University? (parents, friends etc.)
- During the last 4 weeks, how good or bad have you felt about the following?
  - The way you get along with others
  - The way you get along with your family
  - The way life seems to be for you

The YPB&A Survey can be analysed for five of the Section 75 grounds (religious belief, age, gender, disability and racial/ethnic origin) at post-primary level only. It does not record any data on political opinion, marital status, sexual orientation or those with dependants; nor does it record social class or whether the young person is looked after. Hence data on five of the eight priority groups will not be available from this source:

- Protestant working class boys
- lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) children and young people;
- looked after children and young people;
- children and young people with caring responsibilities; and
- newcomer children and young people.

There are no questions in the YPB&A survey on community support and no other data source has been identified. Potential sources of data could include questions on parental and/or community support for education in the Continuous Household Survey, or a dedicated unit in a future Life and Times Survey.

5.6.3. Sub- Indicator 4.3: Outside agency support

Findings

4.3(A): Rationale

The Department of Education makes clear that it looks for schools to work closely with other relevant statutory and voluntary agencies whose work impacts on education, especially Health, Social Services, the public library service and local Neighbourhood Renewal Groups (Department of Education, 2010b). Marginalised children are more likely to have complex needs that will require an engagement from various agencies, and measuring the extent of involvement and coordination of these other bodies appears important.

4.3(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

Stakeholders in at least one workshop and two comment forms referred to the important role of the Youth Service in terms of support for individual children and young people, especially in relation to attitudes to education.

There was considerable discussion during the stakeholder engagement of the additional support which may be required by children and young people in the priority groups, especially in relation to emotional health and well-being. To some extent this type of support may be provided by teachers, classroom assistants and pastoral care advisers. However, there is a key role for outside agencies, both statutory and voluntary, which has been recognised in individual pieces of research. For example, the NISRA Research Briefing *"An Investigation of Youth Work, as a Process of Informal Learning, in Formal Settings"* (February 2008), showed that Youth work is mainly associated with non-accredited personal and social development, and that Youth workers engage with 'disengaged' youth in a variety of ways, primarily influenced by the ethos of the school.

4.3(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

One respondent who submitted written comments explained that they recognised the term "education" to include non-formal education as provided through youth

work and they would welcome the development of indicators/measures for youth work settings. Another respondent agreed that more research was needed on this topic, including which agencies should be monitored.

Discussion
4.3(D): Recommended Indicator
The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- marginalised children and young people are more likely to have complex needs that will require an engagement from various agencies;
- the support of outside agencies, particularly youth work, make an important contribution to the education of children and young people;
- there is a need for further research to identify the specific role that outside agencies may play in determining educational attainment.

It is therefore recommended that *"Outside Agency Support"* should be a key indicator. However, it is suggested that further work needs to be done to determine the appropriateness and viability of the associated measure and this is therefore regarded as a Potential Future Measure.

4.3(E): Associated Measures
It would be useful to monitor the level of support from outside agencies that schools of different types and management types enjoy. However, further research would be necessary to define the range of agencies, and to set guidelines for the levels of relevant support for each type of school, and for children and young people with different needs. The following measure is suggested as a starting point:

4.3.1   Level of outside agency support, by school type and management type[28] and by S75 grounds and priority groups (Potential Future Measure).

---

[28] For details of school types and management types, see section 3.10.2 on p.17

4.3(F): Available Data

No existing source of information has been identified; the collection of information on level of outside agency report on a regular basis would have to involve some kind of self assessment by schools. Agencies themselves could be encouraged to provide more monitoring information on levels of engagement with various school types.

Outside agency support is noted here as a Potential Future Measure as further research would be required to determine how outside agency support could be classified in terms of the quantity and quality of provision and the impact on learners.

5.7. Conclusions

Theme 1: Access - Recommended Indicator Framework

Overarching goal: Every child has equality of access to a quality educational experience

Indicators	Sub-Indicators	Associated Measures[29]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
1. Access to schools	1.1 Choice of school	1.1.1 Number of schools	School Census	Annual	By school type and management type	By Board area (including catchment areas)	
		1.1.2 Proportion of learners (enrolments)	School Census	Annual	By school type and management type	By Board area	By S75 grounds and priority groups
		1.1.3 Proportion of children in pre-school education	School Census	Annual			By S75 grounds and priority groups
		1.1.4 Proportion of learners from a Catholic community background attending controlled sector schools	School Census	Annual		By Board area	By S75 grounds and priority groups
		1.1.5 Proportion of learners from a non-Catholic community background attending maintained sector schools	School Census	Annual		By Board area	By S75 grounds and priority groups

---

[29] Highlighted cells (shaded grey) are those for which no data source has been identified as currently available or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure

Indicators	Sub-Indicators	Associated Measures[30]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
1. Access to schools cont'd	1.1 Choice of school cont'd	1.1.6 Number and spatial distribution of special schools	School Census	Annual		By Board area	
		1.1.7 Number, spatial distribution and travel times of children with special needs attending mainstream schools and special schools	School Census (number and spatial distribution only) No data source currently available for travel times	Annual			By Stage and SEN category including multiple disabilities
		1.1.8 Demand for places at schools as indicated by schools which are at capacity or over-subscribed as first choice	No data source currently available		By school type and management type	By Board area	
		1.1.9 Proportion of children refused first choice of pre-school placements	No data source currently available				By S75 grounds and priority groups
		1.1.10 Quality of schools – *Potential Future Measure*	*Potential Future Measure*				

---

[30] Highlighted cells (shaded grey) are those for which no data source has been identified as currently available or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure

Indicators	Sub-Indicators	Associated Measures[31]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
1. Access to schools cont'd	1.2 Attendance	1.2.1 Proportion of placement changes in the last academic year	No data source currently available		By school type and management type		By S75 grounds and priority groups
		1.2.2 Overall authorised absence rate	School Census	Annual	By school type and management type		By S75 grounds and priority groups
		1.2.3 Overall unauthorised absence rate	School Census	Annual	By school type and management type		By S75 grounds and priority groups
		1.2.4 Young people's attitudes to attendance	YPB&A survey	Triennial	(NB Available for post primary only)		By S75 grounds and priority groups

---

[31] Highlighted cells (shaded grey) are those for which no data source has been identified as currently available or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure

Indicators	Sub-Indicators	Associated Measures[32]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
2. Access to subjects	2.1 Breadth of curriculum	2.1.1 Proportion of full (entitlement) curriculum offered within school premises	No data source currently available		By school type and management type		
		2.1.2 Young people's perceptions of the breadth of subject choice	YPB&A Survey includes questions relating to subject choice	Triennial	(NB Available for post primary only)		By S75 grounds and priority groups
		2.1.3 Young people's perceptions of the effectiveness of Area Learning Communities	No data source currently available				By S75 grounds and priority groups
		2.1.4 Quality of the curriculum delivered – *Potential Future Measure*	*Potential Future Measure*				
	2.2 Extracurricular activities	2.2.1 Proportion of learners participating in extracurricular activities	No data source currently available[33]		By school type and management type		By S75 grounds and priority groups
		2.2.2 Range and depth of extracurricular activities – Potential Future Measure	*Potential Future Measure*		By school type and management type		

---

[32] Highlighted cells (shaded grey) are those for which no data source has been identified as currently available or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure
[33] YPB&A Survey includes questions relating to participation in sports and physical activities

Indicators	Sub-Indicators	Associated Measures[34]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
3. Access to facilities	3.1 Physical access	3.1.1 Proportion of schools with one or more areas (e.g. common rooms) and classrooms inaccessible to learners with physical disabilities and whether lack of access is temporary or permanent	No data source currently available		By school type and management type		
		3.1.2 Proportion of schools unable to provide reasonable adjustments for learners with disabilities	No data source currently available		By school type and management type		

---

[34] Highlighted cells (shaded grey) are those for which no data source has been identified as currently available or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure

Indicators	Sub-Indicators	Associated Measures[35]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Indicators
3. Access to facilities cont'd	3.2 Facilities & materials	3.2.1 Extent of access to on-line educational materials within the school (time, duration and activity)	No data source currently available[36]		By school type and management type		By S75 grounds and priority groups
		3.2.2 Proportion of teaching materials where examples are culturally diverse	No data source currently available		By school type and management type		
4. Access to support	4.1 Teachers & specialists	4.1.1 Pupil/teacher ratios	School Census; Annual Return on Teacher Numbers	Annual	By school type and management type		
		4.1.2 Number of SEN assistants (FTE)	Data available from Boards	Annual	By school type and management type		
		4.1.3 Quality of SEN support – *Potential Future Measure*	*Potential Future Measure*		By school type and management type		
		4.1.4 Parental confidence in SEN support – Potential Future Measure	*Potential Future Measure*		By school type and management type		

[35] Highlighted cells (shaded grey) are those for which no data source has been identified as currently available or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure

[36] YPB&A Survey includes questions relating to access to computers at home

Indicators	Sub-Indicators	Associated Measures[37]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
4. Access to support cont'd	4.1 Teachers & specialists cont'd	4.1.5 Proportion of learners supported by SEN assistants	Data available from Boards	Annual	By school type and management type		
		4.1.6 Number of EAL assistants (FTE)	No data source currently available		By school type and management type		
		4.1.7 Proportion of learners supported by EAL assistants	No data source currently available		By school type and management type		
		4.1.8 Quality of EAL support – *Potential Future Measure*	*Potential Future Measure*		By school type and management type		
		4.1.9 Parental confidence in EAL support – *Potential Future Measure*	*Potential Future Measure*		By school type and management type		

---

[37] Highlighted cells (shaded grey) are those for which no data source has been identified as currently available or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure

Indicators		Associated Measures[38]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
4. Access to support cont'd	4.2 Home & community	4.2.1 Proportion of learners who consider that they receive appropriate support from parents/guardians – *Potential Future Measure[39]*	*Potential Future Measure*				By S75 grounds and priority groups
		4.2.2 Types of support offered to learners by parents/guardians – *Potential Future Measure*	*Potential Future Measure*				
		4.2.3 Level of community support – *Potential Future Measure*	*Potential Future Measure*				
	4.3 Outside agency	4.3.1 Level of outside agency support – *Potential Future Measure*	*Potential Future Measure*		By school type and management type		By S75 grounds and priority groups

---

[38] Highlighted cells (shaded grey) are those for which no data source has been identified as currently available or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure
[39] YPB&A Survey includes some relevant questions

6.   Theme 2 – Attainment

6.1.   Theme introduction

The second overarching goal identified in *Every Child an Equal Child* relates to Attainment:

Every child is given the opportunity to reach his or her full potential.

Universally, indicator frameworks linked to education place attainment centre-stage, representing a key output for young people from their engagement with formal schooling. *Every Child an Equal Child* suggests that, 'There is clear evidence that children and young people, who are already at risk of being marginalised in society, often have lower levels of educational attainment' (2008, p.10) .

At the same time, the factors which impact on the educational attainment of children and young people are complex and interactive and consequently there is often a lack of clarity in relation to causes of under-attainment (ECNI, 2008). Nevertheless, many education indicator frameworks place attainment as a core component of the educational experience (see Burchardt et al., 2009; Moser, 2007; EU Working Committee on the Quality of School Education, 2000), with poor educational attainment acting to reinforce the cycle of deprivation that marginalised groups and individuals experience throughout their lives (ECNI, 2008).

Therefore, while attainment is an important component in the educational experience of all children and young people, it becomes particularly important for marginalised individuals and groups. Current government strategy recognises this and focuses our attention on those who leave school without the basic skills necessary to compete in the world of work (Department of Education, 2008). The strategy for raising achievement in literacy and numeracy states that, '[w]hile standards are high in many schools here, there are still far too many children

who struggle with reading, writing and using mathematics and too many young people who leave school still lacking in skills and confidence in these areas. Too often, these are young people who are already contending with other barriers to education, including socially disadvantaged backgrounds, those with additional educational needs or those whose first language is not English.' (Department of Education, 2008, p.1).

If children and young people are to be given the opportunity to reach their full potential, it is important not to disregard the breadth of factors that determine educational attainment. These factors include opportunities that go beyond formal education. A number of these have already been signalled under the previous theme (Access), including extracurricular activities, but in the former section these refer to barriers and facilitators to achievement; here the focus shifts to attainment itself. The child/young person must be encouraged to develop to his or her full academic and personal potential. Attainment therefore represents a wide-ranging and complex construct which will need to be tracked through the use of a broad range of complementary indicators.

6.2. Recommended indicators

In line with existing good practice with regard to indicator frameworks in education and informed by current strategic priorities, five indicators are recommended to track progress relevant to this overarching goal[40]. In combination these indicators will address the multifaceted nature of attainment:

- Public examinations;
- Personal development and cultural awareness;
- Other achievements;
- Teacher and learner expectations;
- Employability.

---

[40] It should be noted that there are no sub-indicators proposed under this theme; each of the suggested indicators stands alone.

The recommended indicators, together with associated measures and data sources, are set out in the RIF table at the end of this section on pages 127-131.

6.3. Indicator 5: Public examinations

Findings

5(A): Rationale

Formal general and applied qualifications are not the only measure of achievements by children and young people during their school education. However, they do tend to be the most standard and popular means of assessing attainment. For example most school league tables are based on accumulated data on performance in public examinations (see e.g. http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/interactive/2010/jan/12/school-tables-secondary-schools) while academic qualifications still tend to be highly valued by potential employers in their recruitment processes. Research published by the Learning and Skills Council (2006) states that 22% of employers say they would not recruit job-seekers with fewer than five good GCSEs or the applied equivalent and that 15% completely discount a CV if the job applicant does not have these essential qualifications.

In *Every School a Good School: Policy for School Improvement*, (Department of Education, 2009c) the Department of Education describes a successful school as one in which a culture of achievement, improvement and ambition exists, and in which a clear expectation exists that all pupils can and will achieve to the very best of their ability. It is noteworthy that the report goes on to use formal qualifications (i.e. GCSE results in English and Maths) as the yardstick by which to measure success:

> 'It is at Grade A*-C at which an average pupil can be described as having the expected levels of functional skills in these subjects (English and Mathematics). These skills are generally accepted as being essential for young people seeking employment.'

Research indicates consistent underachievement by marginalised groups in relation to formal qualifications. Statistics, such as those summarised in the

Commission's *Every Child an Equal Child* (ECNI, 2008), provide the following information about children and young people in the priority groups:

- Protestant males attending secondary school were more likely their Catholic counterparts to indicate they intended not to progress to Further or Higher Education.[41] In addition, schools performing lower than expected (LTE) were observed to be clustered mainly in Belfast, and often in areas that are more than 75% Protestant in terms of community background.[42]
- Irish Traveller children and young people consistently underachieve;
- Some disabled children and young people are consistently below average in terms of achievement in examinations.

Other research has highlighted the longstanding 'gender gap' in school achievement (see Northern Ireland Assembly, 2001), with boys consistently underperforming in comparison with girls. The accumulated research serves to highlight the importance of formal qualifications as a key indicator.

5(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

A large majority of stakeholders suggested that attainment should not be measured simply in terms of general and applied qualifications. However, they emphasised that the current culture in Northern Ireland still places great emphasis on GCSEs and A levels. Stakeholders felt that these are important to employers and many parents/guardians in Northern Ireland. It was also a widely held view that children and young people need a reasonable level of literacy and numeracy to allow them to function successfully in society.

With regard to the priority groups, stakeholders made the following points:

- Stakeholders considered that the pressure of caring responsibilities would impact on behaviour in school, and ultimately on the educational achievement of children and young people with caring responsibilities;

---

[41] Taken from: OFMDFM (2001) Report on Participation Rates in Further and Higher Education. See *http://www.ofmdfmni.gov.uk/partrate.pdf* [last accessed 18/03/2011].
[42] Taken from: DENI (2008) Literacy and Numeracy of Pupils in Northern Ireland, Report No. 49. See http://www.deni.gov.uk/no_49-2.pdf [last accessed 18/03/2011].

- It was argued by two participants in workshops and one respondent in a comment form that children whose first language is not English can perform well academically if they receive the appropriate language support at the right time;
- Concerns were expressed during two workshops about the difficulties around verifying the achievements of newcomer children and young people in their former country of residence;
- Also, it was suggested that the teaching style, examinations and key stages in Northern Ireland may be very different from those the child or young person has previously experienced, which can add to the pressure of integration.

5(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

Workshop participants and respondents who submitted written comments generally reiterated the view from the first phase of engagement that, while formal qualifications were important, they were only one subset of the life skills that schools should provide for young people. Participants in the general workshop and young people's workshop expressed the view that focusing the framework only on a limited range of GCSE and A Level grades may not reveal the full profile of attainment. Hence, on the basis of these comments, the researchers proposed that a profile of all grades by S75 grounds and priority groups (including a range of disabilities) was needed. Additionally, several participants in the general workshop argued that the framework was skewed towards post-primary schools. On the basis of participants' comments on this issue, the researchers proposed that additional measures were perhaps needed to represent the situation in primary schools. One participant in the general workshop raised the point that by only including measures on attainment at levels 1-4 of Key Stage 2 (English and Maths), this may infer that this was an established quality standard. The participant expressed the view that, in practice, the level achieved depended on a variety of factors.

The need to revise the terminology in the framework in line with future changes to be made to the core curriculum was also mentioned by two workshop participants. It was suggested by one respondent who submitted written

comments that "academic" and "vocational" attainments should be recorded separately in the framework. In line with these comments, the terms 'general and applied' have been used to replace 'academic and vocational'.

Discussion
5(D): Recommended Indicator

The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- although public examinations are not the only measure of attainment by children and young people, they tend to be the most standard and popular means of assessing attainment;
- research indicates consistent underachievement by marginalised groups in relation to public examinations;
- there is a widely held view that children and young people need a reasonable level of literacy and numeracy to allow them to function in society;
- the level of attainment achieved by children and young people can depend on a variety of factors and measures of the widest possible range of attainment in public examinations should be included.

