



House of Commons  
Environmental Audit  
Committee

---

# Environmental Education: Follow-up to Learning the Sustainability Lesson

---

**Fifth Report of Session 2004–05**

*Volume I*

*Report, together with formal minutes*

*Ordered by The House of Commons  
to be printed Wednesday 16 March 2005*

**HC 84-I**  
Published on Tuesday 5 April 2005  
by authority of the House of Commons  
London: The Stationery Office Limited  
£12.00

## The Environmental Audit Committee

The Environmental Audit Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to consider to what extent the policies and programmes of government departments and non-departmental public bodies contribute to environmental protection and sustainable development; to audit their performance against such targets as may be set for them by Her Majesty's Ministers; and to report thereon to the House.

### Current membership

Mr Peter Ainsworth MP (*Conservative, East Surrey*) (Chairman)  
Mr Gregory Barker MP (*Conservative, Bexhill and Battle*)  
Mr Harold Best MP (*Labour, Leeds North West*)  
Mr Colin Challen MP (*Labour, Morley and Rothwell*)  
Mr David Chaytor MP (*Labour, Bury North*)  
Mrs Helen Clark MP (*Labour, Peterborough*)  
Sue Doughty MP (*Liberal Democrat, Guildford*)  
Mr Paul Flynn MP (*Labour, Newport West*)  
Mr Mark Francois MP (*Conservative, Rayleigh*)  
Mr John Horam MP (*Conservative, Orpington*)  
Mr John McWilliam MP (*Labour, Blaydon*)  
Mr Elliot Morley MP (*Labour, Scunthorpe*)  
Mr Malcolm Savidge MP (*Labour, Aberdeen North*)  
Mr Simon Thomas MP (*Plaid Cymru, Ceredigion*)  
Joan Walley MP (*Labour, Stoke-on-Trent North*)  
David Wright MP (*Labour, Telford*)

### Powers

The constitution and powers are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally Standing Order No. 152A. These are available on the Internet via [www.parliament.uk](http://www.parliament.uk).

### Publication

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the Internet at: [www.parliament.uk/parliamentary\\_committees/environmental\\_audit\\_committee.cfm](http://www.parliament.uk/parliamentary_committees/environmental_audit_committee.cfm).

A list of Reports of the Committee in the present Parliament is at the back of this volume.

### Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are: Mike Hennessy (Clerk); Lynne Spiers (Second Clerk); Eric Lewis (Committee Specialist); Elena Ares (Committee Specialist); Louise Combs (Committee Assistant); Caroline McElwee (Secretary); and Robert Long (Senior Office Clerk).

### Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to The Clerk, Environmental Audit Committee, Committee Office, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA. The telephone number for general inquiries is: 020 7219 6150; the Committee's e-mail address is: [eacom@parliament.uk](mailto:eacom@parliament.uk)

### References

In the footnotes of this Report, references to oral evidence are indicated by 'Q' followed by the question number. References to written evidence are indicated by page number as in 'Ev12'. number HC \*-II

'App' refers to written evidence printed in Volume II, serial number HC 84-II

# Contents

---

<b>Report</b>	<i>Page</i>
<b>Conclusions and recommendations</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>8</b>
The Scope of the Inquiry	8
<b>2 Do we need to be educated about Sustainable Development?</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3 Education for Sustainable Development</b>	<b>12</b>
Education for Sustainable Development—gaining ground	13
Education for Sustainable Development—losing ground	14
Is the Government getting the ESD message across to the public?	15
<b>4 ESD in Schools</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Sustainable Development Action Plan</b>	<b>17</b>
Who knows about the SDAP and how successful has it been?	19
Leadership	22
<b>The Tomlinson Report and the White Paper</b>	<b>24</b>
Unrealistic expectations	25
The 14-19 Education and Skills White Paper	26
<b>ESD and the National Curriculum</b>	<b>27</b>
Has ESD been embedded in the National Curriculum?	29
Teachers' time and the reliance on Websites	30
Ofsted Inspections and a comparison with Wales	31
Out of Classroom learning	33
<b>Resources</b>	<b>35</b>
The Landfill Tax Credit Scheme (LTCS)	36
The Environmental Action Fund (EAF)	37
A game of pass the parcel	38
ESD: a comparison with Sport and Music	40
A long-term strategy	40
<b>UK Sustainable Development Strategy</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Endnote</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Formal minutes</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Witnesses</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>List of written evidence</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Past reports from the Environmental Audit Committee since 1997</b>	<b>52</b>