It is therefore recommended that *"Public Examinations"* should be a key indicator. This indicator was included in the PIF but the terminology has been revised to take account of concerns expressed during the second phase of stakeholder engagement. There may be a need for a further revision of terminology in 2012 when the revised curriculum is embedded. Some of the associated measures have also been extended and revised to reflect the views expressed in the second phase of the stakeholder engagement that a wider range of measures was needed, and to avoid any implication that a particular level of attainment is regarded as a quality standard. The changes are set out below.

5(E): Associated Measures

On the basis of existing literature, and confirmed by comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time it is recommended that associated measures should include:

5.1   Proportion of school leavers achieving 1 or more A levels or equivalent, by S75 grounds and priority groups;

5.2   Proportion of school leavers achieving 1 or more GCSEs or equivalent, by S75 grounds and priority groups

5.3   Proportion of school leavers achieving at least 5 GCSEs at grades A*-C or equivalent including Maths and English, by S75 grounds and priority groups

5.4   Proportion of school leavers achieving at least 5 GCSEs at grades A*-G or equivalent, by S75 grounds and priority groups

5.5   Proportion of learners leaving school with no formal qualifications, by S75 grounds and priority groups

5.6   Proportion of learners achieving levels 1-4 in Key Stage 1 English, by S75 grounds and priority groups

5.7   Proportion of learners achieving levels 1-4 in Key Stage 1 Maths, by S75 grounds and priority groups

5.8   Proportion of learners achieving Levels 1-4 in Key Stage 2 English, by S75 grounds and priority groups

5.9   Proportion of learners achieving levels 1-4 in Key Stage 2 Maths, by S75 grounds and priority groups

5.10   Proportion of learners achieving other applied and/or vocational qualifications, by S75 grounds and priority groups

5(F): Available Data

Measures 5.1 – 5.5

The annual School Leavers Survey provides comprehensive information on A level, GCSE and equivalent qualifications.

Measures 5.6 – 5.9

It would also be useful to monitor achievements in English and Mathematics at Key Stages 1 and 2. This information is available from the School Census.

Measure 5.10: Proportion of learners achieving other applied and/or vocational qualifications

Both the annual School Leavers Survey and the annual School Census currently provide detailed information on school type and the number of pupils in each, by six of the Section 75 grounds (religious belief, age, gender, marital status, disability, race/ethnic origin). This would facilitate partial analysis of each of the above measures. However, the surveys do not record data under three of the Section 75 grounds, namely political opinion, sexual orientation and those with dependants. Hence data on the following two of the eight priority groups will not be available from this source:

- Lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) children and young people; and
- Children and young people with caring responsibilities.

The OC2 indicator collection provides more detail on the educational attainment of looked after children and young people.

6.4. Indicator 6: Personal Development and Cultural Awareness

Findings

6(A): Rationale

Alongside formal qualifications, the school system should aspire to provide a much broader grounding for young people in their formative years. The Equality Commission's report, *Every Child an Equal Child* (ECNI, 2008) states:

> "There is a significant role for education in developing the individual's personality and [a] world view that transcends the acquisition of qualifications."

The Independent Strategic Review of Education (Department of Education, 2006) likewise emphasised the need to develop learning environments that will foster an environment based on mutual respect across all communities, along with providing a quality education. More recently, the Good Relations Forum (2010) confirmed the important role that schools can play in 'developing young minds to enable young people to contribute purposefully to the development of a successful, vibrant and welcoming society' (p.22).

An exclusive focus on formal qualifications may also exacerbate existing inequalities, in particular among those communities that place greater value on life and applied skills. For example, in the words of the Good Relations Forum, there is evidence 'that some predominantly Protestant urban communities, mainly clustered in Belfast, are not attaining educationally as well as predominantly Catholic communities with similar levels of poverty. Many more school leavers in predominantly Catholic wards go on to further or higher education than do school leavers in predominantly Protestant wards.' (p.19). Current government policy acknowledges the need to ensure that all children follow an educational pathway which is appropriate for them. It recognises the need to develop a coherent set of qualifications for young people who, because of the barriers they face, may not be able to achieve at GCSE level (Department of Education, 2008).

6(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

Stakeholders suggested that Individual Education Plans (also referred to as Personal Education Plans and Personal Development Plans) are good practice instruments for personal development, provided that they are regularly reviewed. One stakeholder referred to the ASDAN certificate of personal effectiveness[43] as a potential measure. This certificate is recognised by curriculum authorities and allows young people to take part in projects which reflect their interests.

It was widely agreed that there is a need to develop imaginative ways of capturing non-formal educational experiences that add to children and young people's personal development.

With regard to the priority groups, stakeholders made the following points:

- Participants in three workshops and two respondents who submitted comment forms suggested that Irish Traveller families perceive that the curriculum is not relevant to their lifestyle and culture and they place more emphasis on life skills and independence;
- Several stakeholders in workshops and two respondents who submitted comment forms suggested that personal development is especially important for looked after children and young people as they have fewer opportunities to develop such skills outside the school environment;
- Statemented children and young people have explicit Individual Education Plans (IEPs) which are specific to them and can be an effective tool. However, it was argued by one workshop participant that some IEPs fail to present the pupil with the challenges and aspirations they need to achieve their potential. The participants suggested that there is a tendency for teachers to make assumptions about the capabilities of disabled children and young people;

---

[43] The Personal and Social Development Qualification (PSD) supports young people in becoming confident individuals who are physically, emotionally and socially healthy, in being responsible citizens who make a positive contribution to society and embrace change and in managing risk together with their own wellbeing, as well as introducing them to new activities and personal challenges. See http://www.asdan.org.uk/Qualifications/PSD for further information.

- Participants in two workshops suggested that LGB young people may feel marginalised in school and that this may inhibit engagement in activities that may enhance their personal development.

6(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

There was a range of comments from workshop participants and respondents who submitted written comments regarding the meaning of some of the terminology suggested for this indicator and associated measures. Concern was voiced in the young people's workshop that the term 'Personal development' alone was not appropriate for this indicator and, instead, these measures often related specifically to cultural awareness. One respondent who submitted written comments said that the term "Personal development" needed to be clarified. A participant in the general workshop suggested that the breadth of what was meant by "Learning for Life and Work qualifications" should be explained in more detail. One participant in the young people's workshop commented that schools do not afford sufficient weighting to Learning for Life and Work.

Several participants in both workshops and two respondents who submitted written comments commented on the proposed measures relating to Cultural Awareness Weeks and education in school about different cultures and traditions. The existence of a 'Cultural Awareness Week' was not seen as evidence of raised awareness or changed attitudes. It was suggested by two participants that the indicator framework should look more closely at the range of activities and effectiveness of such events, and seek to incorporate other methods of promoting inclusion. One respondent who submitted written comments suggested amending the measures relating to Cultural Awareness to focus on beneficial qualities. This respondent commented that doing so would help shift the focus of the framework towards identifying positive, attitude-changing actions.

Discussion
6(D): Recommended Indicator

The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- there is a significant role for education in developing the child/young person's personality;
- there is a need to develop learning environments that will foster mutual respect across all communities and cultural diversity education is a key factor;
- there is a view that personal development opportunities are particularly significant for children and young people in some of the priority groups;
- the role of education in promoting learning about cultural diversity and inclusion should be measured, if possible, in terms of the effectiveness of such initiatives.

It is therefore recommended that *"Personal Development and Cultural Diversity"* should be a key indicator. This indicator was included in the PIF but the terminology has been revised to take account of concerns expressed during the second phase of stakeholder engagement. Some of the associated measures have also been extended and revised. This has been done to reflect the views expressed in the second phase of the stakeholder engagement that there should be more emphasis on the content and outcomes achieved by the actions under consideration. The changes are set out below.

6(E): Associated Measures

On the basis of existing literature and comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time it is recommended that associated measures could include:

6.1 Proportion of learners achieving recognised Learning for Life and Work qualifications by grade, S75 grounds and priority groups

6.2 Young people's attitudes to personal development through school, by S75 grounds and priority groups

6.3 Proportion of learners receiving education in school about people from different cultures and traditions, by S75 grounds and priority groups

6.4 Range and effectiveness of activities in school about people from different cultures and traditions, by school type and management type[44] (Potential Future Measure).

6(F): Available Data

Measure 6.1: Proportion of learners achieving recognised Learning for Life and Work qualifications

As well as academic and vocational achievements, a school education provides children and young people with an opportunity to develop as individuals and prepare themselves for the adult world. The Council for the Curriculum, Examinations and Assessment (CCEA) recognises a range of qualifications in relation to Learning for Life and Work (including the GCSE and the ASDAN Certificate of Personal Effectiveness), although assessment of these elements is not compulsory. These are clearly useful measures of personal development within a structured framework and can be obtained from CCEA on an annual basis, although this data will only encompass those elements that have been formally assessed. In the future, the School Census could potentially be used to capture detail of those elements that have been taught but not formally assessed.

CCEA data can be analysed by gender and school type (grammar or non-grammar).

Measure 6.2: **Young people's attitudes to personal development through school**

The YPB&A survey includes a number of questions on attitudes to school including –

- My school is a place where:
  - the things I learn are important to me;

---

[44] For details of school types and management types, see section 3.10.2 on p.17

- I have learned things that will be useful to me;
- the things I learn will help me in my adult life;
- the things I am taught are worthwhile learning;
- I am a success as a student;
- I really like to go to school each day.

The responses to these questions will help to monitor young people's attitudes to their personal development through school.

The YPB&A Survey can be analysed for five of the Section 75 grounds (religious belief, age, gender, disability and racial/ethnic origin) at post-primary level only. It does not record any data on political opinion, marital status, sexual orientation or those with dependants; nor does it record social class or whether the young person is looked after. Hence data on five of the eight priority groups will not be available from this source:

- Protestant working class boys
- lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) children and young people;
- looked after children and young people;
- children and young people with caring responsibilities; and
- newcomer children and young people.

Measure 6.3: Proportion of learners receiving education in school about people from different cultures and traditions

The YPB&A survey includes questions relating to education in school about the culture and traditions of different groups. The following questions are asked –

- Have you received education in school on the culture and traditions of people from a Catholic community background?
- Have you received education in school on the culture and traditions of people from a Protestant community background?
- Have you received education in school on the culture and traditions of people of a different race or colour?
- Have you received education in school on religions other than Christianity?

The YPB&A Survey can be analysed for five of the Section 75 grounds (religious belief, age, gender, disability and racial/ethnic origin) at post-primary level only. It does not record any data on political opinion, marital status, sexual orientation or those with dependants; nor does it record social class or whether the young person is looked after. Hence data on the following five of the eight priority groups will not be available from this source:

- Protestant working class boys
- lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) children and young people;
- looked after children and young people;
- children and young people with caring responsibilities; and
- newcomer children and young people.

In the future, the School Census could potentially be expanded to include a section that details the ways in which pupils experience those from other cultures, highlighting which subjects include this material and at which levels. The survey could also include questions relating to any specific activities such as a cultural awareness/diversity/cross-cultural event or week.

Measure 6.4: Range and effectiveness of activities in school about people from different cultures and traditions (Potential Future Measure)

At the present time, no data sources are available to track this measure. Once more, the School Census could be employed to provide more specific information on the range of experiences that pupils encounter with regard to those from different cultures and traditions. This measure was derived from the need to delineate the extent to which young people have been directly exposed to those from different cultures during their school years. The researchers feel that the measure should not be restricted to taught subjects such as geography or history. Instead the focus should fall on those activities that a school has deliberately organised in order to allow young people to experience different cultures. This measure should endeavour to track not only the extent of engagement but also the impact that these activities may have had on young people's attitudes and behaviours, i.e. their effectiveness. It is recommended that

this should be included as a Potential Future Measure subject to further research to determine the appropriateness and viability of the measure.

6.5. Indicator 7: Other achievements (Potential Future Indicator)

Findings
7(A): Rationale

There is a range of other achievements which are capable of being measured to some degree but which do not fit within the indicator on public examinations. These include sport, music, Duke of Edinburgh/President's Award, Youth Achievement and Prince's Trust. All these achievements are relevant to a range of life skills, and are important in assisting every child to reach his or her full potential. Research by the National Youth Agency and The Fabian Society describes how non-formal learning such as participation in sports, arts, recreation and other positive activities can, by increasing such things as interpersonal skills and motivation, have an impact on the future life chances of young people in areas such as employment, health and education (NYA, 2008: 3). Additionally, these other achievements are often seen by employers as relevant to preparation for the workplace. Indeed the Duke of Edinburgh (DofE) Award has recently introduced a 'Skills for Employment' programme as a part of the scheme to further cement the relationship between the award scheme and the workplace (see http://www.dofe.org/en/content/cms/Doing_your_DofE/Your_DofE _programme/Sections/Skills/Employment/Employment.aspx). Furthermore, research by Campbell et al. found that employers regarded 'other achievements' such as the DofE as an important indication of young people's abilities outside the classroom with regarding to team-working, personal qualities, time management and organisational skills (Campbell et al. 2009: 180-1).

The availability of 'other achievement' schemes by school, and within schools, can vary significantly. While research in Northern Ireland on uptake by Section 75 grounds is not currently available, it is likely that marginalised groups and communities will be less involved. Research by Noel (2006) into participation in the DofE in Britain found that the uptake of DofE programmes in ethnic and lower social economic groups was much lower than in other groups. Noel (2006) found that young people from ethnic minorities are more likely to feel that the DofE

Award was not for them or that it was inaccessible to them. Additionally, Campbell et al. (2009 : 170) found that the cost of participating in the DofE was a barrier to getting low-income communities involved.

7(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

This indicator was supported in the first phase of stakeholder engagement. Participants in one workshop commented that use of the word "achievement" narrowed the focus, in the eyes of many people, to academic achievement and that it was important to address the full potential of each child including, sport, music and other areas.

7(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

It was noted by one respondent who submitted written comments that these indicators needed further research and clarification.

Discussion

7(D): Recommended Indicator

The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- there is a range of achievements outside the scope of public examinations which are capable of being measured to some degree;
- these achievements are relevant to a range of life skills and help to address the full potential of a child or young person;
- minority ethnic groups and lower socio-economic groups and communities are often less involved in 'other achievement' initiatives than mainstream groups;
- however, further research will be needed to define the range of bodies facilitating programmes aimed at developing these types of skill and the standards which they apply when making awards.

It is therefore recommended that *"Other Achievements"* should be a **Potential Future Indicator**, subject to further research to determine appropriateness and viability.

7(E): Associated Measures

On the basis of existing literature and comments received from stakeholders, potential associated measures are not currently evident for this indicator. However, it is recognised that children and young people attain measurable standards in the 'other achievements' they undertake. They mostly study for these standards during extracurricular activities or outside the school environment. The standards achieved by children and young people are likely to be recorded by sponsoring organisations. For example, Invest NI regularly monitor all those taking part in Prince's Trust activities by gender, age, community background, disability and ethnic origin (see Invest NI, 2005). Hence it should be possible to obtain information on the number of children and young people achieving defined standards[45] in fields such as sport and music.

7(F): Available Data

Further research will be necessary to define these measures and identify data sources. However, the task of coordinating information from a wide range of organisations should not be underestimated. These organisations should be encouraged to develop more systematic monitoring arrangements for tracking participants. At the present time, Youth Councils do have some data on the overall number of participants on Duke of Edinburgh Award schemes but breakdowns by S75 grounds are not available.

Given the difficulties associated with gathering information on these activities, at this time 'other achievements' can only be noted here as a Potential Future Indicator until further research has been undertaken.

---

[45] For example: Duke of Edinburgh, President's, Youth Achievement and Prince's Trust Awards

6.6. Indicator 8: Teacher and learner expectations

Findings

8(A): Rationale

The overarching goal emphasises that children and young people should be given the opportunity to reach their full potential. It is therefore important to understand the concept of 'full' potential, and to find a way to monitor the effectiveness of schools in helping children and young people to achieve this goal. Clearly, both teachers and learners will play important roles in determining the limits imposed on potential (e.g. Fang, 1996). This is often referred to in relation to explaining the 'achievement gap'. This is the difference, on a number of educational measures, between the actual performance of groups of learners, and especially groups defined by identity (e.g. gender, race/ethnicity, ability, and socioeconomic status), and the school population as a whole.

Research consistently reveals the important role that expectations play in determining achievement (e.g. Dee, 2007), suggesting that expectations are commonly attached to a wide range of related 'self' or psychological constructs including self-esteem, self-confidence, self-worth and self-efficacy.

In broad terms, this indicator encompasses two elements:

- the motivation and support given to children and young people to achieve;
- the role of both teachers and learners in defining what can be achieved by each individual.

These elements include both formal and informal attainment, through the achievement of general and applied qualifications and of personal goals. For example, the elements outlined above have been seen as important in determining the persistent 'gender gap' between boys and girls school achievement (Northern Ireland Assembly, 2001). Research has shown that lower expectations for Traveller children may impact on subject / school

performance (Reynolds et al., 2003, p. 407), beginning with allocation to the lowest ability groups on school entry. According to Hamilton et al. (2007), 'It was also noted that many interviewees, both Travellers and non-Travellers, were aware that there were often low expectations about what Traveller children would actually achieve from within the education system. It was suggested that this was in part due to the culture or tradition among Travellers, failing to see the relevance of education, and also due to the discrimination faced by young Travellers when they seek employment. Perhaps more importantly to note, the findings from this research indicate that the low expectations were due to the curriculum and the education system as a whole failing to meet the needs of Traveller children.' (p.2).

'Expectations' is also a significant element in ongoing debates on the relative merits of special or mainstream schooling for children with disability and special educational needs, in particular around staff expectations (Abbott, 2006; Lambe & Bones, 2006; Moran & Abbott, 2002).

8(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

Stakeholders in several workshops suggested that one of the key factors affecting attainment is the expectations of both teachers and the learners themselves. This has an impact on both general/applied and personal achievements. In one workshop and one comment form it was suggested that this was particularly relevant for disabled children and young people, as there may be a tendency for teachers to make assumptions about what the child/young person is capable of doing.

Three respondents who submitted written comments suggested that Individual Education Plans (IEPs) were relevant to the consideration of expectations.