## Conclusions and recommendations

---

1. Ignorance of an individual's role in contributing damage to the environment, such as negative bio-diversity impacts, unsustainable use of natural resources and climate change, is inexcusable and frankly dangerous. The longer the status quo prevails the more frightening the message becomes and the more threatening, to the modern western way of life, the solutions will appear (Paragraph 10)
2. It is important for the Prime Minister to show leadership with regard to the need for sustainable development if the effects of climate change and other environmental impacts are to be tackled. It is vital, however, that all parts of the Government are equally committed. (Paragraph 11)
3. The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) and the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) have a crucial role to play in helping us understand, and promoting, Sustainable Development. The Prime Minister's vision of the threat of climate change, and in particular the urgency he expressed about taking positive action to deal with this threat, must be reflected in those Departments' actions and not just their rhetoric. (Paragraph 12)
4. Whilst we have reservations about the inappropriate use and, indeed, over-use of the term "sustainability", we have to conclude that what holds back the progress of education in environmental matters is not really a problem with the terminology, whether it be Sustainable Development, Education for Sustainable Development, Environmental Education or something else, but rather its application, and the fundamental lack of commitment to the basic principle on the part of those with responsibility for promoting it and educating us about it. (Paragraph 23)
5. The consensus amongst those who have contributed to this inquiry, a consensus with which we would agree, is that the Government is failing to get the ESD message across to the general public. (Paragraph 24)
6. Defra still has much to do to get the Sustainable Development message across to the public. Having made a positive start by commissioning research in this area it is important that Defra now puts the lessons learned from this research into practice, not only within Defra but across Government. (Paragraph 26)
7. The National Museum of Science and Industry, whilst relatively new to the ESD scene, has shown commitment and innovation in its approach to ESD and should be congratulated on its progress so far. Defra and DCMS should work with the Museum to see how its experience could be shared with museums across England (Paragraph 29)
8. It is clear that the most positive signs of achievement against the SDAP, as opposed to "activity" which is not the same thing at all, can be found in relation to Objectives Two, Three and Four. Whilst we welcome this progress, and commend DfES on these initial achievements, we cannot help but draw attention to what can only be seen as a very serious failing of Objective One of the SDAP – education for sustainable development. (Paragraph 37)

9. What we found during the course of this inquiry was that it was impossible to judge with any certainty just how widely known the SDAP was outside of the NGO sector in England. This is because there is absolutely no way of knowing who has seen the SDAP and who is actually doing anything to achieve the objectives of the Plan. (Paragraph 38)
10. DfES must review the way in which it communicates key strategic documents, such as the Sustainable Development Action Plan, to those in the Department who need to know about it and who may well have responsibility for delivering parts of the Plan. (Paragraph 45)
11. The absence of any system for measurement of progress against the SDAP is a significant failing and threatens the credibility of the Plan itself. This is a critical error on the part of DfES and must be reviewed by the department as a matter of some urgency. (Paragraph 47)
12. The lack of leadership from DfES in particular has been a constant theme throughout the course of this inquiry. The fact that the new Secretary of State for Education and Skills, the Rt. Hon Ruth Kelly MP, has decided not to continue to act as Green Minister, as her predecessor did, is disappointing and serves only to emphasise the lack of priority given to this issue in DfES. (Paragraph 50)
13. DfES and Defra should consider how it fills the gap left by the demise of the Government's Sustainable Development Education Panel, to provide a central home for important conceptual thinking on ESD and thereby help to provide a strategic dimension to the work of DfES. (Paragraph 52)
14. What we found, however, was a total absence of ESD in the Tomlinson Report, despite ESD being recommended to the Working Group as a "key cross-cutting theme" by many of those who responded to the consultation. (Paragraph 55)
15. Whilst the Tomlinson Report may well have provided an opportunity for ESD to be somehow "hooked on" to the various references in the Report to vocational and skills training, the Report itself falls far short of expectations. When introducing the Sustainable Development Action Plan, the Rt. Hon Charles Clarke MP was quite clear that sustainable development should no longer be a "bureaucratic add-on" but this is exactly what the Tomlinson Report consigns it to being. (Paragraph 60)
16. Whether intentionally or not, as a result of poor communication, deliberate omission or ignorance on the part of those who set the remit for the Tomlinson Working Group, ESD was not considered by the Group. (Paragraph 63)
17. Both the Tomlinson Report and the 14-19 Education and Skills White Paper have failed to recognise Education for Sustainable Development as a priority. As an indication of the way in which ESD is viewed by DfES this omission cannot be ignored. The implications for any progress to be made in moving ESD forward in any meaningful way have been significantly reduced as a result. (Paragraph 66)
18. It is clear to us that, for far too many schools, ESD is either not known about or is judged to be a low priority. (Paragraph 72)