With regard to the priority groups, stakeholders made the following points:

- Several participants in three workshops mentioned how, traditionally, Protestant working class boys have followed their fathers' career paths. The participants felt that this has led to low expectations in terms of

educational achievement, both on the part of the boys themselves and their teachers;

- Several workshop participants cited anecdotal evidence that teachers do not expect Irish Traveller children and young people to perform well, despite the fact that statistics show that those who attend school regularly are capable of higher than average achievement;
- The targets set by the DHSSPS for looked after children in terms of achievement are considerably lower than average. A number of participants in different workshops, and respondents in two comment forms, suggested that teachers may have different expectations of looked after children, particularly in terms of their behaviour;
- One School Principal commented that it is sometimes difficult to assess whether a child's poor performance is due to language difficulties or intelligence.

8(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

No specific comments on this indicator were made in either of the workshops. One respondent who submitted written comments suggested that the associated measures could be better explained and suggested that further research on this issue was required.

Discussion

8(D): Recommended Indicator

The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- research has indicated that expectations play an important role in determining achievement;
- this may be of particular relevance to children and young people in several of the priority groups;
- Individual Education Plans are relevant to expectations and may provide a source of information.

It is therefore recommended that "*Teacher and Learner Expectations*" should be a key indicator with particular attention to the use of IEPs.

8(E): Associated Measures

On the basis of existing literature and comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time it is recommended that associated measures could include:

8.1   Proportion of learners with Individual Education Plans in place, by S75 grounds and priority groups

8.2   Proportion of learners who achieved all the targets in their Individual Education Plans by the specified end date of the Plan, by S75 grounds and priority groups (Potential Future Measure)

8.3   Young people's perceptions of their teachers' expectations, by S75 grounds and priority groups

8.4   Young people's perceptions of their own needs and aspirations, by S75 grounds and priority groups

8(F): Available Data

Measure 8.1: Proportion of learners with Individual Education Plans in place

While many schools actively encourage the drawing up of IEPs by pupils, these are not an integral part of the assessed curriculum. Instead IEPs are documents that help the young person track their attainments and thereby assist in the future planning of their careers, both general and applied. These plans are used to help young people chart their futures in an integrated and holistic manner. In general, IEP set learners short-term targets, and outline the success criteria that will be used to judge if the targets are met. Action for Blind People (ACB) recommend that IEPs should include the teaching strategies to be used, and list the support to be given by any professionals from outside the school. They also suggest that the IEP should specify any equipment or resources that need to be put in place for the learner and include a date when it will next be reviewed (Wright, Nov-Dec 2009). At present, no data sources are available to track this measure. The School Census could potentially be employed to assess the extent to which schools encourage the drafting of IEPs, and at what age.

Measure 8.2: Proportion of learners who achieved all the targets in their Individual Education Plans by the specified end date of the Plan (Potential Future Measure)

It would be useful to be able to monitor learner achievement of expectations more directly, for example through the use of IEPs. However, in many cases IEPs do not contain targets relating to specific areas of the curriculum, such as daily spellings (Wright, Nov-Dec 2009). This is because such a target wouldn't be 'additional to' or different from' the ones set for any child in the class, as is recommended in the SEN Code of Practice (DfEs, 2001. p77). Instead, an IEP is likely to concentrate on access to curriculum materials, specialist areas such as ICT and keyboard skills, self-help skills, mobility and possibly social interaction. It may also include ways in which the teacher can deliver the lesson to ensure that learners with IEPs are included, e.g. layout of classroom and seating arrangements (Wright, Nov-Dec. 2009). We thus propose this as a **Potential Future Measure**, as further research would be required to establish appropriate and viable measures on learner IEP target achievement.

Measure 8.3: Young people's perceptions of their teachers' expectations

The YPB&A survey includes a number of questions about young people's perceptions of the way their teachers treat them, including –

- My school is a place where –
  - teachers treat me fairly in class;
  - teachers give me the marks I deserve;
  - teachers help me to do my best.

The responses to these questions will help to monitor young people's perceptions of their teachers' expectations.   The YPB&A survey can be analysed for five of the Section 75 grounds (religious belief, age, gender, disability and racial/ethnic origin) at post-primary level only. It does not record any data on political opinion, marital status, sexual orientation or those with dependants; nor does it record social class or whether the young person is looked after. Hence data on the following five of the eight priority groups will not be available from this source:

- Protestant working class boys
- lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) children and young people;
- looked after children and young people;
- children and young people with caring responsibilities; and
- newcomer children and young people.

Measure 8.4: Young people's perceptions of their own needs and aspirations

The UNOCINI assessment (Understanding the Needs of Children in NI), which is developed for all looked after children and young people, includes the child's views on his/her needs and aspirations. However, there is no published source of data providing aggregate information as, the UNOCINI assessment process does not include standard questions.   There is also no comparable assessment for children who are not looked after. Dedicated primary research looking at the range and content of IEPs may help to address this deficit. Also, the YPB&A survey does include various questions dealing with young people's needs and aspirations, while the School Leavers Survey and Labour Force Survey also consider career aspirations.

6.7. Indicator 9: Employability

Findings
9(A): Rationale

Every Child an Equal Child describes the significance of Employability as an indicator succinctly:

> 'Education plays a key role in determining a person's life chances and opportunities in terms of social and economic mobility. Those with fewer qualifications and skills are likely to be disadvantaged when competing for available employment opportunities. The Government views accessing employment as the most effective way of reducing poverty[46] and [of reducing] the [resulting] effects of poverty on health, life expectancy, exposure to crime and anti-social behaviour.' (p.7)

It is therefore essential to include an indicator on employability, particularly in relation to the destination of school leavers (to employment, training etc.) and the effect of formal attainments on the ability of young people in Northern Ireland to become economically active (i.e. in employment or seeking work).

Northern Ireland research continues to highlight inequalities in the economic activity rates of various groups, and including several attaching to Section 75 grounds. For example, the Equality Commission continue to point to the persistent gender pay gap between men and women. Research shows that, in 2002, 'Average hourly earnings for all women were 85 per cent of the average for all men, giving a whole economy gender pay gap of 15 percentage points' (ECNI, 2003, p.6). There continues to be considerable debate regarding the extent of the gap (OFMDFM, 2009) but there is a consensus that the labour market remains 'gendered' and inequalities persist. These inequalities extend to other grounds, including socio-economic status, rurality, location and, to some degree, community background (See: Committee on the Administration of Justice, 2006).

---

[46] Department of Work and Pensions (2008). *No-one written off: reforming welfare to reward responsibility*. Department of Work and Pensions: UK

Statistics on employment prospects for those with a disability also reveal longstanding imbalances. For example, across the UK it is estimated that there are currently 1.3 million disabled people who are available for and want to work. Despite this demand, only half of disabled people of working age are in work (50%), compared with 80% of non-disabled people (Disabled Living Foundation, 2010).

9(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

Stakeholders in several workshops agreed that there are issues around employability which need to be factored into any assessment of attainment. These participants suggested that employability depends on a combination of general/applied attainments and personal development, including life skills, confidence, self esteem etc.

9(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

It was suggested by participants in the young people's workshop that rurality of location may be a significant factor in a person's employability, and that this should not be ignored. Also, one respondent who submitted written comments argued that opportunities should be made available to collect information on parental satisfaction with employment prospects. Another respondent who submitted written comments was supportive of indicators on attainment, provided they were sensitive to the various routes to success open to learners. This respondent suggested that the education system should be cognisant of the fact that pupils are diverse in their skills and aptitudes, and that society's needs regarding employability are diverse.

Discussion
9(D): Recommended Indicator

The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- young people with fewer qualifications and skills are likely to be disadvantaged when competing for available employment opportunities;

- employability depends on a combination of factors including public examination results and personal development (including life skills, confidence and self esteem);

- this indicator should not simply address public examination results and the destination of school leavers but should also consider other factors – rurality, cognisance of learners skills and attitudes and parental satisfaction were factors particularly identified by stakeholders.

It is therefore recommended that "*Employability*" should be a key indicator with particular attention to the destinations of school leavers, public examination results and qualitative factors such as the perceptions of both young people and their parents.

9(E): Associated Measures

On the basis of existing literature and comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time it is recommended that associated measures could include:

9.1 Proportion of school leavers continuing to Higher Education, by S75 grounds and priority groups

9.2 Proportion of school leavers continuing to Further Education, by S75 grounds and priority groups

9.3 Proportion of school leavers continuing to training, by S75 grounds and priority groups

9.4 Proportion of school leavers entering employment, by S75 grounds and priority groups

9.5 Proportion of school leavers registering as unemployed, by S75 grounds and priority groups

9.6 Proportion of parents satisfied with employment prospects of children

9.7 Proportion of economically active working age people who have a degree or above or 'other higher' as their highest educational attainment, by S75 grounds

9.8 Proportion of economically active working age people who have A levels as their highest educational attainment, by S75 grounds

9.9 Proportion of economically active working age people who have GCSEs A*-C as their highest educational attainment, by S75 grounds

9.10 Proportion of economically active working age people who have no formal qualifications as their highest educational attainment, by S75 grounds

9.11 Proportion of economically inactive working age people who have a degree or above of 'other higher' as their highest educational attainment, by S75 grounds

9.12 Proportion of economically inactive working age people who have A levels as their highest educational attainment, by S75 grounds

9.13 Proportion of economically inactive working age people who have GCSEs A*-C as their highest educational attainment by S75 grounds

9.14 Proportion of economically inactive working age people who have no formal qualifications as their highest educational attainment, by S75 grounds

9.15 Young people's perceptions of employability, by S75 grounds and priority groups

9(F): Available Data

Measures 9.1-9.5: Destination of school leavers

The annual School Leavers Survey provides comprehensive information on the destination of school leavers in terms of higher education, further education, training, employment and unemployment. The annual School Leavers Survey currently provides detailed information on school type and management type and the number of pupils in each, by six of the Section 75 grounds (religious belief, age, gender, marital status, disability, race/ethnic origin). It can also distinguish between urban/rural residence, should this be required. This would facilitate partial analysis of each of the above measures. However, the survey does not record data under three of the Section 75 grounds, namely political opinion, sexual orientation and those with dependants. Hence data on the following two of the eight priority groups will not be available from this source:

- lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) children and young people; and
- children and young people with caring responsibilities.

The OC2 and OC3 indicator collections provide more detail on looked after children and young people.

Measure 9.6: Proportion of parents satisfied with employment prospects of children

At the present time, no suitable data sources are available to track this measure. It is not immediately apparent how this information will be able to be collected. Perhaps additional items could be included within the Continuous Household Survey on this topic. However, consideration would need to be given to how these items within the survey could be specifically targeted to parents of school age children.

Measures 9.7-9.14: Highest educational attainments of economically active and inactive people

The DETI NI Labour Force Survey provides information on the highest qualifications of economically active and inactive working age people. The Survey currently provides detailed information by six of the Section 75 grounds (religious belief, age, gender, marital status, those with/without a disability and nationality/ethnicity). This would facilitate partial analysis of each of the above measures. However, the Survey does not record data under three of the Section 75 grounds, namely political opinion, sexual orientation, and those with/without dependants. Hence data on the following two of the eight priority groups will not be available from this source:

- lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) children and young people; and
- children and young people with caring responsibilities.

Measure 9.15: Young people's perceptions of employability

The YPB&A survey includes questions relating to young people's perceptions of employability:

- What do you think you will be doing immediately after you finish school? (Tick one box only)
    - Going to University

- o Going to a Further Education College (or Tech)
- o Doing some Training/Apprenticeship
- o On a Jobskills or Youth Training Scheme
- o I will be working
- o I will be unemployed
- o Don't know
- I chose subjects with a career area in mind.
- I am content with the advice I got about my subject choices from my careers teachers.
- I am content with the advice I got about my subject choices from careers advisors (from an outside organisation).
- Which of the following do you want to do immediately after you finish year 12? (NVQs, A levels, no plans etc.)
- Which do you think is the most important for getting a job with good pay – staying on in education and getting as many qualifications as possible? leaving school and getting a skilled trade? or neither of these?
- Would you be interested in starting your own business at any time in the future?
- Are you aware of any support that is available to help you start your own business?

The YPB&A Survey can be analysed for five of the Section 75 grounds (religious belief, age, gender, disability and racial/ethnic origin) at post-primary level only. It does not record any data on political opinion, marital status, sexual orientation or those with dependants. It also does not does record social class or whether the young person is looked after. Hence data on the following five of the eight priority groups will not be available from this source:

- Protestant working class boys
- lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) children and young people;
- looked after children and young people;
- children and young people with caring responsibilities; and
- newcomer children and young people.

6.8. Conclusions

Theme 2: Attainment - Recommended Indicator Framework

Overarching goal: Every child is given the opportunity to reach his or her full potential

Indicators	Associated Measures[47]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
5. Public examinations	5.1 Proportion of school leavers achieving 1 or more A levels or equivalent	School Leavers Survey	Annual			By S75 grounds and priority groups
	5.2 Proportion of school leavers achieving 1 or more GCSEs or equivalent	School Leavers Survey	Annual			By S75 grounds and priority groups
	5.3 Proportion of school leavers achieving at least 5 GCSEs at grades A*-C or equivalent including Maths and English	School Leavers Survey	Annual			By S75 grounds and priority groups
	5.4 Proportion of school leavers achieving at least 5 GCSEs at grades A*-G or equivalent	School Leavers Survey	Annual			By S75 grounds and priority groups
	5.5 Proportion of learners leaving school with no formal qualifications	School Leavers Survey	Annual			By S75 grounds and priority groups
	5.6 Proportion of learners achieving levels 1-4 in Key Stage 1 English	School Census	Annual			By S75 grounds and priority groups
	5.7 Proportion of learners achieving levels 1-4 in Key Stage 1 Maths	School Census				By S75 grounds and priority groups

---

[47] Highlighted measures are those for which no data source has been identified or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure

Indicators	Associated Measures[48]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
	5.8 Proportion of learners achieving levels 1 -4 in Key Stage 2 English	School Census	Annual			By S75 grounds and priority groups
	5.9 Proportion of learners achieving levels 1 -4 in Key Stage 2 Maths	School Census	Annual			By S75 grounds and priority groups
5. Public examinations cont'd	5.10 Proportion of learners achieving other applied and/or vocational qualifications	School Leavers Survey	Annual			By S75 grounds and priority groups
6. Personal development and cultural	6.1 Proportion of learners achieving Learning for Life and Work qualifications by grade	CCEA[49]	Annual			By S75 grounds and priority groups
awareness	6.2 Young people's attitudes to personal development through school	YPB&A Survey	Triennial	(NB Available for post primary only)		By S75 grounds and priority groups
	6.3 Proportion of learners receiving education in school about people from different cultures and traditions	YPB&A Survey	Triennial	(NB Available for post primary only)		By S75 grounds and priority groups
	6.4 Range and effectiveness of activities in school about people from different cultures and traditions – *Potential Future Measure*	*Potential Future Measure*		By school type and management type		

---

[48] Highlighted measures are those for which no data source has been identified or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure
[49] Council for the Curriculum, Examinations and Assessment

Indicators	Associated Measures[50]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
7. Other achievements - *Potential Future Indicator*	Further research required to determine appropriateness and viability of associated measures	*Potential Future Indicator*				
8. Teacher & learner expectations	8.1 Proportion of learners with Individual Education Plans in place	No data source currently available				By S75 grounds and priority groups
	8.2 Proportion of learners who achieved all the targets in their Individual Education Plan by the specified end date of the Plan – *Potential Future Measure*	*Potential Future Measure*				By S75 grounds and priority groups
	8.3 Young people's perceptions of their teachers' expectations	YPB&A Survey	Triennial	(NB Available for post primary only)		By S75 grounds and priority groups
	8.4 Young people's perceptions of their own needs and aspirations	No data source currently available[51]				By S75 grounds and priority groups
9. Employability	9.1 Proportion of school leavers continuing to Higher Education	School Leavers Survey	Annual			By S75 grounds and priority groups
	9.2 Proportion of school leavers continuing to Further Education	School Leavers Survey	Annual			By S75 grounds and priority groups

[50] Highlighted measures are those for which no data source has been identified or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure
[51] The DHSSPS collects information on looked after children and young people's perceptions of their own needs and aspirations through the UNOCINI assessment (Understanding the Needs of Children in NI)

Indicators	Associated Measures[52]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
9. Employability cont'd	9.3 Proportion of school leavers continuing to training	School Leavers Survey	Annual			By S75 grounds and priority groups
	9.4 Proportion of school leavers entering employment	School Leavers Survey	Annual			By S75 grounds and priority groups
	9.5 Proportion of school leavers registering as unemployed	School Leavers Survey	Annual			By S75 grounds and priority groups
	9.6 Proportion of parents satisfied with employment prospects of children	No data source currently available				
	9.7 Proportion of economically active working age people who have a degree or above or 'other higher' as their highest educational attainment	DETI Labour Force Survey	Quarterly			By S75 grounds
	9.8 Proportion of economically active working age people who have A levels as their highest educational attainment	DETI Labour Force Survey	Quarterly			By S75 grounds
	9.9 Proportion of economically active working age people who have GCSEs A*-C as their highest educational attainment	DETI Labour Force Survey	Quarterly			By S75 grounds

---

[52] Highlighted measures are those for which no data source has been identified or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure

Indicators	Associated Measures[53]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
9. Employability cont'd	9.10 Proportion of economically active working age people who have no formal qualifications as their highest educational attainment	DETI Labour Force Survey	Quarterly			By S75 grounds
	9.11 Proportion of economically inactive working age people who have a degree or above of 'other higher' as their highest educational attainment	DETI Labour Force Survey	Quarterly			By S75 grounds
	9.12 Proportion of economically inactive working age people who have A levels as their highest educational attainment	DETI Labour Force Survey	Quarterly			By S75 grounds
	9.13 Proportion of economically inactive working age people who have GCSEs A*-C as their highest educational attainment	DETI Labour Force Survey	Quarterly			By S75 grounds
	9.14 Proportion of economically inactive working age people who have no formal qualifications as their highest educational attainment	DETI Labour Force Survey	Quarterly			By S75 grounds
	9.15 Young people's perceptions of employability	YPB&A Survey	Triennial	(NB Available for post primary only)		By S75 grounds and priority groups

---

[53] Highlighted measures are those for which no data source has been identified or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure

7. Theme 3 – Ethos

7.1. Theme introduction

The third overarching goal identified in *Every Child an Equal Child* (ECNI, 2008) relates to Ethos:

The ethos[54] of every school promotes the inclusion and participation of all children.