19. It seems increasingly clear to us that DfES is able to be much more focused on developing schools which aspire to be designed, built and managed sustainably, but is unable, or perhaps unwilling, to make the same commitment to teaching pupils about Education for Sustainable Development. (Paragraph 75)
20. The best that can be said about the integration of ESD into the National Curriculum is that it is “patchy”. This represents a failure of DfES policy so far (Paragraph 77)
21. Switching the method of dissemination and communication of important information from hard to electronic copy might be better environmentally, and may also prevent teaching staff being overwhelmed with paper, but it does not address some fundamental issues. Whether hard or electronic copy, the information still has to be accessed, read and then, in some cases, actioned by teaching staff who have no greater amount of time to devote to this than previously. Combine this with the fact that, as it currently stands, there is no real priority attached to ESD, nor is it an aspect of the curriculum against which teachers and schools are judged, and it is little wonder that we have so very few schools that are aware of the SDAP, or that teachers are not comfortable teaching ESD. (Paragraph 80)
22. The difference between ESD and citizenship is marked and we are left to ponder what the deciding factor is here. Is it the case that ESD is not high profile enough, not distinct enough as a subject, to merit Ofsted inspection? Or is it low priority and indistinct exactly because it is not inspected? In fact, it is a combination of both, a vicious circle which is unlikely to be broken until DfES takes the decision to attribute sufficient status to ESD and to request that Ofsted include it in its inspection framework (Paragraph 84)
23. We are not persuaded that an inspection based on a system of self-evaluation, which allows schools to decide whether or not to include material on ESD is any kind of improvement. We have already heard that very few schools attach priority to ESD and we cannot see this new system changing that fact. Unless ESD is made a mandatory part of the self-evaluation conducted by schools we see little value in the system. (Paragraph 86)
24. It is, in part, a fear of litigation, but also a lack of training and experience on the part of teaching staff, which dictates whether or not a class will venture outside of the classroom. An overcrowded curriculum, and the perception that ESD is a low priority for schools, serves to stifle any remaining urges to decant from the classroom. (Paragraph 92)
25. We welcome the appointment of Dr Jake Reynolds as Senior Adviser and look forward to seeing what progress he can make on implementing the Sustainable Development Action Plan. One of his first tasks must surely be to ensure that the SDAP is properly monitored, evaluated and reported on (Paragraph 105)
26. It is regrettable that DfES has failed so completely to understand or accept the extent of the funding crisis in the ESD sector and even now continues to turn a blind eye to it. DfES must show leadership and work quickly to contain the damage already done by developing a national strategy to provide effective long-term funding to ensure that there is sufficient and continued support for ESD at all levels. (Paragraph 106)

27. Given the lack of understanding of the complexities of Sustainable Development, which we are told is prevalent in so many schools, we are interested to know what additional training school governors and managers are to receive to help them make informed decisions with regard to what ESD support they buy in to the school. (Paragraph 108)
28. If the Government is serious about climate change and about protecting and enhancing the environment, then it also has to be serious and realistic about the levels of funding for ESD. (Paragraph 111)
29. Unless and until there is a strategic review of the way in which ESD is perceived and prioritised within government, and within DfES in particular, so that there is a coherent, long-term plan for progressing ESD, it is likely that what little funds are allocated to ESD will not be used to best effect. To increase funding without this review and commitment would be unwise and counter-productive. We look forward to hearing from the Parliamentary Under Secretary for Schools, Derek Twigg MP in the very near future and once he has had time to deliberate on the ESD funding crisis. (Paragraph 114)
30. DfES, in reviewing both its commitment to ESD and the SDAP, should make full use of the wide range of expertise offered by the NGOs to help create a coherent framework for their work, thereby ensuring consistency of approach throughout the education sector. (Paragraph 115)
31. We accept that some of the initiatives and programmes of work referred to in the Strategy are new and will need time to bed down before any serious analysis of their worth can be conducted. We hope that our successor Committee will return to the subject of Education for Sustainable Development during 2006 and this will be one of the key areas of that inquiry. (Paragraph 121)
32. It is unclear why there is a delay in the development of the ESD indicator, more than twelve months after we raised the issue with the Secretary of State in DfES. We are left to speculate on whether it is yet another example of the low priority afforded to ESD, or whether it is an indication that Defra and DfES simply don't know what to do with it. Whatever the reason for the delay, it is extremely disappointing and we would urge Defra and DfES to agree a suitable indicator as soon as possible. (Paragraph 122)
33. It is in regard to ESD in formal education, perhaps more than anywhere else in the Strategy, that the Prime Minister's "moratorium on further words", requested in his preface to the new Strategy, is most needed. What is important now is focused action, not more rhetoric. (Paragraph 124)
34. It is now clear that the Prime Minister's sense of urgency about the threat of climate change, and his commitment to do something about it, is not matched by the actions of the Department for Education and Skills. DfES has failed to ensure sufficient funds for ESD, has lost the impetus that led to the creation of the Sustainable Development Action Plan and continues to treat ESD as a "bureaucratic add-on", and a low priority one at that. We are deeply concerned about this failure and look



to the Prime Minister, if necessary, to ensure that DfES moves ahead and gives ESD the financial and policy priority that it needs. (Paragraph 128)

# 1 Introduction

---

## The Scope of the Inquiry

1. On 1<sup>st</sup> November 2004, we announced our intention to appoint a Sub-committee on Environmental Education which would hold a follow-up investigation into an earlier inquiry undertaken by us, entitled *Learning the Sustainability Lesson*<sup>1</sup>. The Sub-committee on Environmental Education was established on 17<sup>th</sup> November 2004 and began taking evidence on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2004.

2. In our press release, we expressed a desire to hear responses to the following questions:

- Has the term Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) lost its currency? Does it have any resonance with the general public? Has the environmental message been lost?
- The DfES said in 2003 that the Sustainable Development Action Plan was supposed to signal the start of a process of change, identifying the most powerful levers – what can be achieved immediately and what can be built upon. More than a year on, can it be said that that process of change has begun and have there been any immediate achievements?
- Government is currently reviewing the UK Sustainable Development Strategy. What should the Strategy include in order to significantly strengthen the role of learning within it?
- Does the 14-19 Working Group’s report, “*14-19 Curriculum and Qualifications Reform*”, go far enough? Will ESD be adequately represented if this report is used as the basis for the forthcoming White Paper? What must be included in the White Paper if progress is to be made to fully integrate ESD into all aspects of learning, formal and informal?
- In response to our last inquiry the DfES said they recognised that more could be done to embed ESD in the school curriculum and that they would lead on strengthening ESD links within geography, design and technology, science and citizenship. Has there been any discernible improvement in these areas? Is there evidence that this work has been taken forward by the DfES and its agencies?
- The role of informal learning, including youth work, work-based learning and adult and community learning, in taking the environmental education agenda forward is key. Is the Government doing enough in these crucial areas?
- Is there any evidence to suggest that the Government, through its stewardship of education, is getting better at getting the environmental message across to the general public? And is there any evidence to suggest that sufficient work is being done at regional and local levels to support environmental education?