As *Every Child an Equal* Child makes clear, this overarching goal is key to mainstreaming equality of opportunity and good relations in education, as it involves making these themes central to the culture and ethos of a school and the education system as a whole (ECNI, 2008). It acts as a natural complement to the previous overarching goals by offering a consideration of the context within which learning and growth take place.

Once more, this approach mirrors that adopted by other indicator frameworks where reference is made to culture or climate (see Burchardt et al., 2009; Moser, 2007; EU Working Committee on the Quality of School Education, 2000). Almost all these frameworks recognise that 'ethos' is the most difficult area to delimit. Hence, simply because of practicalities regarding measurement, many previous international examples have tended to limit themselves simply to a consideration of 'entry to' and 'exit from', schooling.

The present framework considers the school context itself to be significant to the educational experience of the young person. Hence, despite practical measurement difficulties, it has been decided that indicators relating to this third broad theme should be included with an acknowledgement that actual measurement will present many practical difficulties.

---

[54] In Together Towards Improvement, ETI/DENI 2003, a school's ethos is defined as 'The discernable and distinctive character of the school...the atmosphere and expectations which enable it to promote the all round development of its pupils'.

A school's ethos impacts on children and young people's educational experience. Current government policy reflects this understanding, as ethos is an integral part of school improvement as outlined in *Every School a Good School.* In this policy the Department,

'recognise[s] the role that school leaders and school governors play in forming and preserving the ethos of individual schools. […] The importance of having a culture of high aspiration and achievement, where every young person is cared for, supported and encouraged to reach his or her full potential and where progress and achievement is acknowledged and celebrated cannot be overstated' (Department of Education, 2009c).

For a child or young person to feel that his or her school's ethos is one which promotes inclusion and participation there are a number of features which must be present. For example the child/young person must feel supported by the school's pastoral care system and the child/young person's parents must feel that they are part of the area learning community. In order to assess these and other features, it is important to consider the context, culture and climate that together define the environment of the school.

7.2. Recommended indicators

In line with current policies and priorities, five indicators are recommended to track progress relevant to this overarching goal:

- Policies and procedures, including school aims, charters, anti-bullying policies and diversity policies;
- Pastoral care;
- Communication, with other schools and with parents/guardians;
- Governance, including the Board of Governors and School Council
- Teacher development.

The recommended indicators, together with associated measures and data sources, are set out in the RIF table at the end of this section on pages 177-182.

7.3. Indicator 10: Policies

7.3.1. Sub-Indicator 10.1: School aims

Findings

10.1(A): Rationale

There is broad agreement that the history of Northern Ireland's schooling has been one inclined towards segregation and not integration. This has been confirmed by successive government documents, including the Department's *Independent Strategic Review of Education* (Department of Education, 2006), which makes a series of recommendations designed to create a school system that is more welcoming and inclusive. Further to this report, several recent government policy initiatives have all pointed towards the promotion of greater inclusion throughout the education system, to complement broader government aims as signalled in the *Programme for Cohesion, Sharing and Integration* (OFMDFM, 2010). Building on earlier community relations work, these aspire to create a society where shared spaces become more commonplace through mutual interdependence. In *Every School a Good School: Policy for School Improvement* (Department of Education, 2009c), this drive towards inclusion is made explicit, with a clear expectation that a successful school should aspire to have in place a commitment to promoting equality of opportunity, high quality learning, a concern for individual pupils and a respect for diversity.

There is also a recognition that good relations must be mainstreamed into the fabric or ethos of schools to achieve these goals. For example, the *Review of the Department of Education's Schools' Community Relations Programme* (O'Connor et al, UUJ, 2002) included the recommendation that schools should be encouraged to, 'place a community relations ethos within their mission statement' (p.7). It also recommended that effective monitoring systems should be established to track evidence of good relations work within and between schools over time. Hence there is strong evidence to indicate that the promotion of good relations and equality of opportunity should be an integral part of each school's mission, values and aims.

10.1(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

Schools use different mechanisms to define their aims, frequently in the form of a School Charter. While this is an important statement of intent, it is the practice within the school which will actually determine the experienced ethos. Stakeholders in each workshop debated the meaning of ethos and agreed that, while it may be hard to define, it was easy to identify within a particular school. Stakeholders also identified the importance of leadership, and particularly that given by the School Principal, in effectively implementing the school's aims and translating aspiration into reality.

In one workshop it was pointed out that parents/guardians do not always consider the ethos of a school when making a choice, and sometimes parents/guardians have different value systems from those of the school. For example, it was argued by several participants and by two respondents who submitted comment forms that the value system of Irish Traveller families may be at odds with the value system of the school.

10.1(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

A number of participants in both workshops commented on the fact that the existence of a policy may have no bearing on real outcomes 'on the ground' within the school. In particular, one participant in the general workshop commented that a school's policies tell an observer very little, and that it was the attitudes behind their implementation that was important.

It was also pointed out by one participant in the general workshop that not all schools have a charter. The participant commented that all schools have to have an ethos, but this is not the same as a school charter, and the framework needed to clarify the difference between these. Defining what may or may not constitute a statement of aims reflecting diversity was seen as problematic. Further, it was maintained by one respondent who submitted written comments that, even if diversity was reflected in the aims of the school, this would not automatically have an impact on the life of the young person. The same respondent commented that evidence that a Charter or equivalent statement had been regularly revised was no indication that it was effective and that statements of

aims may be revised for a number of reasons. One respondent pointed out that accessibility of school aims should also be measured.

Discussion
10.1(D): Recommended Indicator
The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- there is a clear expectation that a successful school should aspire to have in place a commitment to promoting both equality of opportunity and a respect for diversity, and that this commitment must be mainstreamed into the ethos of schools;
- schools use different mechanisms to define their aims but the most common is the School Charter;
- however, the existence and regular review of a charter or similar statement is not indicative of its effectiveness.

It is therefore recommended that *"School Aims"* should be a key indicator, acknowledging that these may be expressed in various formats, such as mission statements, vision or ethos. It is suggested that a measure should be included which seeks to ascertain whether the school aims are reflected in good practice procedures in relation to promotion of equality of opportunity and good relations; this will assist in tracking both the existence and the effectiveness of such aims. It is also suggested that a measure on accessibility of policies and procedures should be included.

10.1(E): Associated Measures
On the basis of existing literature and comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time it is recommended that associated measures should include:

10.1.1   Proportion of schools with a mission statement, vision, ethos or charter which has a statement reflecting diversity within the school, by school type and management type[55]

10.1.2   Proportion of schools revising/updating/reviewing the diversity elements of their mission statement, vision, ethos, charter etc. on a regular basis (e.g. annually), by school type and management type

10.1.3   Evidence that the mission statement etc. is reflected in good practice procedures in relation to promotion of equality of opportunity and good relations, by school type and management type

10.1.4   Availability of policies and procedures in alternative formats, by school type and management type

10.1(F): Available data

Measure 10.1.1: Proportion of schools with a mission statement, vision, ethos or charter which has a statement reflecting diversity within the school

During the stakeholder engagement, concerns were raised about whether all schools have been able to embrace the changes required in order to address the increasing diversity of their pupils. It would therefore be useful to monitor the content and changing nature of school aims, expressed in documents such as mission statements or School Charters. Although schools often publish their aims on their websites, it does not appear that this information is routinely collated by any central authority. At present, no data sources are thus available to track this measure. It may be possible to collect such information through the School Census.

Measure 10.1.2: Proportion of schools revising/updating/reviewing the diversity elements of their mission statement, vision, ethos, charter etc. on a regular basis

It would also be useful to measure whether these documents are being reviewed on a regular basis to reflect current issues attached to diversity. It would be important to ensure that any monitoring of these documents takes cognisance of

---

[55] For details of school types and management types, see section 3.10.2 on p.17

changes that reflect emerging best practice in equality and good relations. It does not appear that this information is available on a central basis at present. At present, no data sources are thus available to track this measure. It may be possible to collect such information through the School Census.

Measure 10.1.3: Evidence that the mission statement etc. is reflected in good practice procedures in relation to promotion of equality of opportunity and good relations

It would also be important to monitor the impact of school aims. However, evidence that these documents are then reflected in good practice procedures may be difficult to quantify precisely without dedicated primary research. At present, no data sources are thus available to track this measure. A viable alternative could be based on self-assessment procedures where schools themselves are asked to cite occasions where they feel that overarching mission statements are reflected in the school's management policies and procedures, including those policies relating to access and communications.

Measure 10.1.4: Availability of policies and procedures in alternative formats

In order to be effective. school aims must be capable of being communicated to all who have an interest in them. It would therefore be important for the documents to be available in alternative formats to ensure that everyone who wished to could access them in a format appropriate to their needs. Again, it does not appear that this information is currently collected on a central basis. At present, no data sources are thus available to track this measure. It may be possible to collect such information through the School Census.

7.3.2. Sub-Indicator 10.2: Anti-bullying policies

Findings

10.2(A): Rationale

Discrimination within a school environment can manifest itself in occasions of harassment and bullying. Successive research reports (Collins et al., 2004; James, 2010) continue to reveal the alarming extent of bullying and harassment within schools. For example, the SHOUT report (Youthnet, 2003) revealed that among young people who had openly declared their sexuality as LGBT, '44% of respondents indicated that they been bullied at school directly because of their sexual orientation' (p.12). Connolly & Keenan (2002), in a local qualitative study, found that 'racist harassment is a significant problem in schools in Northern Ireland.' (p.1). Similarly, Reynolds et al. (2003) identified bullying as an issue affecting Irish Traveller children in West Belfast secondary schools, a finding confirmed in the research of Hamilton et al. (2007). Successive large scale surveys (e.g. Livesey et al., 2006), have revealed the significant role that identity continues to play in school bullying and harassment, whether on grounds of race, sexual orientation, gender, disability or religion.

The Education & Library Board (ELB) Order 2003 requires all grant-aided schools to include an anti-bullying policy in their discipline policy. The anti-bullying policy must contain measures to prevent all forms of bullying among pupils. A survey of schools carried out just prior to the introduction of this legislation revealed that the majority already had anti-bullying policies in place, but that these varied widely in scope and the majority were subsumed within a general policy on discipline (McGuckin & Lewis, 2008). The effectiveness of these policies is now monitored through school inspections of pastoral care arrangements. However, a NICCY survey of young people with regards to their awareness of, and involvement with, school bullying policies revealed that 'Individual schools vary enormously in the way in which they develop and implement anti-bullying policies. While there were some examples of excellent practice in devising and applying anti-bullying policies.... the general picture is of very limited participation of pupils.' (Schubotz & Sinclair, 2006,p.5).

The importance of anti-bullying policies is highlighted in a recent Department for Education and Skills report (2003) on attainment among minority ethnic young people. The report suggests that, 'effective behaviour policies should be developed with parents, carers and pupils. They should be linked with a school's equal opportunities and anti-bullying policies, with a clear statement of the consequences of 'zero tolerance' behaviours such as racial bullying.' (p.23)

10.2(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

Bullying was an issue raised extensively during the stakeholder engagement. All schools must have a policy and procedure in place to deal with bullying, but it was acknowledged that some schools deal with issues more effectively than others. Stakeholders in three workshops identified the need to extend anti-bullying policies to cover additional categories. For example, one respondent who submitted a comment form who is involved in supporting LGB young people pointed out that not all policies include procedures to deal with homophobic bullying.

With regard to the priority groups, stakeholders made the following points:

- In one workshop it was suggested that Irish Traveller children and young people are significantly affected by bullying;
- One stakeholder suggested that young people often feel unable to confide in anyone about instances of homophobic bullying and that some anti-bullying policies do not specifically mention it. The DE-sponsored SHOUT survey (Youthnet, 2003) reports that young people who had openly expressed their sexuality said bullying came more often from teachers than pupils;
- Several stakeholders suggested that bullying issues arise from time to time based on religious, racial or cultural prejudices;
- Stakeholders in two workshops and in one comment form referred to high levels of bullying of disabled children and young people. One participant reported that, as they grew older, it was possible that disabled young people reported bullying incidents less.

10.2(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

A number of participants in both workshops commented on the fact that the existence of a policy may have no bearing on real outcomes 'on the ground' within the school. In particular, one participant in the general workshop commented that a school's policies tell an observer very little, and that it was the attitudes behind their implementation that was important. Two respondents who submitted written comments pointed out that all schools must have an anti-bullying policy by law, but that the existence of such a policy was not a clear indicator that the school had effective measures for tackling bullying. These respondents suggested that the indicator should be made more specific.

In relation to the proposed measure on learners who state they have been bullied, one respondent who submitted written comments suggested including a caveat in this measure acknowledging that bullying is a relative term.

Discussion

10.2(D): Recommended Indicator

The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- all grant aided schools are required to include an anti-bullying policy in their discipline policy;
- research has shown that identity (on the grounds of race, sexual orientation, gender, disability or religion) plays a significant role in school bullying and harassment and the way in which schools deal with bullying issues may therefore have significant consequences for children and young people in some of the priority groups;
- stakeholders considered that some schools deal with bullying issues more effectively than others, and that the outcomes achieved in the school are more important than the existence and content of an anti-bullying policy.

It is therefore recommended that *"Anti-bullying policies and procedures"* should be a key indicator with particular attention being paid to the effectiveness of measures taken within schools to combat bullying.

10.2(E): Associated Measures

On the basis of existing literature and comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time it is recommended that associated measures should include:

10.2.1   Proportion of schools with an effective anti-bullying policy and associated procedures in place, by school type and management type[56]

10.2.2   Proportion of learners who state they have been bullied in last 12 months, by S75 grounds and priority groups

10.2.3   Effectiveness of support systems in curtailing bullying incidents, by school type and management type

10.2(F): Available Data

Measure 10.2.1: Proportion of schools with an effective anti-bullying policy and associated procedures in place

All schools are required to have an anti-bullying policy in place. However, it seems that information on the content of each policy (for example, the range of types of bullying covered) and the number of bullying incidents recorded under each policy is not routinely collected. To reflect on the effectiveness of each policy would require a consideration of not only the wording of the policy but also how many queries are processed, and whether the complaint is resolved appropriately. This may necessitate in-depth qualitative research attaching to the policy of each school, and thus is probably beyond the scope of existing surveys. At present, no data sources are thus available to track this measure.

Measure 10.2.2: Proportion of learners who state they have been bullied in last 12 months

The Department of Education has carried out two surveys (2002; 2007) specifically into the nature and extent of bullying in schools. There is a possibility that the survey will be repeated at some time in the future[57]. On each occasion learners in 60 primary and 60 post-primary schools (Year 6 and Year 9) were surveyed on a face-to-face basis. The survey contained a large number of

---

[56] For details of school types and management types, see section 3.10.2 on p.17
[57] At the time of writing it is anticipated that the Department will receive a final report on the Nature and Extent of Bullying in Schools in Northern Ireland in the near future.

questions relating to incidence of bullying behaviour, perceptions of support available, and also the availability of bullying policies. The specific questions which could be used to track levels of bullying include:

- In the past 12 months, have you been a victim of the following?
  - Been bullied
  - Had your belongings damaged/deliberately broken
  - Been sexually or physically abused
  - Been threatened by paramilitaries
  - Been called names/harassed because of your religion
  - Been called names/harassed because of your race or skin colour
  - Been called names/harassed for some other reason

- In the past 12 months, have you been a victim of the following?
  - Been assaulted because of your religion
  - Been assaulted because of your race or skin colour
  - Been assaulted for some other reason
  - Been threatened/hurt by someone with a knife
  - Been harassed/bullied/abused via the internet
  - Been bullied/ harassed via texts/videos/images or calls to your mobile
  - Something else

While data are available by ethnicity and disability of learners, no information was collected by sexual orientation. It is not known at this time whether the survey will be repeated.

It is acknowledged that "bullying" is a relative term and that those children and young people stating that they have been bullied may not be placing the exact same definition on the occurrence as is contained in school policies. This means that it may not be possible to compare measures 10.2.1 and 10.2.2.

Measure 10.2.3: Effectiveness of support systems in curtailing bullying incidents

The Department of Education surveys (2002; 2007) into the nature and extent of bullying in schools also included questions on the effectiveness of teachers and other adults in curtailing bullying incidents:

- Has your teacher or any other teacher talked with you about your bullying other pupils at school in the past couple of months?
- Has any adult at home talked with you about your bullying other pupils at school in the past couple of months?
- How often do teachers or other adults at school try to put a stop to it when a pupil is being bullied?
- Overall, how much do you think your class teacher has done to stop bullying in the past couple of months?

This research combines both behavioural and attitudinal measures.

7.3.3. Sub-Indicator 10.3: Diversity policies

Findings

10.3(A): Rationale

Stakeholders in the education sector have frequently advocated a hope that schools will embrace diversity policies as part of their mission and vision. Unfortunately, the work of Schubotz & Sinclair (2006) and McGuckin & Lewis (2008) gives the impression that such policies are often not central to a school's mission statement. Instead they seem to be a 'bolt-on', perhaps introduced in response to specific initiatives. However, recent progress has been made to mainstream diversity policies within the school environment, with the publication of the Department of Education's *Policy for School Improvement*. This policy incorporates an indicator to measure whether a 'clear commitment exists to promoting […] a respect for diversity' within a given school (Department of Education, 2009c p. 14).

A Shared Future (OFMDFM, 2007) stated that all schools should ensure, through their policies, structures and curricula, that pupils are consciously prepared for life in a diverse and inter-cultural society and world. The more recent draft strategy, *Cohesion, Sharing and Integration* (CSI) (OFMDFM, 2010) suggests that a similar emphasis will be placed on school's policies and procedures. However, this is not made explicit.