---

1 Environmental Audit Committee, Tenth Report of Session 2002-03, *Learning the Sustainability Lesson*, HC472

- Are there sufficient resources available to deliver the Government's commitment for sustainable development?

3. Seventy-five memoranda were received, some of which were supplementary to evidence sessions. Oral evidence was heard from fifteen individuals or organisations, including Derek Twigg MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Schools, Department for Education and Skills (DfES) in his first appearance before a Commons Select Committee. We are grateful for all the evidence given to the Sub-committee during this inquiry. In particular, we would like to thank our Special Adviser, Libby Grundy MBE, Director of the Council for Environmental Education (CEE), for her assistance.

4. We had looked forward to returning to the subject of environmental education. The DfES' response to our first inquiry had been very positive, with the Rt. Hon Charles Clarke MP, then Secretary of State for Education and Skills, taking a personal interest in taking forward Education for Sustainable Development. The creation of the DfES Sustainable Development Action Plan (SDAP) was a direct result of our first report and we were eager to see what impact the Plan had made in the intervening period. The UK Sustainable Development Strategy was also being reviewed, with a revised Strategy due to be published around March 2005. This year (2005) also marks the start of the UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development. The time was right, we felt, to revisit this subject and evaluate the progress being made.

5. However, what became clear over the course of this inquiry was that our expectations had been too high and our optimism premature. Whilst we found some excellent pockets of progress, and certainly evidence of increased activity, the overall picture was patchy and disappointing. The question of whether or not our expectations had been unrealistically high, with regard to the SDAP in particular, we will return to later in this report. Of more immediate concern, however, was the worrying degree of disagreement, whether openly expressed or unknowingly implied, about the value of ESD and the priority it should be given by DfES in general and in the curriculum in particular. We heard from a few witnesses who quite clearly thought it unreasonable and unrealistic for us to expect ESD to have featured in the Tomlinson Working Group's final report, "*14-19 Curriculum and Qualifications Reform*",<sup>2</sup> (hereafter the Tomlinson Report). Similarly, we were told there was no reason why ESD should be included in the forthcoming DfES White Paper, to any greater degree than any other single subject; and as for expecting priority to be given to ESD as a classroom subject, this was, it seems, another naïve assumption. This is a fundamental issue and therefore we have decided to begin this report by asking the question, "Do we need to be educated about Sustainable Development?"

---

2 "*14-19 Curriculum and Qualifications Reform*", published 18 October 2004

## 2 Do we need to be educated about Sustainable Development?

---

“What is now plain is that the emission of greenhouse gases, associated with industrialisation and strong economic growth from a world population that has increased six-fold in 200 years, is causing global warming at a rate that began as significant, has become alarming and is simply unsustainable in the long-term. And by long-term I do not mean centuries ahead. I mean within the lifetime of my children certainly; and possibly within my own. And by unsustainable, I do not mean a phenomenon causing problems of adjustment. I mean a challenge so far-reaching in its impact and irreversible in its destructive power, that it alters radically human existence [...] no one nation alone can solve it. It has no definable boundaries. Short of international action commonly agreed and commonly followed through, it is hard for even a large country to make a difference on its own [...] there is no doubt that the time to act is now. It is now that timely action can avert disaster. It is now that with foresight and will such action can be taken without disturbing the essence of our way of life, by adjusting behaviour, not altering it entirely.”<sup>3</sup>

Rt. Hon Tony Blair MP, Prime Minister, London September 2004

6. The Prime Minister used this grave language to describe climate change and the threat it poses to human existence when he spoke at a meeting in London in September 2004. He spoke, quite rightly, of it being a global issue, impossible to solve without the commitment of developed and developing nations alike. Later in his speech the Prime Minister also brought the issue down to the more personal and individual level and talked about communities needing to make the links between their actions locally and how that fits into the national and more strategic level. These are all sentiments with which we would agree.

7. Whether one believes that there is still time to “solve”, and perhaps even reverse the damage already caused by climate change, or whether, in fact, one believes that we have run out of time so that any action we take now can only limit the damage, there can be no doubt that it is going to take the combined efforts of everyone to effect the kind of changes to behaviour that may be needed if the problem of climate change is to be addressed. Inevitably, many of the decisions about how to respond to climate change will be taken at a national and international level. Individuals cannot singly decide what targets should be set for reducing the UK’s greenhouse gas emissions, for example, or how many billions should be spent developing renewable energy sources. Whilst those decisions will be taken by the Government of the day, it does not mean that the individual does not have a very important role to play.

8. To date, however, the urgent need to tackle those actions and activities which result in climate change, has not been made sufficiently clear and occupies a precarious position in public consciousness. Whilst many people can now recognise that the unusual weather conditions, such as the heat waves of the summer of 2003 and the widespread flooding

experienced, not just in the UK but across Europe, in the last few years, has something to do with global warming and climate change, only a small number of people will be able to connect these events with the way in which they live their daily lives. In oral evidence to us, Mr Glenn Strachen, Programme Manager for PP4SD,<sup>4</sup> illustrated this point very well when he said:

“People are encouraged to recycle but how often are they informed about the whole loop? They might be told that they are preventing things from going to landfill but what about the energy they are saving in glass production if they recycle their bottles and jars and what is the knock on effect with climate change for that?”<sup>5</sup>

9. That all-important link that the Prime Minister talked about between the actions of the individual and those at the national and strategic level is simply not there yet. Most people in the West live in a comfort zone and as long as they remain, some might argue deliberately, ignorant of the connection between the kind of cars they drive, the low-cost holiday flights that they take and the fuel that they burn and the long-term and possibly irreversible damage to the planet that is happening as a direct result of those actions, there is little hope of real progress.

**10. Ignorance of an individual’s role in contributing damage to the environment, such as negative bio-diversity impacts, unsustainable use of natural resources and climate change, is inexcusable and frankly dangerous. The longer the *status quo* prevails the more frightening the message becomes and the more threatening, to the modern western way of life, the solutions will appear.** Already there is the danger that the “problem” of climate change is perceived as just too big for one person, or even one nation, to do anything about, thereby providing an alibi for those unwilling to consider alternatives. Education for Sustainable Development therefore is essential if people are firstly to understand and accept why the Government might have to agree to what may be significant changes to the way the country operates on an international and business level; and, secondly, if people are to understand and agree to make, as individuals, the kinds of behavioural changes necessary on a personal level to make the whole thing work. Informed choices can only be made by people who understand the options and the issues and know the cost of whichever course of action is decided upon.

**11. It is important for the Prime Minister to show leadership with regard to the need for sustainable development if the effects of climate change and other environmental impacts are to be tackled. It is vital, however, that all parts of the Government are equally committed.** Under the UK Sustainable Development Strategy, which is a cross-government document, every Department has responsibilities towards Sustainable Development. For the purposes of this inquiry we have dealt largely with two Government Departments, the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra). DfES has responsibility for Education for Sustainable Development in relation to the education system itself. Defra, however, actually has a Public Service Agreement (PSA) target which relates to Sustainable

---

4 Professional Practice for Sustainable Development

5 Q171

Development. Its PSA target 1 is, “to promote sustainable development across Government and in the UK and internationally”.

**12. The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) and the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) have a crucial role to play in helping us understand, and promoting, Sustainable Development. The Prime Minister’s vision of the threat of climate change, and in particular the urgency he expressed about taking positive action to deal with this threat, must be reflected in those Departments’ actions and not just their rhetoric.**

## 3 Education for Sustainable Development

---

13. When we launched this inquiry we asked whether the term Education for Sustainable Development had lost its currency, whether it had any resonance with the general public and whether the environmental message within it had been lost. In retrospect, and after looking at the evidence we received it is clear that the issue is bigger than that. First, we must try to establish whether, purely as a term, ESD means anything to anyone, outside of those professionals who inhabit the ESD sector; second, and in our view more importantly, we must assess whether, although the term itself might not be known, the underlying concept of sustainable development is actually understood and is helping to change people’s behaviour.

14. The memoranda we received largely fell into two groups. The first group argued that ESD was still gaining currency and still had relevance. They conceded that there might be issues around definition and cohesion but still argued that ESD was a relevant and growing phenomenon. The second group argued that the term was losing currency, was largely unrecognised by the general public and that the environmental message had been lost. In fact, in this group, there were also those who felt that ESD had never had any currency to begin with. It was also clear that progress in ESD varied quite significantly and was dependent on a number of factors, such as the strength of the commitment from the relevant government department, the funding available to the ESD NGOs working in a particular area, the accessibility of the many and varied target audiences and the methods used to communicate with them

15. There are very few statistics to rely on which indicate exactly how many people, whether in formal or informal education, in the workplace or at home, have a sense of what sustainable development means. Recent research carried out by Andrew Darnton for Defra, entitled “The Impact of Sustainable Development on Public Behaviour”,<sup>6</sup> revealed that only 28% of those questioned had heard of the term “sustainable development”. It was no more encouraging when this 28% were asked to explain what they understood the term to mean. Some 16% said sustainable development related to ‘development which does not harm the environment’; a further 11% said it related to ‘using renewable resources’. Most discouraging of all perhaps was that 20% of those who said that they had heard of the term could not offer any explanation of what it meant.

## Education for Sustainable Development—gaining ground

16. Most of those who argued that ESD was a relevant term which was still gaining currency, also conceded that it was, inevitably, a slow process. In its written evidence, PP4SD (Professional Practice for Sustainable Development Project) said that “the term ESD is still increasing its currency and is now recognised beyond the formal education sector in areas such as CPD and lifelong learning. It has yet to gain real resonance with the general public, but that is not surprising. The term is still relatively new.”<sup>7</sup> Perhaps more significant is the progress PP4SD says it has seen in the private sector and with professional bodies like the Institute of Chartered Accountants for England and Wales, the British Institute of Agricultural Engineers, the Royal Institute of British Architects and a number of others. It reports:

“Awareness of sustainable development has grown in both the public and private sector. This awareness has led to a demand from professionals for training on the implementation of sustainable development, across a wide range of sectors. There has been a shift in the approach of the private sector towards sustainable development with the increase in corporate social responsibility (CSR). Similarly in the professional institutions there is a move through the Society for the Environment for a range of professions to come together to adopt an integrated, systems approach to sustainable development.”