The Department of Education has recently developed a new *Community Relations, Equality and Diversity in Education (CRED)* strategy (see Department of Education, 2011a). This follows on from a highly critical Education and Training Inspectorate (ETI) evaluation of community relations work in formal and non-formal settings. The ETI evaluation gave a strong steer that this work requires greater coordination and strategic direction (ETI, 2009). Furthermore, ETI's Process for Self-Evaluation - *Together Towards Improvement* - recommends that schools evaluate the extent to which they meet their statutory requirements in relation to equality, diversity and good relations. The document states that ETI are likely to ask for the findings of a school's self-evaluation prior to conducting an inspection. ETI also outline that inspection 'will assess the

quality of provision under […] a range of quality indicators', of which 'Equality of Opportunity, Diversity and Good Relations' is one (ETI 2010a, p14; 2010b/c/d p.12).

Within the school curriculum itself, there may be opportunities for identifying whether diversity issues feature. For example, an indicator to measure diversity was attached to *A Shared Future* (OFMDFM, 2007) – "the percentage of schools delivering Citizenship studies on a joint basis with another school with a good relations element".

10.3(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

Stakeholders identified that the changing environment in Northern Ireland has resulted in a more ethnically diverse school population than in the past. The need for policies which respect different cultures and religions is therefore greater. One respondent who submitted a comment form suggested that special schools are facing the greatest change in terms of integrating children and young people from different ethnic backgrounds. Across all workshops and in many comment forms there was a general consensus that a school needs a comprehensive set of policies which actively promote tolerance and respect for diversity, and that these should be assessed during school inspections.

With regard to the priority groups, stakeholders made the following points:

- It was maintained in two workshops and one comment form that there is often a lack of reference to Irish Traveller culture in diversity policies;
- In two workshops stakeholders argued that many schools seem unwilling to recognise that LGBT young people represent a group that requires support. It was suggested in these workshops that RSE[58] policies should address issues around sexual orientation;
- A number of stakeholders identified a wide range of issues which can impact on the experiences of minority ethnic children and young people,

---

[58] Relationship and Sex Education

including religious practices, religious and cultural holidays, school meals and uniforms;

- Reference was made to the *Belong Project*[59] which has shown that when schools make an effort to include children's first language and culture in their school environment, children settle and integrate more quickly. However, it was reported by a great many participants that, in most schools, there is an unwritten assumption that a child should aspire to assimilate into mainstream culture. The participants suggested that this should not necessarily be the key aim. Rather, schools should aspire to promote cultural diversity.

10.3(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

One respondent who submitted written comments suggested that this was 'simultaneously the most significant indicator in the document and the most difficult to measure'. One workshop participant felt that the term 'citizenship studies' limited the scope of measure 10.3.2, and this measure should be expanded to encompass other good relations-focussed, but non-citizenship initiatives delivered by schools on a joint basis. This participant commented that as the measure currently stood, such initiatives would not be measured. Participants in the young people's workshop felt that this was a vital topic and unfortunately schools in Northern Ireland concentrated heavily on the academic aspect of education.

Discussion
10.3(D): Recommended Indicator
The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- recent progress has been made to mainstream diversity policies within the school environment;
- the ETI has given a strong steer that community relations work requires greater co-ordination and strategic direction;

---

[59] The BELONG Programme works in partnership with other children's and young people's services throughout the Southern Area of Northern Ireland (Dungannon, Craigavon, Armagh, Banbridge and Newry & Mourne) to create a Network of services / agencies and signposting on where best to get help. See http://www.belongni.org/about for further information.

- measures of diversity were attached to *A Shared Future* and could be included as associated measures in this framework; however, the term "citizenship" within one measure might limit the scope and the measure should therefore be expanded;
- several stakeholders indicated that this was a vital topic with regards to mainstreaming equality of opportunity and good relations in education.

It is therefore recommended that *"Diversity policies"* should be a key indicator and that measures should include those attached to *A Shared Future* and also include young people's perceptions of learning about diversity to ensure that the impact of diversity policies and not just their existence is measured.

10.3(E): Associated Measures

On the basis of existing literature and comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time it is recommended that associated measures should include:

10.3.1   Proportion of schools with diversity policies in place, by school type and management type[60] *(Potential Future Measure)*

10.3.2   Proportion of schools delivering Citizenship studies or similar initiatives on a joint basis with another school with a good relations element, by school type and management type and by Board area

10.3.3   Young people's attitudes towards learning about diversity, by S75 grounds and priority groups

10.3.4   Proportion of people who believe schools in NI are effective at preparing pupils for life in a diverse society

---

[60] For details of school types and management types, see section 3.10.2 on p17

10.3(F): Available Data

Measure 10.3.1: Proportion of schools with diversity policies in place (Potential Future Measure)

It would be useful to be able to monitor the number of schools (by school type and management type) which have diversity policies in place. However, it would be necessary to define what constitutes a diversity policy and, ideally, be able to relate the effectiveness of such policies to the diversity of the learners within the school. We thus propose that this is considered a **Potential Future Measure** as further consideration would be required to determine the scope of the measure, (although the annual School Census would be able to capture baseline statistics on the existence of diversity policies within schools).

Measure 10.3.2: Proportion of schools delivering Citizenship studies or similar initiatives on a joint basis with another school with a good relations element

This measure is derived from one of the indicators included in *A Shared Future and Racial Equality Strategy: Good Relations Indicators Baseline Report* (OFMDFM, 2007). Although no information was available against the indicator at that time, it was anticipated that the measure could be populated with data from the annual return to the Department of Education by the ELBs.

Measure 10.3.3: Young people's attitudes towards learning about diversity

The YPB&A survey includes questions about young people's attitudes to learning about diversity as follows –

- Does studying Citizenship make you want to learn more about people from other countries?
- Does studying Citizenship make you want to learn more about people who have a different religion than you?
- Does studying Geography make you want to learn more about people from other countries?
- Does studying Geography make you want to learn more about people who have a different religion than you?

- Does studying History make you want to learn more about people from other countries?
- Does studying History make you want to learn more about people who have a different religion than you?
- Does studying Religious Education make you want to learn more about people from other countries?
- Does studying Religious Education make you want to learn more about people who have a different religion than you?

While the survey does not define diversity[61], in combination the questions do highlight a number of significant issues relating to the construct. The YPB&A Survey can be analysed for five of the Section 75 grounds (religious belief, age, gender, disability and racial/ethnic origin) at post-primary level only. It does not record any data on political opinion, marital status, sexual orientation or those with dependants, nor does it record social class or whether the young person is looked after. Hence data on five of the eight priority groups will not be available from this source:

- Protestant working class boys
- lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) children and young people;
- looked after children and young people;
- children and young people with caring responsibilities; and
- newcomer children and young people.

Measure 10.3.4: Proportion of people who believe schools in NI are effective at preparing pupils for life in a diverse society

This measure was one of the indicators included in *A Shared Future and Racial Equality Strategy: Good Relations Indicators Baseline Report* (OFMDFM, 2007). Data was taken from the Life and Times Survey, 2005. In 2010 the OFMDFM issued for consultation a draft strategy on *Cohesion, Sharing and Integration* (OFMDFM, 2010) which is expected to supersede *A Shared Future*. At the time of writing the final strategy has not been published and no new good relations

---

[61] The Oxford English Dictionary defines "diversity" as "the state of being diverse, different or unlike"

indicators have been developed. However, it is possible that new measures will emerge as the strategy is implemented and these may include alternative or expanded measures of perceptions of the effectiveness of schools in preparing pupils for life in a diverse society.

7.4. Indicator 11: Pastoral care

Findings

11(A): Rationale

The existence of policies may serve to indicate the intent of a school to provide an inclusive and supportive environment that values difference but the translation of aspiration to reality will be revealed in the pastoral care actually afforded to young people within a school. This is made explicit in the Department of Education's report, *Every School a Good School: Policy for School Improvement (*Department of Education, 2009c), which itself builds on earlier initiatives (e.g. Department of Education, 2001a). The report identifies the need for pastoral care to reflect at all times the needs and aspirations of pupils within the school. It suggests that effective interventions and support should be in place to help pupils overcome barriers to learning. It also expects schools to have in place the highest standards of pastoral care and child protection.

Young people who are at risk of being marginalised within a school community on grounds of their identity (e.g. race, disability, sexual orientation, religion) need a robust pastoral care system. Pastoral care can represent a first point of contact when issues arise, and can enable a swift and effective intervention.

As one example, OFSTED (1999) examined schools' 'state of alert' to the racism experienced by pupils of different ethnic groups within, and beyond, the schoolyard. It explored how schools sought to support their pupils in resolving racist conflict and dealing with hostility in their lives. The methods of support examined included pastoral care systems, mentoring initiatives, promotion of good standards of behaviour, links with parents and the wider community, and the promotion of good race relations. The report concluded that:

- Strong pastoral care systems are especially vigilant and responsive to pupils who have been made vulnerable, emotionally and physically, by taunting and racial abuse.

- Effective pastoral care is characterised by the reinforcement of positive behaviour and the highlighting of respect for others.

The Department for Education and Skills report *Aiming High: Raising the Achievement of Minority Ethnic Pupils* (DfES, 2003) likewise emphasised the important role that pastoral support can play in supporting those with particular needs linked to their identity. The report confirms the importance of this aspect of school support for learners in Great Britain.

11(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

Workshop participants acknowledged the role of pastoral care in helping children and young people in the priority groups to overcome the range of challenges they face. It was pointed out by several participants in two workshops that pastoral care is particularly important in assisting those groups which cannot be identified through data collection (e.g. lesbian, gay and bisexual young people and those with caring responsibilities).

However, there was a widely held perception among many stakeholders that pastoral care was not always supportive and that, in particular, young people coping with sexual orientation issues did not always seek help. It was also pointed out during these workshops, and by one respondent who submitted a comment form[62], that there was likely to be little support in primary schools for children who begin to identify sexual orientation issues. Also, in one workshop, stakeholders suggested that, while children from all religions should feel equally able to avail of pastoral care, this may not always be the case in reality.

One stakeholder maintained that teachers and counselling staff should be well trained to offer support to looked after children and young people. However, it was more generally acknowledged that there are issues around disclosure. For example, DHSSPS officers suggested that often only one teacher in a school would be aware that a child or young person was looked after. One respondent who submitted a comment form, who is involved in supporting looked after

---

[62] This respondent is involved in supporting lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) young people.

children and young people, pointed out that these children and young people are unlikely to draw attention to their status. The respondent suggested that these children feel that they would be discriminated against if they did so.

11(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

In keeping with earlier themes, it was argued in the general workshop that the existence of pastoral care staff was not always revealing of the extent or nature of support and care available for marginalised young people, and that the measures should reflect the quality of pastoral care and the outcomes rather than inputs. The need to integrate and mainstream this function with other policy areas was highlighted by several participants in the general workshop. In particular, one participant commented that it was worth bearing in mind that pastoral care was not about 'being nice to your children' but about setting them a challenge and getting them to work towards that challenge. In addition, one respondent who submitted written comments pointed out that this indicator seemed to be based on the perception that pastoral care was something discrete and separate that was offered in a school. This respondent suggested that the framework should be cognisant of the intrinsic link between pastoral care and school policies and processes.

Discussion
11(D): Recommended Indicator

The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- schools are expected to have in place the highest standards of pastoral care; and further to this, there is a need for pastoral care to reflect at all times the needs and aspirations of pupils within the school;
- pastoral care can play an important role in supporting those with particular needs linked to their identity, and may be particularly important in assisting those groups which cannot be identified through data collection (e.g. lesbian, gay and bisexual young people, and those with caring responsibilities);
- there was a widely held perception among stakeholders that young people do not always seek help from pastoral care providers;

- pastoral care cannot be measured as a discrete function but is linked to school policies and processes
- measures should reflect the quality of pastoral care and the outcomes rather than inputs (in terms of the level of support).

It is therefore recommended that "*Pastoral Care*" should be a key indicator but that emphasis should be placed on the integration of pastoral care into school policies and processes rather than the levels of support provided by schools. It is also recommended that children and young people's attitude to pastoral care, in terms of their willingness to access it, should be considered. It is also acknowledged that the quality of pastoral care may be a significant factor but further research would be required to determine the appropriateness and viability of the measure and it is therefore recommended as a Potential Future Measure.

11(E): Associated Measures

On the basis of existing literature and comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time it is recommended that associated measures could include:

11.1   Integration of pastoral care into school policies and processes, by school type and management type[63]

11.2   Children and young people's attitudes towards accessing pastoral care, by S75 grounds and priority groups

11.3   Quality of pastoral care (Potential Future Measure).

11(F): Available Data

Measure 11.1: Integration of pastoral care into school policies and processes

At the present time, no data sources are available to track this measure. It is likely that dedicated research would have to be commissioned in order to determine whether pastoral care policies and procedures are an integral part of school management or are seen as a distinct element of school business. Purely

---

[63] For details of school types and management types, see section 3.10.2 on p.17

quantitative approaches would not be able to capture the degree of integration, but instead a more qualitative analysis of all school policies and procedures would be required to identify the extent of mainstreaming.

Measure 11.2: Children and young people's attitudes towards accessing pastoral care

There was widespread agreement during the stakeholder engagement process that children and young people in the priority groups would benefit significantly from high standards of pastoral care. However, some concerns were expressed about the extent to which children and young people in some vulnerable groups access pastoral care and it would therefore be important to measure (a) whether support is being requested and (b) children and young people's views of the appropriateness and usefulness of the support they are given. At present, no relevant questions are asked in either the YPB&A survey or the Young Life & Times Survey but it may be possible to include appropriate research in either of these surveys in future.

Measure 11.3: Quality of pastoral care (Potential Future Measure)

It is recommended that quality of pastoral care should be included as a Potential Future Measure subject to further research to determine the appropriateness and viability of the measure.

7.5. Indicator 12: Communication

7.5.1. Sub-Indicator 12.1: Communication and collaboration with other schools

Findings

12.1(A): Rationale

The Department of Education's report, *Community Relations, Equality and Diversity in Education* (Department of Education, 2011a) aims to ensure that every child grows into adulthood confident in their ability to relate to others from different cultures. It also aims to instil every child with knowledge about their own cultural background and that of others in Northern Ireland. The earlier *Review of the Schools' Community Relations Programme* (O'Connor et al., 2002) included a recommendation that the Department should adopt:

> 'A programme which is no longer limited solely to cross-community contact activities between pupils, [and is] organised by pairs of teachers and partner schools. [Future] [a]ctivities could include whole-school staff development, staff development with a partner school, school stock-taking to identify the most important community relations issues facing the school and the community it serves.'

A key recommendation in the Good Relations Forum's 2010 report, *Ensuring the Good Relations Work in Our School Counts,* relates to the issue of sharing and collaboration between schools. The report suggests that, '[e]xisting collaborative networks [should] [..] be used to inform the entire schools' sector of the benefits of working together. Consideration [should] [..] be given to twinning schools, so pupils from socially disadvantaged backgrounds, or with lower than expected attainment records, could be paired with better-performing schools on a cross-sector or cross community basis.' (p.14).

12.1(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

Stakeholders in one workshop referred to the importance of links with other schools from different sectors. They emphasised the need to make these links part of the continuing life of the school and not a series of single events. This view was strongly supported by one School Principal who submitted a comment form.

12.1(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

It was argued by one participant in the general workshop and one respondent who submitted written comments that a shift from quantitative to qualitative measures would make this indicator more meaningful. The respondent suggested that assessing the quality of good relations simply by measuring the number of activities with a partner school could result in affording the same value to a negative activity which enforces prejudice, as to a positive attitude-changing encounter. This respondent felt that the measures should have a focus on identifying positive actions.

With regard to cross community activities, three participants in the general workshop commented on the scope of these activities. It was suggested that "cross community" should be broadly defined to encompass many types of different communities e.g. by socio-economic status, race and disability as well as religious belief.

Discussion
12.1(D): Recommended Indicator

The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- there is a clear expectation that schools should aim to ensure that every child grows into adulthood confident in their ability to relate to those from different cultures;
- collaboration between schools is seen as an intrinsic aspect of achieving this aim, and such collaboration should encompass many types of different communities;

- such collaboration needs to be part of the continuing life of the school, not a series of single events. Therefore, qualitative measures are more meaningful than quantitative.

It is therefore recommended that "***Communication and collaboration with other schools***" should be a key indicator with an emphasis on the scope and effectiveness of activities with partner schools.

12.1(E): Associated Measures

On the basis of existing literature and comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time it is recommended that associated measures should include:

12.1.1   Scope and effectiveness of activities with partner schools per year, by school type and management type[64] **(Potential Future Measure)**

It should be noted that Measure 10.3.2 (Proportion of schools delivering Citizenship studies on a joint basis with another school with a good relations element) and Measure 10.3.3 (young people's attitudes towards learning about diversity) may also be relevant to this indicator.

12.1(F): Available Data

The Department of Education's draft consultation report*, Community Relations, Equality and Diversity in Education* (2010) emphasises how important it is for children and young people to be able to relate to others from different cultures, and for them to be knowledgeable about their own cultural background and that of others in Northern Ireland. It would be useful to monitor the scope of cross community activities undertaken by schools with partner schools per year. However, there appears to be no current source for this information and further research would be required to develop suitable measures. We thus consider that this measure should be considered as a **Potential Future Measure.**

---

[64] For details of school types and management types, see section 3.10.2 on p.17

The YPB&A Survey includes questions about education provided in school about people from other cultures (see Measure 10.3.3 above), but does not currently ask questions about inter-school activities. The scope and effectiveness of activities with partner schools would require a consideration of both the range and type of activity that involves inter-school engagement (e.g. joint teaching, shared events/functions, extracurricular activities) and an evaluation of what those activities may or may not have achieved. This should include the impact on individual learners as well as the culture of both schools, and would necessitate dedicated research of a quantitative and qualitative nature.

7.5.2. Sub-Indicator 12.2: Communication with parents/guardians

Findings

12.2(A): Rationale

As previous indicator rationales have already demonstrated[65], it is not appropriate to consider schooling in isolation. Rather, it must be set in a wider context that encompasses both the home and the community. By considering schooling in this context it is possible to identify potential obstacles and facilitators to young people's education. The extent of contact between schools and parents/guardians is widely accepted as an important dimension of engagement. For example, according to Hansson et al. (2002), parents of children from minority ethnic communities in Northern Ireland felt themselves to be distant from schools. These parents indicated that they would have welcomed further opportunities to be consulted over the provision being made for those families within which the first language was not English. Likewise, consultations with the Irish Travelling community suggest a significant communication gap between parents and schools (ECNI, 2006). This issue was also identified within Protestant working class communities (Department of Enterprise Trade and Investment, 2005).