17. The PP4SD analysis of progress in the private and professional sectors was borne out by the evidence we received from CITB Construction Skills, which also reported “an increase in the awareness of the need for learning around the issues of sustainable development”<sup>8</sup> in the construction industry. Whilst previous inquiries, such as our recent inquiry, *Housing: Building a Sustainable Future*,<sup>9</sup> might lead us to exercise caution about the exact level of progress in certain parts of the construction industry in particular, we welcome the positive signs of growing awareness of ESD in those areas.

18. In its written evidence, Forum for the Future said that the term had not lost currency but rather was “still lacking in coherent meaning” and it went on to say, “the general public know instinctively that ‘something must be done’”.<sup>10</sup> When we asked for clarification on this statement during oral evidence session, Dr Andy Johnstone, Head of Education and Learning at Forum for the Future, said that the general public this referred to was actually the staff and pupils it dealt with in the post-16 and Higher Education sector. In support of this, Dr Johnstone said,

“We hardly ever [...] come across anybody who does not think that sustainable development in its broadest sense is a good idea and something which everyone should sign up for. We are not coming across resistance in that sense, so that leads us to believe that time spent exhorting people or persuading people is actually wasted

---

7 Ev33

8 Ev154

9 Environmental Audit Committee, First Report of Session 2004-05, *Housing: Building a Sustainable Future*, HC135-1

10 Ev24

really. What people are looking for is a way of finding out how it is that they can actually make a contribution themselves. They need to be shown that.”<sup>11</sup>

19. There is, however, the danger that it may simply be that some NGOs are so used to their subject area, and deal largely with people who already have some level of interest, that their perception is perhaps skewed and they assume a level of understanding on the part of the general public that is simply not there. This would certainly more adequately explain the miserable results identified in the Darnton research results.

## Education for Sustainable Development—losing ground

20. The majority of those who believe that ESD as a term is either losing currency or had none to begin with attribute the blame for this to a number of different problems. There are those who believe that the term is confusing, has been used for too many competing things and lacks definition. RSPB’s written evidence explains why it believes the gains made at the Rio Earth Summit in 1992 have been lost. It states:

“Much of this lack of success can be laid at the door of confusing terminology. There does not appear to be a single cross governmental definition of sustainable development and there remains much ambiguity. For instance, within the Regional Development Agency network, sustainable development appears to principally mean ‘economic sustainable development’ and it appears that Government has down-played the environmental dimension. Amongst young people, there has been a decline in environmental concern as measured by opinion pollsters, which leads to the inevitable conclusion that, sustainable development and the environmental messages within it are not permeating the public consciousness.”<sup>12</sup>

21. Similarly, in its written evidence, ENCAMS also said that the sustainable development message had been lost and it went on to give two reasons for this, “firstly the over-use of the word “sustainable” and secondly the wide scope ascribed to the term “sustainable development” makes it difficult for the general public to relate to.”<sup>13</sup> This touches on an issue raised by others in this inquiry, which is that to many people development suggests growth and so they are confused when they see the word development in connection with something which, in fact, might be imposing limits on their behaviour.

22. Probably the most vigorous denouncement of the term ESD and its currency was offered by Mr Trewin Restorick, Director, Global Action Plan (GAP), in his oral evidence to us. He said:

“If education for sustainable development has lost its currency, you could ask did it ever have a currency in the first place to lose? It does not have any resonance with the general public, we feel, and the environmental message has been lost. We can back those claims up in a number of ways. Sustainable development is such a

---

11 Q106

12 Ev226

13 Ev172



nebulous term that there are many escape routes that people can charge down to avoid the full environmental implications of the message. We have sustainable airport policies or various other policies which are claimed to be sustainable development policies and it is questionable whether they are, because of the financial component. Because there is a lack of political will behind the whole thing, people charge down the escape routes.”<sup>14</sup>

23. The question of whether or not the Government is providing sufficient leadership in promoting Sustainable Development is, we believe, the crux of the matter. **Whilst we have reservations about the inappropriate use and, indeed, over-use of the term “sustainability”, we have to conclude that what holds back the progress of education in environmental matters is not really a problem with the terminology, whether it be Sustainable Development, Education for Sustainable Development, Environmental Education or something else, but rather its application, and the fundamental lack of commitment to the basic principle on the part of those with responsibility for promoting it and educating us about it.**

### Is the Government getting the ESD message across to the public?

24. **The consensus amongst those who have contributed to this inquiry, a consensus with which we would agree, is that the Government is failing to get the ESD message across to the general public.** We have already highlighted the very complex nature of Sustainable Development. We must also acknowledge the considerable task of getting the sustainable development message out to a majority of the population who are no longer in formal education but who still have to be able to make informed decisions about the way in which they live and the impact that has on the environment. It is the adults among us who have to make the key decisions about what type of housing or car to buy, how many holidays to take and how to get there, what luxuries to buy and how to spend leisure time. However, it is clear from the evidence we have seen, and which has been reinforced by the Darnton research for Defra, that very few people are actually aware of what their own environmental impact is.