Further to such findings, the Department of Education's overarching *Policy for School Improvement* (Department of Education, 2009c) emphasises the need for good relationships that facilitate engagement and communication between:

- The school and parents/guardians of pupils;
- The school and the wider community it serves.

For those young people in care, this issue can be especially problematic. A survey of young care leavers by Barnardos (2006) revealed that attendance rates at school events such as parents' evenings and sports days by their carers were low.

---

[65] See Indicator 4.2: Home and community support, p.75

12.2(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

In all workshops and several comment forms, stakeholders emphasised the importance of communicating effectively with parents/guardians and encouraging their involvement. Workshop participants commented on the success of some pilot projects in this area.[66] However, there were concerns about the resources available for such work.

A further aspect raised in two workshops concerned the extent of parental disclosure to the school, especially in terms of some vulnerable groups such as looked after children and young people and those with caring responsibilities. One representative from the Department of Health (DHSSPS) alluded to schemes in place to assist foster parents/guardians to become more involved with schools and universities[67]. One respondent who submitted a comment form who was involved in supporting looked after children and young people pointed out that most parents/guardians have discretion in terms of disclosing personal information but authorities responsible for looked after children do not.

With regard to other priority groups, stakeholders made the following points:

- In all workshops it was agreed there is perceived to be a reluctance for some parents/guardians and communities in Protestant working class areas to engage with schools, and schools may not always devote sufficient resources to communication as they do not expect this will be effective;
- In each workshop it was suggested that schools can sometimes find it more difficult to engage with parents/guardians of minority ethnic children and young people because of language difficulties or cultural differences;
- In each workshop it was also agreed that the involvement and support of parents/guardians of newcomer children and young people is crucial. One

---

[66] E.g. Lagan College have established a 'parents email' page, where parents of a school pupil can submit their email details and receive updates from the school via email. See http://www.lagancollege.com/parentmail/index.php

[67] Further details of this scheme are not available at this time, as at the time of writing, the evaluation of this project has not yet been completed and published.

School Principal commented that they provide a special induction process for newcomer parents/guardians and their children.

12.2(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

Parents/guardians perceptions of the school environment, and engagement by parents/guardians in the life of the school were cited by several participants as critical. In particular, one respondent representing a disability group highlighted the importance of parental satisfaction in encouraging continued engagement by the young person in formal education.

Discussion

12.2(D): Recommended Indicator

The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- the extent of contact between schools and parents/guardians is widely accepted as an important dimension of engagement;
- the Department of Education has emphasised the need for good relationships that facilitate engagement and communication between schools and parents/guardians;
- stakeholders emphasised the importance of communicating effectively with parents/guardians and encouraging their involvement in the school.

It is therefore recommended that "***Communication with parents/guardians***" should be a key indicator with the emphasis on the scope and effectiveness of both engagement activities and the resulting level of involvement of parents/guardians.

12.2(E): Associated Measures

There was widespread agreement among stakeholders that the involvement of parents/guardians in school activities is significant in developing an ethos which promotes the inclusion and participation of all children.

Potential measures could include:

12.2.1 Range of types of communication with parents/guardians, by school type and management type[68] **(Potential Future Measure)**

12.2.2 Number of activities per year which schools initiate with parents/ guardians, by school type and management type **(Potential Future Measure)**

12.2.3 Level of involvement of parents/guardians in school activities, by school type and management type **(Potential Future Measure)**

12.2.4 Parents/guardians' access to parents' associations and events, by school type and management type **(Potential Future Measure)**

12.2.5 Level of parents/guardians' knowledge of schools' complaints procedures and how to use them effectively, by school type and management type **(Potential Future Measure)**

12.2(F): Available Data

At the present time, no data sources are available to identify the scope and effectiveness of communication with parents/guardians. Future research could begin to define what is encompassed by the term 'communication' and to identify ways of assessing the effectiveness of the actions taken by schools. This research would further inform the development of appropriate and viable measures, definitions and data sources. We thus consider that all measures under 12.2 should be considered as **Potential Future Measures.**

---

[68] For details of school types and management types, see section 3.10.2 on p.17

7.6. Indicator 13: Governance

7.6.1. Sub-Indicator 13.1: Board of Governors

Findings

13.1(A): Rationale

The ethos of the school is cemented through its board of governors, and this extends to the promotion of equality, good relations and diversity. In the words of *Every School a Good School – The Governors' Role* (Department of Education, 2011b),

'Promoting equality, good relations and diversity' are important issues for schools, parents and local communities. School Boards of Governors as well as principals and teachers have responsibilities to promote these issues in schools and the wider community. These responsibilities are driven by DE education policies, education and employment legislation and anti-discrimination, human rights and equality legislation.' 'There is a need for a consistent approach by schools to promoting equality, good relations and diversity. Effective leadership by the Board of Governors will have a positive influence on the school and the wider community. The Board of Governors should consider how the school's own policies, practices and procedures affect people in the school community particularly staff, parents and pupils.' 'The ethos, policies and practices of a school – and particularly their implementation – need to collectively and consistently value all young people, particularly those from minority communities and backgrounds. Education for all children and young people should be provided in an inclusive environment that is nurtured within the whole community. This environment should

- be positively welcoming to all, whatever their identity;
- provide equality for all and foster good relationships;
- be understanding of the way of life and cultures of different families;
- value the contribution of a diversity of cultures;
- ensure every learner fulfils their potential; and
- recognise and encourage parents as primary educators.'

Governors undoubtedly play a significant role in determining the ethos of a school. Despite this research on the composition of Boards is relatively sparse. Bird (2003) did find significant under-representation of minority ethnic governors in a sample of English schools, and an over-representation of women. In addition, research conducted in London schools found that 'the qualitative element of the research strongly suggest[s that] a greater number of governors are from middle class backgrounds than from lower social classes. In addition to the groups mentioned above [...] disabled people and business people tend to be poorly represented on governing bodies.' (Rollock, 2006, p.8)

13.1(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

In general, stakeholders agreed that the Governors have a major influence on the ethos of the school, and that there is a need to have an ethnically and socially diverse range of people on a School Board.

13.1(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

No comments were offered in relation to Governors during the second phase of stakeholder engagement.

Discussion

13.1(D): Recommended Indicator

Although there were few specific comments from stakeholders, the literature review suggests that Governors play an important role in giving a school a sense of direction and that there is therefore a clear link to the ethos of the school. It is therefore recommended that "***Board of Governors***" should be a key indicator and that, as suggested in the first phase of stakeholder engagement, the diversity of the range of people acting as Governors should be a measure. A second measure relating to diversity training of Governors has also been included as this data is collected, albeit not readily accessible at present.

13.1(E): Associated Measures

On the basis of existing literature and comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time it is recommended that associated measures could include:

13.1.1 Proportion of schools with Board of Governors where composition reflects diversity within the school catchment/local area, by school type and management type[69]

13.1.2 Proportion of School Governors attending training including a diversity element, by school type and management type and by Board area

13.1(F): Available Data

Measure 13.1.1: Proportion of schools with Board of Governors where composition reflects diversity within the school catchment/local area

It would be useful to collect information on the composition of Boards of Governors so as to assess whether the composition reflects the diversity within the school. However, this would involve monitoring School Governors by equality categories, which is not current DE policy. At present the Boards record name, address and age of Governors only. Therefore, there is no data source for this measure at the present time but this may be an area that requires revisiting.

Measure 13.1.2: Proportion of School Governors attending training including a diversity element

The extent of training of any sort taken by school governors is recorded by individual ELBs but is not centrally collated. In order to track this measure, it would be necessary to develop a consistent, centralised approach, for example by developing a separate register of such activity, cataloguing types of training, and engagement by governors (both elected and appointed). At present, no data sources are thus available to track this measure.

---

[69] For details of school types and management types, see section 3.10.2 on p.17

7.6.2. Sub-Indicator 13.2: School Council

Findings

13.2(A): Rationale

The Department of Education's *Policy for School Improvement* (Department of Education, 2009c) emphasises the need for a school to have a commitment to involving young people in discussions and decisions on school life that directly affect them. It also emphasises the need for a school to listen to young people's views. However, available research suggests that the extent to which school councils genuinely provide an opportunity for young people to influence decision-making within a school is limited, and varies between schools. For example, in a project evaluating the introduction of citizenship education into schools in Northern Ireland, O'Connor et al. (2008) report that, 'the experience of citizenship education had raised many pupils' expectations of democracy and their awareness of the limitations of existing practice in school. Yet, while School Councils had been set up in most schools and while many school managers and teachers acknowledged the inherent link between school ethos and the values of citizenship, there continued to be considerable disparity between teacher perceptions about school democracy and real evidence of pupils being consulted or influencing decision-making. Interviewees were often sceptical about the status of Schools Councils and their power to initiate change.' (p.8)

13.2(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

Several stakeholders in two workshops argued that schools needed to be responsive to the perceived needs of young people themselves, rather than to the needs identified by young people's representatives. School Councils were seen to provide a direct and immediate medium through which young people could inform and influence school policy and procedures. It was suggested that the composition of a School Council and its effectiveness therefore has an impact on the ethos of the school.

13.2(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

Several participants in the young people's workshop mentioned the diverse ways in which school councils operated, and how elections to these councils were

held. This was seen to have an influence on the extent to which students from different backgrounds could play a role in decision-making within the school. The young people's workshop participants also emphasised the importance of young people taking part in decision making in schools, and commented that young people need to feel a heightened sense of identifying with, and belonging to, their school. There was a strong steer from several participants to focus more closely on school councils as an index of inclusivity. One respondent who submitted written comments suggested that consideration might be given to how the effectiveness of a school council should be determined, as the existence of a school council may not necessarily mean that it has a positive impact.

Discussion
13.2(D): Recommended Indicator
The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- a school should have a commitment to involving young people in discussions and decisions on school life that directly affect them, and the school should listen to young people's views;
- the composition of a School Council and its effectiveness has an impact on the ethos of a school.

It is therefore recommended that "*School Council*" should be a key indicator with an emphasis on the impact which such bodies have on school policies and procedures and young people's perceptions of the impact. It is acknowledged that the recommended measures may be difficult to obtain in respect of primary schools.

13.2(E): Associated Measures
On the basis of existing literature and comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time it is recommended that associated measures could include:

13.2.1 Proportion of schools with a School Council, by school type and management type[70]

13.2.2 Young people's perceptions of School Councils, by S75 grounds and priority groups

13.2.3 Impact of School Councils on policies and procedures, by school type and management type

13.2.4 Young people's perceptions of their impact on decision-making, by S75 grounds and priority groups

13.2(F): Available Data

Measure 13.2.1: Proportion of schools with a School Council and

Measure 13.2.2: Young people's perceptions of School Councils

The YPB&A Survey includes two questions about School Councils and young people's perceptions of their effectiveness:

- Does your school have a school council?
- Do you think the school council is an effective way for pupils to get their views across?

The YPB&A Survey can be analysed for five of the Section 75 grounds (religious belief, age, gender, disability and racial/ethnic origin) at post-primary level only. It does not record any data on political opinion, marital status, sexual orientation or those with dependants; nor does it record social class or whether the young person is looked after. Hence data on the following five of the eight priority groups will not be available from this source:

- Protestant working class boys
- lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) children and young people;
- looked after children and young people;
- children and young people with caring responsibilities; and
- newcomer children and young people.

---

[70] For details of school types and management types, see section 3.10.2 on p.17

Measure 13.2.3: Impact of School Councils on policies and procedures

At the present time, no data sources are available to track this measure. To identify the impact of councils on policies and procedures would require focused and bespoke primary research to identify the mechanisms through which councils impact on policy development and implementation.

Measure 13.2.4: Young people's perceptions of their impact on decision-making

The YPB&A Survey includes two questions about how young people are able to make their views known to school authorities and how well they consider they are listened to, as follows –

- Do you feel that you have the chance to give your views about issues that affect you?
- Do you think your views are listened to?
- Who do you give your views to?

As referred to above, the YPB&A Survey can be analysed for five of the Section 75 grounds (religious belief, age, gender, disability and racial/ethnic origin) at post-primary level.

Note: School Development Plans

The PIF included a sub-indicator on School Development Plans as the result of a suggestion by a stakeholder at an earlier stage or the research. However, no other comments were received during either stage of the stakeholder engagement and, in preparing this final report, it has become clear that the indicator is closely linked to other aspects of school governance that have been addressed under previous indicators[71] and does not contribute significantly to the measurement of equality of opportunity and good relations in education. School development plans are specific to the individual school but the inclusion or exclusion of a particular topic from a development plan does not provide any indication of the effectiveness of the school in addressing that topic.

 "*School Development Plans*" are therefore not included in this Recommended Indicator Framework.

---

[71] See Indicator 10.2 Anti-bullying policies and Indicator 10.3 Diversity policies

7.7. Indicator 14. Teacher development

Findings

14(A): Rationale

For children and young people, teachers represent the single most important point of contact with a school, as their school day involves a succession of interactions with teaching staff. Not surprisingly then, the attitudes, beliefs and values that teachers bring to the classroom are subject to close scrutiny. For example, the Department of Education's *Policy for School Improvement* (Department of Education, 2009c) identifies high-quality teaching and learning as one its four key themes. It also emphasises the need for teachers to be committed and enthusiastic, to be dedicated to improving learning and to enjoy a positive relationship with their pupils and with other school-based staff. It recommends that teachers use adaptable, flexible teaching strategies that respond to the diversity within the classroom. Available research in Northern Ireland suggests that there are positive signs of change regarding student teachers' attitudes and stereotypes (Lambe & Bones, 2006b). However, in the past the somewhat traditional and segregated teacher training system may not always have provided adequate preparation for dealing with diversity in the classroom (Montgomery & McGlynn, 2009). In a review of equality awareness in teacher training in Northern Ireland, Elwood et al. (2003) maintained, 'it was felt that most Northern Ireland teachers have had limited experience of diversity, either in their own schooling or in their professional lives. This may limit their capacity to engage across the range of equality issues.' (p.7). Further, 'there is no generally-known or accepted programme within the (education) system either to identify the full range of equality needs, or to address those already identified.' (p.3)

14(B): Stakeholder Views – Phase 1

The issue of teacher development was a subject of extensive comment and debate by stakeholders in all workshops and several comment forms. There were concerns surrounding the ability of some teachers to deal with good relations issues in the classroom. References were made to (unspecified)

research reports which showed reluctance on the part of some teachers to deal with sensitive issues. *Every Child an Equal Child* quotes Equality Commission research which shows that many teachers would welcome more training on equality and good relations issues.

With regard to the priority groups, stakeholders made the following points:

- two participants felt that teachers are not always equipped to cope with issues of inclusion for Irish Travellers in citizenship classes;
- several stakeholders said it was important for teachers to have the skills to address and explore sexual orientation issues;
- two stakeholders independently suggested that teachers should have awareness training in all aspects of disability;
- a common theme across the workshops was the perception that there was a lack of awareness among teachers of the specific problems which children and young people with caring responsibilities face.

14(C): Stakeholder Views – Phase 2

A number of respondents in the young people's workshop highlighted the traditional nature of teacher training, and voiced the perception that few teachers had been trained in equality, good relations and diversity issues. It was argued in this workshop that the focus on the academic aspects of education in Northern Ireland detracted from these important concerns. One respondent who submitted written comments said that schools need to be active in promoting diversity and inclusion and there is room here for more teacher training.

Discussion
14(D): Recommended Indicator

The key points arising from the findings set out above are considered to be as follows:

- in the past the somewhat traditional and segregated teacher training system may not always have provided adequate preparation for dealing with diversity in the classroom;

- stakeholders suggested that teachers should have greater awareness of the needs of children and young people in a number of the priority groups - (Irish Travellers, lesbian, gay and bisexual young people, disabled children and young people and those with caring responsibilities).

It is therefore recommended that "***Teacher Development***" should be a key indicator. However, it is acknowledged that further research will be needed to develop viable and informative associated measures and that there will be a need to take account of the current review of the CPD Framework by the General Teaching Council. The measure suggested below is therefore recommended as a Potential Future Measure.

14(E): Associated Measures

On the basis of existing literature and comments received from current stakeholders, in order to effectively track this indicator at this time it is recommended that associated measures could include:

14.1   Teacher development in relation to equality of opportunity and good relations (**Potential Future Measure**)

14(F): Available Data

Teachers undertake continuing professional development (CPD) throughout their careers. CPD includes training in relation to equality of opportunity and diversity issues.

CPD activities relate to the Competency Framework which is currently being reviewed. There are four Competencies which specifically include equality of opportunity and diversity elements (see Appendix D). However, the range of CPD activities is wide and not restricted to formal courses.

While at this stage it has not been possible to identify data sources for this indicator, in future it may be possible to liaise with the General Teaching Council during the review of the CPD Framework, in order to devise a methodology for monitoring the equality of opportunity and diversity elements

of the Competency Framework. It might also be useful to consider SEN and EAL assistants in terms of their qualifications and access to CPD.

7.8. Conclusions

Theme 3: Ethos - Recommended Indicator Framework

Overarching goal: The ethos of every school promotes the inclusion and participation of all children

Indicators	Sub-Indicators	Associated Measures[72]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
10. Policies and procedures	10.1 School aims	10.1.1 Proportion of schools with a mission statement, vision, ethos or charter which has a statement reflecting diversity within the school	No data source currently available		By school type and management type		
		10.1.2 Proportion of schools revising/updating/ reviewing their mission statement, vision, ethos, charter etc. on a regular basis (e.g. annually)	No data source currently available		By school type and management type		
		10.1.3 Evidence that the mission statement etc. is reflected in good practice procedures	No data source currently available		By school type and management type		
		10.1.4 Availability of policies and procedures in alternative formats	No data source currently available		By school type and management type		

---

[72] Highlighted measures are those for which no data source has been identified or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure

Indicators	Sub-Indicators	Associated Measures[73]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
10. Policies and procedures cont'd	10.2 Anti-bullying policies and procedures	10.2.1 Proportion of schools with an effective anti-bullying policy and associated procedures in place	No data source currently available		By school type and management type		
		10.2.2 Proportion of learners who state they have been bullied in last 12 months	DE survey on nature and extent of bullying in schools	5 yearly			By S75 grounds and priority groups
		10.2.3 Effectiveness of support systems in curtailing bullying incidents	DE survey on nature and extent of bullying in schools	5 yearly	By school type and management type		
	10.3 Diversity policies	10.3.1 Proportion of schools with diversity policies in place – *Potential Future Measure*	Potential Future Measure		By school type and management type		
		10.3.2 Proportion of schools delivering Citizenship studies or similar initiatives on a joint basis with another school with a good relations element	ELBs annual return to DE	Annual	By school type and management type	By Board area	

---

[73] Highlighted measures are those for which no data source has been identified or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure

Indicators	Sub-Indicators	Associated Measures[74]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Detail
		10.3.3 Young people's attitudes towards learning about diversity	YPB&A Survey	Triennial	(NB Available for post primary only)		By S75 grounds and priority groups
		10.3.4 Proportion of people who believe schools in NI are effective at preparing pupils for life in a diverse society	Life & Times Survey 2005	No fixed frequency			
11. Pastoral care		11.1 Integration of pastoral care into school policies and processes	No data source currently available		By school type and management type		
		11.2 Children and young people's attitudes towards accessing pastoral care	No data source currently available				By S75 grounds and priority groups
		11.3 Quality of Pastoral Care – *Potential Future Measure*	Potential Future Measure				
12. Communication	12.1 Communication and collaboration with other schools	12.1.1 Scope and effectiveness of activities with partner schools per year – *Potential Future Measure*	Potential Future Measure		By school type and management type		

---

74 Highlighted measures are those for which no data source has been identified or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure

Indicators	Sub-Indicators	Associated Measures[75]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
12. Communication cont'd	12.2 Communication with parents/ guardians	12.2.1 Range of types of communication with parents/guardians – *Potential Future Measure*	Potential Future Measure		By school type and management type		
		12.2.2 Number of activities per year which schools initiate with parents/guardians - *Potential Future Measure*	Potential Future Measure		By school type and management type		
		12.2.3 Level of involvement of parents/guardians in school activities - *Potential Future Measure*	Potential Future Measure		By school type and management type		
		12.2.4 Parents/ guardians' access to parents' associations and events - *Potential Future Measure*	Potential Future Measure		By school type and management type		

---

[75] Highlighted measures are those for which no data source has been identified or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure

Indicators	Sub-Indicators	Associated Measures[76]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
12. Communication cont'd		12.2.5 Level of parents/guardians' knowledge of schools' complaints procedures and how to use them effectively - *Potential Future Measure*	Potential Future Measure		By school type and management type		
13. Governance	13.1 Board of Governors	13.1.1 Proportion of schools with Board of Governors where composition reflects diversity within the school catchment/local area	No data source currently available		By school type and management type		
		13.1.2 Proportion of School Governors attending training including a diversity element	No data source currently available		By school type and management type	By Board area	
	13.2 School Council	13.2.1 Proportion of schools with a School Council	YPB&A Survey	Triennial	(NB Available for post primary only)		
		13.2.2 Young people's perceptions of School Councils	YPB&A Survey	Triennial	(NB Available for post primary only)		By S75 grounds and priority groups

---

[76] Highlighted measures are those for which no data source has been identified or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure

Indicators	Sub-Indicators	Associated Measures[77]	Data Sources	Frequency	School Information	Spatial Detail	Learner Information
		13.2.3 Impact of School Councils on policies and procedures	No data source currently available		By school type and management type		
		13.2.4 Young people's perceptions of their impact on decision-making	YPB&A Survey	Triennial	(NB Available for post primary only)	NI level	S75 grounds Priority groups
14. Teacher development - Potential Future Indicator		14.1 Teacher development in relation to equality of opportunity and good relations – *Potential Future Measure*	Potential Future Measure				

---

[77] Highlighted measures are those for which no data source has been identified or where further research is required to define an appropriate indicator/measure

8. Recommendations

The 14 indicators set out in the Recommended Indicator Framework represent the key issues which need to be addressed in order to achieve the three overarching goals in *Every Child an Equal Child*. However, in order to address all the key issues it has been necessary to include indicators and associated measures for which no data sources are currently available.

The Recommended Indicator Framework is a mix of measures which can be measured now, those which could be measured if data were collected, and those which should be given further consideration as part of ongoing research / policy development with regards to how best to measure equality of opportunity and good relations.

In order to take this research further and to develop a more robust system for tracking progress, it will be necessary to obtain additional qualitative and quantitative data which adequately represent the indicators.

Stakeholders emphasised several issues attaching to current information gathering arrangements, including in particular the need for additional qualitative measures and the need to ensure that individual learners and schools should not be identifiable in any breakdown of data. Reflecting on the views of stakeholders, in order to further develop the Indicator Framework, consideration should be given to:

1. Examining the feasibility of extending existing quantitative surveys (most notably the triennial Young Persons' Behaviour and Attitude Survey and the 5 yearly Survey on the Nature and Extent of Bullying in Schools) to provide more detailed qualitative information on issues such as the effectiveness of Area Learning Communities and attitudes to pastoral care, and also to include more systematic analyses by S75 grounds and priority groups.

2. Enhancing the accessibility of qualitative information already collected during school inspections by the ETI, particularly where this may have some bearing on school policies and procedures, the range of teaching materials and the effectiveness of specialist support.

3. Examining the feasibility of undertaking qualitative research with parents/guardians in relation to issues such as the support they offer their children, their satisfaction regarding employment prospects and their involvement with schools, with a particular reference to parents/guardians of children and young people in the different S75 grounds and priority groups.

4. Consolidating the central collation of information currently held at individual school level about activities such as extracurricular activities, cultural awareness activities, provision of on-line materials and cross community initiatives with partner schools.

5. Conducting further research to define standards for measurable achievements outside the scope of public examinations (e.g. life skills, sport and music).

6. Conducting further research to define the scope and extent of community and outside agency support for learners.

7. Working with the GTCNI to devise a methodology for monitoring the equality of opportunity and good relations elements of the Teachers' Competency Framework.

8. Facilitating partnership engagements between bodies including DE, CSU, NISRA, DEL and ETI to ensure that future large scale surveys relating to education issues yield data that are directly comparable by common variables and values.

9.   Providing clarity as to protocols attaching to the disaggregation for future data, to ensure that individual learners and schools are not identifiable and that geographical breakdowns can capture variables including rurality, travel time to school and social deprivation.

10.   Developing a common framework for the classification of type of disability for the purposes of measuring impacts on children and young people with disabilities. This could be restricted to use in relation to the measures in this framework or could be expanded to provide a standard classification for the education sector.

Appendicies

Appendix A

Bibliography

Abbott, L. (2006). Northern Ireland head teachers' perceptions of inclusion. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 10, 627-643. http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~db=all~content=a758011756

ARK (2006). Research Update: School Bullying in Northern Ireland - It hasn't gone away you know. ARK, Belfast. http://www.ark.ac.uk/publications/updates/update48.pdf

Barnardo's (2006). Failed by the System: The views of young care leavers on their educational experiences. Barnardo's, London. http://www.barnardos.org.uk/failed_by_the_system_report.pdf

Bell, K., Jarman, N. & Lebevre, T. (2004). Migrant Workers in Northern Ireland. Institute for Conflict Research, Belfast. http://www.ofmdfmni.gov.uk/migrantworkers.pdf

Bell, K, Caughey A, Hansson U, Martynowicz A and Scully M. (2009) "...easy life, great people, bad weather": A Report on the Experiences of Migrant Worker in Northern Ireland. Institute for Conflict Research / Department for Employment and Learning:Belfast http://www.delni.gov.uk/a_report_on_the_experiences_of_migrant_workers_in_northern_ireland.pdf

Bird, S. (2003). Do The Right Thing! How Governors Can Contribute To Community Cohesion and Accountability. DfES/TEN, London. http://www.nga.org.uk/cohesion/uploads/Do%20the%20right%20thing.pdf

Burchardt, T. Tsang, T. & Vizard, P. (2009). Specialist Consultation on the List of Central and Valuable Capabilities for Children. EHRC Research Report 41.

http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/publications/our-research/research-reports/research-reports-41-50/

Committee on the Administration of Justice (2006). Equality in Northern Ireland: The Rhetoric and the Reality. Committee on the Administration of Justice, Belfast.

Collins, K., McAleavy, G. & Adamson, G. (2004). Bullying in schools: a Northern Ireland study. Educational Research, 45, 55-71.
http://www.science.ulster.ac.uk/research/psychology/profiles/g_adamson/documents/adamson4.pdf

Connolly, P. & Keenan, M. (2002). Racist harassment in the white hinterlands: Minority ethnic children and parents' experiences of schooling in Northern Ireland. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 23, 341-355.
http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~db=all~content=a713655441

Dearden C and Becker S (2004). Young Carers in the UK. The 2004 Report. Carers UK/The Children's Society
www.carersni.org/Policyandpractice/.../main.../YoungcarersReport2004.pdf

Dee, T. (2007). Teachers and the gender gaps in student achievement. The Journal of Human Resources, 42, 1-28.

Department for Children Schools and Families (2009). Lamb Inquiry: Special Education Needs and parental confidence.
http://media.education.gov.uk/assets/files/pdf/l/lamb-enquiry-final-report.pdf

Department of Education (NI) (2001a). Pastoral Care in Schools - Promoting Positive Behaviour. Department of Education, Bangor.
http://www.deni.gov.uk/ppbehaviour-4.pdf

Department of Education (NI) (2001b). School Governors Handbook. Department of Education, Bangor.

http://www.seelb.org.uk/school_man_new/governors/School%20Governor%20Handbook.pdf

Department of Education (2006). Schools for the Future: Funding, Strategy, Sharing. Report of the Independent Strategic Review of Education. Department of Education, Bangor.
http://www.deni.gov.uk/review_of_education.pdf

Department of Education (NI) (2008). Every School A Good School
A Strategy for Raising Achievement in Literacy and Numeracy. Department of Education, Bangor.
http://www.deni.gov.uk/literacy_and_numeracy_strategy_-_english.pdf

Department of Education (NI) (2009a). Schools for the Future:
A Policy for Sustainable Schools. Department of Education, Bangor.
http://www.deni.gov.uk/a_policy_for_sustainable_schools-2.pdf

Department of Education (2009b). Every School A Good School: Supporting Newcomer Pupils. Department of Education, Bangor.
http://www.deni.gov.uk/print/index/21-pupils-parents-pg/newcomer/newcomer-policy/supporting-newcomer-pupils.htm

Department of Education (NI) (2009c). Every School a Good School: Policy for School Improvement. Department of Education, Bangor.
http://www.deni.gov.uk/esags_policy_for_school_improvement_-_final_version_05-05-2009.pdf

Department of Education (NI) (2009d). The Extended Schools Programme 2010/11. Department of Education, Bangor.
http://www.deni.gov.uk/index/85-schools/03-schools_impvt_prog_pg/extended-schools-programme-2009-2010.htm

Department of Education (NI) (2010). <u>Delivering the Entitlement Framework by 2013: Guidance for Schools on the Next Phase of Implementation</u>. Department of Education, Bangor.
http://www.deni.gov.uk/entitlement_framework_2010-11_guidance_-_english_version__193kb_-5.pdf

Department of Education (NI) (2011a) Community Relations, Equality and Diversity in Education. Department of Education, Bangor
http://www.deni.gov.uk/cred_policy_doc1.pdf

Department of Education (NI) (2011b) Every School a Good School – The Governors' Role. Department of Education, Bangor.
http://www.deni.gov.uk/index/85-schools/5-school-management/79-school_governors_pg/schools_79_governor-roles-and-responsibilities_pg.htm

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2001). <u>SEN Toolkit. Dfes, London.</u>
http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DfES-0558-2001-2.pdf

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2003). <u>Aiming High: Raising the Achievement of Minority Ethnic Pupils</u>. DfES, London.
http://www.ligali.org/pdf/ahconsultation.pdf

Disabled Living Foundation (2010). <u>Key Facts.</u> DLF, London.
http://www.dlf.org.uk/content/key-facts

Education & Training Inspectorate (2008). <u>An Evaluation of Traveller Education in the Five Education and Library Boards</u>. ETI, Belfast.
http://www.etini.gov.uk/traveller_education.pdf

Education & Training Inspectorate. (2009a). <u>An Evaluation of the Provision to Support Newcomer Pupils in a Range of Primary and Post-Primary Schools.</u> ETI, Belfast.

http://www.etini.gov.uk/index/surveys-evaluations/surveys-evaluations-post-primary/surveys-evaluations-post-primary-2009/an-evaluation-of-the-provision-to-support-newcomer-pupils-in-a-range-of-primary-and-post-primary-schools.pdf

Education & Training Inspectorate (2009b). An Evaluation of the Quality Assurance of Community Relations Funding in a Range of Formal and Non-formal Education Settings. ETI, Belfast.
http://www.etini.gov.uk/index/surveys-evaluations/surveys-evaluations-post-primary/surveys-evaluations-post-primary-2009/an-evaluation-of-the-quality-assurance-of-community-relations-funding-in-a-range-of-formal-and-non-formal-education-settings.pdf

Education & Training Inspectorate (2010a). Together Towards Improvement: A Process for Self-Evaluation Pre-school. ETI, Belfast.
http://www.etini.gov.uk/index/together-towards-improvement/together-towards-improvement-preschool.pdf

Education & Training Inspectorate (2010b). Together Towards Improvement: A Process for Self-Evaluation Primary. ETI, Belfast.
http://www.etini.gov.uk/index/together-towards-improvement/together-towards-improvement-primary.pdf

Education & Training Inspectorate (2010c). Together Towards Improvement: A Process for Self-Evaluation Post-Primary. ETI, Belfast.
http://www.etini.gov.uk/index/together-towards-improvement/together-towards-improvement-post-primary.pdf

Education & Training Inspectorate (2010d). Together Towards Improvement: A Process for Self-Evaluation Special Education. ETI, Belfast.
http://www.etini.gov.uk/index/together-towards-improvement/together-towards-improvement-special.pdf

Elwood, J. et al. (2003). Equality Awareness in Teacher Education and Training in Northern Ireland. ECNI, Belfast

http://arrts.gtcni.org.uk/gtcni/bitstream/2428/6344/1/Equality%20awareness%20in%20teacher%20education%20and%20training%20in%20NI.pdf

Equality Commission (2003). Gender and Pay in The Information Technology and Retail Sectors In Northern Ireland. ECNI, Belfast.
http://www.equalityni.org/archive/pdf/GenderPayITRetail.pdf

Equality Commission (2006). Mainstreaming Equality of Opportunity for Travellers in Education: Towards a Strategy. ECNI, Belfast.
http://www.equalityni.org/archive/word/travellerpaper0406.doc

Equality Commission (2006). Gender and Pay in the Hotel and Restaurants and Manufacturing Sectors in Northern Ireland Report. ECNI, Belfast.
http://www.equalityni.org/archive/pdf/GenderPayITRetail.pdf

Equality Commission for NI (2008). Every Child an Equal Child. ECNI, Belfast.

EU Working Committee on the Quality of School Education (2000). Quality of School Education: Sixteen Quality Indicators. EU, Brussels.
http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/education_training_youth/lifelong_learning/c11063_en.htm

Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. Educational Research, 38, 47 – 65.

General Teaching Council NI (2007). Teaching: The Reflective Profession. GTC, Belfast.
http://www.gtcni.org.uk/uploads/docs/GTCNI_Comp_Bmrk%20%20Aug%2007.pdf

Gibbons, S., Machin, S. & Silva, O. (2006). Competition, Choice and Pupil Achievement. CEEDP, Paper 56. Centre for the Economics of Education, London School of Economics and Political Science, London.

http://cee.lse.ac.uk/cee%20dps/ceedp56.pdf

Good Relations Forum (CRC/ECNI) (2010) Ensuring the Good Relations Work in our Schools Counts – A strategy to meet our needs for the 21st Century'. CRC/ECNI, Belfast
http://www.equalityni.org/sections/default.asp?cms=Policy_Public policy_good relations_Challenge papers&cmsid=89_97_430_536&id=536&secid=6

Goodman, A. and Sianesi, B., (2005), Early education and children's outcomes: How long do the impacts last?, Fiscal Studies, 26, 513 - 548.
Gorard, S., Fitz, J. & Taylor, C. (2003). Schools, Markets and Choice Policies. Routledgefalmer, London.