25. In its original written evidence DfES acknowledged the difficulty of this task and recognised that there is work still to be done on the part of the Government. Defra, the department with the lead responsibility for promoting sustainable development across Government and the UK, has also conceded that there is more to be done. To this end it sponsored three separate research projects to look at the communication of sustainable development, to which we were originally alerted by written evidence provided by Forum for the Future.<sup>15</sup> As an alternative to a reliance on individual campaigns, this research identified a number of points thought to be key in any attempt to communicate sustainable development. They are:

- If you want to change a behaviour, target that behaviour (and persist);
- ‘Linear’ communication and information campaigns are least effective;

---

14 Q178

15 Ev25, Ev26

- Government can influence markets, product/service standards and lead by example, for example through procurement strategies;
- Government policies send important signals to consumers. Inconsistency between policies undermines value;
- Make links across Government goals and policies;
- Don't assume that information leads to awareness or awareness to action;
- Communicate creatively;
- Use networks.

26. We could find little to argue with in this list, although clearly it is an aspiration at the moment and not representative of the way in which Defra currently communicates the message. **Defra still has much to do to get the Sustainable Development message across to the public. Having made a positive start by commissioning research in this area it is important that Defra now puts the lessons learned from this research into practice, not only within Defra but across Government.**

27. Of course, Defra is not alone in trying to promote ESD. There is a number of NGOs, some of whom are working with Defra, active in this area and have a positive story to tell. Both the Carbon Trust and the Energy Savings Trust have media campaigns currently running which are aimed at highlighting the causes of climate change and pointing to some of the ways in which individuals can make a difference. This is reaching a national audience and these and similarly focused campaigns must surely be the way forward, particularly given the increased media coverage likely to be given to the environment in general, and climate change more specifically this year, as a result of the UK's Presidency of the G8 and the EU and the Prime Minister's focus on those issues.

28. We were also very fortunate to be able to take evidence from representatives from the National Museum of Science and Industry, Mr Ben Gammon and Ms Rebecca Dawson. Ms Dawson, Executive Assistant, NMSI Masterplanning and Sustainable Development, said that the Museum had recognised that ESD was a complex issue, and explained the Museum's approach as follows:

“just throwing the term out at people does strike them dumb in a lot of ways and makes it really difficult, but if you can give them a hook then you can draw them into a wider arena and a broader understanding and that, from our experience, is a much better way to get people to understand about this big term [...] it is a way of thinking and [...] we talk about it as being a tool to help in the decision making process.”<sup>16</sup>

29. The Museum, and those affiliated to it,<sup>17</sup> have established a number of projects and initiatives designed to inform the adult population about sustainable development and related issues, such as *The Energy Gallery* and the Dana Centre at the Science Museum in

---

16 Q55

17 Science Museum in London and Wroughton, the National Railway Museum in York, the National Museum of Photography, Film & Television in Bradford and Locomotion: The National Railway Museum in Shildon, Co. Durham

London. **The National Museum of Science and Industry, whilst relatively new to the ESD scene, has shown commitment and innovation in its approach to ESD and should be congratulated on its progress so far. Defra and DCMS should work with the Museum to see how its experience could be shared with museums across England.**

## 4 ESD in Schools

---

30. It is surely through the education system that we have the best possible opportunity to educate today's children, and future generations, about the need for sustainable development and, more importantly, how to achieve it. The role of the education system, and its ability to catch children early is, in fact, going to be absolutely vital if, as we believe, the concept of Sustainable Development is simply not registering with the general public, and if there is no discernible change in behaviour to meet the challenge of climate change as described by the Prime Minister.

31. DfES already has the tools which should enable it to assume this responsibility and deliver ESD. There is the overarching, cross-Government, UK Sustainable Development Strategy, which we will discuss at the end of this report, the DfES' own Sustainable Development Action Plan, and the National Curriculum. In addition, it can also call on the expertise of a very experienced and passionate NGO network, already working within the ESD sector; and then there is the real advantage DfES has, one which is not enjoyed by Defra, for example, the advantage of a captive audience.

## Sustainable Development Action Plan

---

32. The DfES Sustainable Development Action Plan (SDAP) was published in September 2003. In the foreword to the SDAP, the then Secretary of State for Education, the Rt. Hon Charles Clarke MP, said,

“We have theorised about sustainable development in education for long enough. That is why this is not a strategy but a plan of action. We need to embrace sustainable development across the education system so that best practice becomes common practice. Not as a bureaucratic add-on but as an integral part of the skills development of this country.”<sup>18</sup>

The SDAP contains four objectives:

- Objective 1 - education for sustainable development
  - Objective 2 - the environmental impact of the DfES and its partner bodies
  - Objective 3 - the environmental impact of the education estate
-

Objective 4 - local and global partnership activity

We were very pleased to hear that an SDAP was to be published in September 2003, believing it would represent a significant step forward for DfES. We were also very encouraged to see the commitment and energy for ESD implicit in the then Secretary of State's foreword. We therefore looked forward to seeing what progress had been made in the intervening months against the four objectives.