Hamilton, A. et al. (2007). Adequacy and Effectiveness of Educational Provision for Traveller Children and Young People in Northern Ireland. NICCY / ECNI, Belfast.
http://www.niccy.org/uploaded_docs/EC%20%20Travellers%20report%20complete%20pdf.pdf

Hansson, U., Morgan, V. & Dunn, S. (2002). Minority Ethnic Groups in Northern Ireland: Experiences and Expectations of English Language Support in Education Settings. OFMDFM, Belfast.
http://www.ofmdfmni.gov.uk/ethnic.pdf

Invest NI (2005). Accelerating Entrepreneurship Strategy: EQIA Full Report. Belfast
http://www.investni.com/aes_eqia_-_full_report.pdf

James, A. (2010). School Bullying: Research Briefing. NSPCC, London.
http://www.nspcc.org.uk/inform/research/briefings/school_bullying_pdf_wdf73502.pdf

Jarman, N. and Tennant, A. (2003). <u>An Acceptable Prejudice? Homophobic Violence and Harassment in Northern Ireland</u>. Institute for Conflict research, Belfast. http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/icr/reports/jarman03homophobic.pdf

Lambe, J. & Bones, R. (2006a). Student teachers' attitudes to inclusion: implications for Initial Teacher Education in Northern Ireland. <u>International Journal of Inclusive Education</u>, 10, 511-527. http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~db=all~content=a758011668

Lambe, J. & Bones, R. (2006b). Student teachers' perceptions about inclusive classroom teaching in Northern Ireland prior to teaching practice experience. <u>European Journal of Special Needs Education</u>, 21, 167-186. http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~db=all~content=a747846603

Livesey, G. et al. (2007). <u>The Nature and Extent of Bullying in Schools in the North of Ireland</u>. Research Report 46, Department of Education, Bangor. http://www.deni.gov.uk/no_46_second_edition.pdf

McGuckin, C. & Lewis, C. (2008). Management of bullying in Northern Ireland schools: A pre-legislative survey. <u>Educational Research</u>, 50, 9-23. http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/ftinterface~db=all~content=a791128706~fulltext=713240928

Melhuish, E. et al. (2006). <u>Effective Pre-School Provision</u>. Department of Education Research Report 41, Belfast. http://www.deni.gov.uk/researchreport41-2.pdf

Montgomery, A. & McGlynn, C. (2009). New peace, new teachers: Student teachers' perspectives of diversity and community relations in Northern Ireland. <u>Teaching and Teacher Education</u>, 25 (3), 391-399. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6VD8-4V5NSX1-1&_user=126978&_rdoc=1&_fmt=&_orig=search&_sort=d&view=c&_acct=C000010438&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=126978&md5=6bb811a60b2f23488c5968860cfe6348

Moran, A. & Abbott, L. (2002). Developing inclusive schools: the pivotal role of teaching assistants in promoting inclusion in special and mainstream schools in Northern Ireland. International Journal of Special Needs Education, 17, 161-173. http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~db=all~content=a713765500

Moser, A. (2007). Gender and Indicators: Overview Report. BRIDGE Pubs., United Nations Development Programme. http://www.bridge.ids.ac.uk/reports/IndicatorsORfinal.pdf

Northern Ireland Assembly (2001). Selected current research in gender and educational attainment. NI Assembly Research Paper 06/01, Belfast. http://www.niassembly.gov.uk/io/research/0601.pdf

O'Connor, U., Hartop, B. & McCully, A. (2002). A Review of the Schools' Community Relations Programme 2002. Department of Education, Bangor.

O'Connor, U. et al. (2008). Evaluation of the Pilot Introduction of Education for Local and Global Citizenship into the revised Northern Ireland Curriculum. UNESCO Centre, School of Education, University of Ulster. http://unesco.ulster.ac.uk/PDFs/citizenship_evaluation_full_report.pdf

OFMDFM Children & Young People's Unit (2006). Our Children and Young People – Our Pledge: A Ten Year Strategy for Children and Young People in NI 2006 – 2016. OFMDFM, Belfast.

OFMDFM (2007). A Shared Future and Racial Equality Strategy: Good Relations Indicators Baseline Report. (see pp. 67 – 78). OFMDFM, Belfast. http://www.ofmdfmni.gov.uk/good-relations-report.pdf.

OFMDFM (2009). Gender Pay Gap Measurement in Northern Ireland: A Discussion Paper. OFMDFM, Belfast. http://www.ofmdfmni.gov.uk/gender_pay_gap_measurement_in_ni__a_discussion_paper__pdf_560kb_.pdf

OFMDFM (2010). <u>Programme for Cohesion, Sharing and Integration:</u> <u>Consultation Document</u>. OFMDFM, Belfast.
http://www.nidirect.gov.uk/reformatted_final_print_version_csi_-_26.07.10.pdf

OFSTED (Office for Standards in Education). (1999) <u>Raising the Attainment of</u> <u>Minority Ethnic Pupils.</u> London, Ofsted.

Reynolds, M. McCartan, D. &Knipe, D. (2003). Traveller culture and lifestyle as factors influencing children's integration into mainstream secondary schools in West Belfast. <u>International Journal of Inclusive Education</u>, 7, 403-414.
http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~db=all~content=a714858187

Rollock, N. (2006). <u>The Experiences of Black School Governors in London</u>. Institute for Policy Studies in Education, London.
http://www.merton.gov.uk/the_experiences_of_black_school_governors_in_london.pdf

Sammons, P., Elliot, K., Sylva, K., Melhuish, E., Siraj-Blatchford, I. and Taggart, B**. (2004). The impact of pre-school on young children's cognitive attainments at entry to reception**. <u>British Educational Research Journal,</u> 30, No. 5, October 2004

Schubotz, D. and Sinclair, R. (2006) *'Being part and parcel of the school' The views and experiences of children and young people in relation to the development of bullying policies in schools,* Belfast: NICCY.

Smith, A. & Robinson, A. (1996). <u>Education for Mutual Understanding:</u> <u>The Initial Statutory Years.</u> Centre for Conflict Research, Coleraine.
http://www.ccruni.gov.uk/research/csc/mutual.htm

Wright, S. (Nov-Dec 2009). 'Individual Education Plans' in <u>Insight</u> Issue 24. Royal National Institute for Blind People, London.

Youthnet / Department of Education (2003). <u>The SHOUT Report: The needs of young people in Northern Ireland who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual and or transgender</u>. Youthnet, Belfast.

http://www.youthnetni.org.uk/Site/29/Documents/shout%20pdf.pdf

Appendix B

Data Sources

1. Data sources

The Department of Education collects a wide range of data on a regular basis at individual learner and school level which can be cross-tabulated as required. The main mechanisms for collection of data which are relevant to the recommended indicator framework are –

- School Census (annual)
- School Leavers Survey (annual)
- Annual Return on Teacher Numbers (annual)
- Young Persons' Behaviour & Attitude Survey (triennial).

In addition, some relevant information can be obtained from other regular research such as –

- Young Life & Times Survey
- DHSSPS OC2 (Collection of outcome indicators for Looked After Children)
- Labour Force Survey (Department of Enterprise, Trade & Investment, Northern Ireland)

Brief background information on each data source is set out below.

1.1 School Census

The School Census is an annual snapshot of pupil and school level data for each pre-school centre, nursery, special, primary, post-primary, hospital and independent school in Northern Ireland. The Census collects a range of data including enrolments which incorporates pupil characteristics such as religion, ethnicity, gender etc, as well as exams data and attendance. The data are used to inform DE policy and procedures, for example school funding, as well as to inform ELBs, providing detailed information useful to them in their auditing

processes. The date for the school census is usually the Friday of the first full working-week in October. Schools are asked to return their data by the end of the week following the census date.

School attendance statistics were collected at pupil level for the first time in the school census in October 2008, providing data on the number of sessions a pupil is absent throughout the year and for what reason.

1.2   School Leavers Survey

The School Leavers Survey is an annual exercise to collect and validate the qualifications and destinations of Northern Ireland school leavers. The data are at individual pupil level and also contain pupil characteristics such as their ethnicity, religion or free school meal eligibility. The data are collected to inform PSA Targets and to monitor Departmental policies such as 'The DE Policy for School Improvement' or 'Literacy and Numeracy Strategy'. With the dataset being at pupil level and the home postcode of each pupil recorded, spatial analysis can be undertaken on the qualifications and destinations of NI school leavers.

In recent years, variables such as Traveller accommodation type, day care destination, GCSE English and Maths, and children in care have been added and in 2007/08, for the first time, the results were presented on the basis of the residential district council of the pupil. This allows spatial comparisons to be made throughout Northern Ireland.

1.3   Annual Return on Teacher Numbers

Each year the Department of Education sends to each school a list of teachers derived from the computerised teachers' payroll system and schools are asked to mark any amendments. Teacher numbers are based on a reference week in the autumn term; the latest information relates to 23-27 November 2009. The numbers include full time and part time permanent teachers and temporary teachers but not substitute teachers, peripatetic teachers or classroom support staff.

1.4 Young Persons' Behaviour & Attitude Survey (YPB&A Survey)

The Young Persons' Behaviour & Attitude Survey has been carried out every three years since 2001 by the NISRA Central Survey Unit. A further survey is planned in 2010. A representative sample of post-primary schools is contacted and invited to participate in the survey. In 2007, 70 schools took part and 6902 young people submitted responses.

The range of questions is wide and the topics are divided between two versions of the questionnaire. Schools are selected at random to complete one version of the questionnaire. One class from each year group (between Year 8 and Year 12) is randomly selected in each school. The results of the survey are weighted by year group and gender in order to reflect the composition of the Northern Ireland post-primary population.

1.5 Young Life & Times Survey (YLT Survey)

The Young Life and Times survey records the views of 16 year olds in Northern Ireland on a range of issues such as community relations, health, politics, sectarianism and education. The survey has been undertaken annually since 2003, although funding for the 2010 survey has not yet been secured.

The Young Life and Times survey is a constituent part of ARK, a resource within the Queen's University Belfast, providing access to social and political information on Northern Ireland. ARK receives core-funding from the Economic and Social Research Council. Each survey is part funded by Government Departments and Agencies with an interest in the particular modules included in the survey for that particular year.

The range of topics included varies each year as respondents are asked to suggest appropriate topics of the following year's survey. Much of the information on attitudes to education comes from questions asked between 2003 and 2007 and there is no guarantee that these questions will be repeated at any stage in the future. The Young Life & Times Survey has in the past asked questions relating to sexual orientation and caring responsibilities which are often not covered in other regular surveys.

In addition to publishing the Young Life & Times survey results, ARK also publishes research updates on specific topics using the survey data. Recent updates include reports on young carers, school bullying, inter-school cross community projects and experience of school.

1.6   DHSSPS Outcome Indicators for Looked After Children

The DHSSPS facilitates annual research designed to monitor and assess outcomes for looked after children. Three annual repost are published (known as OC1, OC2 and OC3) providing information on educational achievements and the circumstances of young people leaving care. The OC2 collection of indicators provides information on the educational achievements at Key Stage assessments and GCSE/GNVQ of all children who had been looked after continuously for 12 months or more on the date of the survey. The OC1 collection provides information on the educational qualifications of care leavers and OC3 looks at the circumstances of care leavers on their 19th birthday.

The OC2 collection was introduced in 2002 and has provided consistent information on an annual basis. The information is provided by each Health & Social Care Trust. It covers children and young people across a wide age range (including under 5 and over 16) and includes details of gender, religion, ethnicity, disability and having dependants. Children and young people in residential accommodation, foster care, placed with a family and in other placement types (e.g. supported accommodation, hospital, shared care, assessment centres) are included but not children and young people in detention.

1.7   DETI Labour Force Survey (LFS)

The Labour Force Survey (LFS) is a quarterly sample survey carried out by interviewing people about their personal circumstances and work. It is the biggest regular household survey in Northern Ireland and provides a rich and vital source of information about the labour force using internationally agreed concepts and definitions. The LFS provides information on, labour market structure, employment, unemployment, economic activity and groups within the labour market.

The sample of addresses for the LFS is obtained from the Valuation & Lands Agency list of domestic properties in Northern Ireland and the quarterly survey has been designed to give reliable estimates of level for each quarter, as well as change over consecutive quarters.

These aims have been achieved by using an unclustered sample with a large element of overlap between quarters. The theoretical sample for each quarter consists of around 3,250 addresses, made up of five 'waves', each containing approximately 650 private households. Every sampled address is interviewed in five successive quarters, such that in any one quarter one wave will be receiving their first interview, one wave their second and so on, with one wave receiving their fifth and final interview. This results in an 80% sample overlap between quarters.

At each address, information is collected on the economic status and activity of all residents aged 16 and over during a specified week in the quarter (termed the reference week). Household size and composition is also recorded for each address. LFS respondents aged 16 and over are classified into two main categories:

-persons who were economically active (i.e people in employment and unemployed persons) or,

-persons who were economically inactive in the reference week of the survey.

2.   Demographics

The table overleaf summarises the Section 75 grounds, school types and management types for which each survey provides information. It also includes detail on whether each survey includes categories relating to language, socio-economic status and looked after children and young people.

Data source	Gender		Racial group											
	Male	Female	White	Irish Traveller	Chinese	Indian	Pakistani	Bangladeshi	Other Asian	Black Caribbean	Black African	Other Black	Mixed	Other ethnic group
School Census	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Sub-divided	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
School Leavers Survey	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Sub-divided	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
YPB&A Survey	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Sub-divided	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Young Life & Times	✓	✓	Sub-divided	✓	✓	←————	✓	————→	Fillipino	←————	✓	————→	✓	✓
Outcome Indicators for LAC[78]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
Labour Force Survey	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

[78] Looked After Children and young people

Data source	Disability							
	Disabled	Not Disabled	Physical disability	Sensory impairment	Cognitive & learning	Communication & interaction	Social, emotional, behavioural	Medical conditions / syndromes
School Census	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
School Leavers Survey	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
YPB&A Survey	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Young Life & Times	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Outcome Indicators for LAC	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Labour Force Survey	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗

Data source	Sexual orientation			Caring responsibilities		Age				Religion				
	Lesbian	Gay	Bisexual	School age mothers	Other carers	Pre-school	Primary	Post-Primary	School Leavers	Roman Catholic	Protestant	Other Christian	Non Christian	None or not recorded
School Census	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Sub-divided	Sub-divided	Sub-divided	✓
School Leavers Survey	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	Sub-divided	Sub-divided	Sub-divided	✓
YPB&A Survey	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	Sub-divided	Sub-divided	Sub-divided	✓
Young Life & Times	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	16 year olds	✗	✓	✓	✓		✓
Outcome Indicators for LAC	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Labour Force Survey	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	16+	✗	✓	Sub-divided	✓	✓	✓

Data source	School type								
	Pre-school	Nursery	Primary	Preparatory Departments	Secondary (Non-Grammar)	Secondary (Grammar)	Special	Hospital	Independent
School Census	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
School Leavers Survey	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
YPB&A Survey	✖	✖	✖	✖	✔	✔	✖	✖	✖
Young Life & Times	✖	✖	✖	✖	✔	✔	✔	✖	✖
Outcome Indicators for LAC	✖	✖	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✖	✖
Labour Force Survey	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖

Data source	School management type								
	Controlled	Catholic Maintained	Irish Medium Maintained	Other Maintained	Controlled Integrated	Grant Maintained Integrated	Voluntary Catholic Management	Voluntary Other Management	Non Grant Aided
School Census	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
School Leavers Survey	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
YPB&A Survey	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Young Life & Times	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Outcome Indicators for LAC	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖
Labour Force Survey	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖	✖

Data source	Language		Socio-economic status (proxy)[79]		LAC
	EAL & requiring support	EFL/not requiring support	FSME	Non-FSME	LAC
School Census	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
School Leavers Survey	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
YPB&A Survey	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘
Young Life & Times	✘	✘	Question regarding finance		✘
Outcome Indicators for LAC	✘	✘	✘	✘	Sub-divided
Labour Force Survey	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘

---

[79] The Department of Education tends to use Free School Meals Entitlement (FSME) as a proxy for 'working class' whether the child or young person takes free school meals or not. However, it is possible to analyse data by postcode of either the school or the learners in order to obtain a more detailed definition.

Appendix C

Priority Groups

This report identifies recommended indicators and associated measures that are broadly relevant to children and young people in each of the eight priority groups identified in *Every Child an Equal Child*. However, there are some indicators/measures which may have particular relevance for children and young people in specific priority groups and these are highlighted in the table overleaf. This analysis is based on existing literature and comments received from stakeholders in the two phases of engagement. At this time it is not presented as an exhaustive list but as a guide to assist with data collection and analysis.

		Protestant working class boys	Irish Travellers	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual	Looked after	Minority ethnic	Disabled	Caring responsibilities	Newcomer
Access – every child has equality of access to a quality educational experience									
1.1	**Choice of school**	✓					✓		✓
1.2	**Attendance**	✓	✓		✓				✓
2.1	**Breadth of curriculum**	✓				✓	✓		
2.2	**Extracurricular activities**	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
3.1	**Physical access**						✓		
3.2	**Facilities and materials**			✓		✓			
4.1	**Teachers and specialist support**	✓				✓	✓		✓
4.2	**Home and community support**	✓	✓					✓	
4.3	**Outside agency support**	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

		Protestant working class boys	Irish Travellers	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual	Looked after	Minority ethnic	Disabled	Caring responsibilities	Newcomer
<td colspan="10">**Achievements – every child is given the opportunity to reach his or her full potential**</td>
5	**Public examinations**	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
6	**Personal development and cultural awareness**		✔		✔		✔		
7	**Other achievements**	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
8	**Teacher and learner expectations**	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔		
9	**Employability**	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔

		Protestant working class boys	Irish Travellers	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual	Looked after	Minority ethnic	Disabled	Caring responsibilities	Newcomer
Attitude – the ethos of every school promotes the inclusion and participation of all children									
10.1	School aims	✔	✔			✔			✔
10.2	Anti-bullying policy		✔	✔		✔	✔		
10.3	Diversity policies		✔	✔		✔			✔
11.1	Pastoral care			✔	✔	✔		✔	
12.1	Communication and collaboration with other schools	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
12.2	Communication with parents/guardians	✔			✔	✔			✔
13.1	Board of Governors	✔	✔			✔	✔		✔
13.2	School Council	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
14.	Teacher development		✔	✔			✔	✔	

Appendix D

Extract from Northern Ireland Teacher Competencies[80]

Professional Competency 8

Teachers will have developed a knowledge and understanding of the need to take account of the significant features of pupils' cultures, languages and faiths and to address the implications for learning arising from these.

Professional Competency 9

Teachers will have developed a knowledge and understanding of their responsibilities under the Special Educational Need Code of Practice and know the features of the most common special needs and appropriate strategies to address these.

Professional Competency 15

Teachers will plan and evaluate lessons that enable all pupils, including those with special educational needs, to meet learning objectives/outcomes/intentions, showing high expectations and an awareness of potential areas of difficulty.

Professional Competency 21

Teachers will employ strategies that motivate and meet the needs of all pupils, including those with special and additional educational needs and for those not learning in their first language.

---

[80] Teaching: The Reflective Profession, General Teaching Council for Northern Ireland

Equality Commission for Northern Ireland
Equality House

7-9 Shaftesbury Square

Belfast

BT2 7DP

Tel: 028 90 890 890

Fax: 028 90 248 687

Textphone: 028 90 500 589

Email: research@equalityni.org

Website: www.equalityni.org/research

March 2012