33. In its written evidence DfES said that the process of change had begun and that since the Plan had been published "much had been achieved against the objectives".<sup>19</sup> The memoranda went on to list eight of the achievements it attributes to the SDAP.<sup>20</sup> Of those eight achievements, three related to the sustainability of the school infrastructure; school buildings (Building Schools for the Future), school transport (the Schools Transport Bill) and the general health of pupils (Healthy Living Blueprint) were all mentioned. A fourth achievement listed was the fact that DfES was getting its "own house" in order and was achieving "more than 90% success in recycling out of date publications and passing IT equipment on to schools and charities".<sup>21</sup> Indeed, during the course of the inquiry when we received any positive feedback about the SDAP it was invariably in relation to these types of initiatives, the projects that look after the external factors relating to schools and which relate largely to Objectives Two and Three. For example, in its oral evidence FEES (Finance and Education Services) was very positive about the Building Schools for the Future project and the efforts being made by the DfES team to maintain what is a huge project.<sup>22</sup> Similarly, RSPB also commended DfES for its progress against Objectives Two and Three.<sup>23</sup>

34. Of the remaining four achievements listed by DfES, one referred to the creation of the Global Gateway, a website intended to "enable people involved in education across the world to engage in creative partnerships",<sup>24</sup> clearly an achievement against Objective Four. The list also referred to the creation of the online "toolkit", "Learning to Last", for the Further Education sector and the inclusion of ESD into the study materials offered by the National College of School Leadership, both of which could probably be classed as achievements against Objective One. Given the very low point from which the SDAP began, these achievements must all be seen as very positive steps forward.

35. However, it is about progress against Objective One that we remain most concerned at this stage. The first achievement listed by DfES in its memorandum is actually more of a general statement about how much it says has been done to raise the profile of ESD in schools. It states:

---

19 Ev120

20 Ev120

21 Ev120

22 Q453-454

23 Ev226

24 Ev120

“Much has been done to raise the profile of ESD in schools, to ensure that young learners experience ESD and engage with this at a local level, whilst appreciating the more global aspects also, and where they fit in the ‘bigger picture’.”<sup>25</sup>

This is a view of progress against Objective One which is flatly contradicted by many of those who contributed to this inquiry and which we have already explored to a small extent earlier in this report. In its written evidence, Ofsted stated that, “generally, ESD is not seen as a priority in the drive towards school improvement. Much of the guidance and information being provided to schools has no, or at best, very little reference to ESD”.<sup>26</sup>

36. In its written evidence, RSPB was also concerned about the lack of progress in Objective One. It said:

“The RSPB is rather more critical of the implementation of Objective 1 – Education for Sustainable Development. Actions such as the development of the Growing Schools network, the new framework for schools and the QCA website on ESD are all praiseworthy but appear rather fragmented. Little progress appears to have been made with promoting sustainable development with some of the key agencies such as OFSTED, the Teacher Training Agency and the National College for School Leadership. The RSPB believes that these agencies are critical to the delivery of the Action Plan.”<sup>27</sup>

**37. It is clear that the most positive signs of achievement against the SDAP, as opposed to “activity” which is not the same thing at all, can be found in relation to Objectives Two, Three and Four. Whilst we welcome this progress, and commend DfES on these initial achievements, we cannot help but draw attention to what can only be seen as a very serious failing of Objective One of the SDAP – education for sustainable development.**

### **Who knows about the SDAP and how successful has it been?**

38. We found that the SDAP was widely known throughout the NGO sector. We fully expected that a plan developed by DfES and designed to help achieve four objectives highly relevant to the education sector would be just as well-known in every school and education establishment in England. In fact, **what we found during the course of this inquiry was that it was impossible to judge with any certainty just how widely known the SDAP was outside of the NGO sector in England. This is because there is absolutely no way of knowing who has seen the SDAP and who is actually doing anything to achieve the objectives of the Plan.**

39. In its written evidence, the Development Education Project, Manchester <sup>28</sup> was very positive about the fact that the SDAP existed at all but was able perfectly to illustrate a significant problem with how the SDAP was actually communicated to educators. It said:

---

25 Ev120

26 Ev91

27 Ev227

28 Ev163

“The main achievement was in getting the Action Plan produced so soon after the EAC enquiry and covering the four key areas that it did, plus making clear who should be involved in each part of it. However, though it said that there has been enough talk and the plan will be about action, this has not been seen on the ground. The Plan itself obtained very little publicity beyond those working in the field. We rarely come across teachers, trainees or tutors who are aware of it. At a recent conference of 60 Secondary Geography teachers in one of the Greater Manchester boroughs, I held up a copy of the plan and asked how many had seen it - about five had (many of them new trainees we had worked with on their university course) - yet Geography is one of the subject areas that explicitly has to cover sustainable development issues.”<sup>29</sup>

40. When we tried to establish just how the SDAP had been disseminated to schools, to those who seemed most likely to need to know what it contained, not to mention what the SDAP expected from them, we found a very confusing picture indeed. In his oral evidence Mr John Westaway, Consultant for ESD at the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA), said that he did “not perceive that the Action Plan has had a tremendous impact on schools” and, whilst he conceded that this was not based on any firm evidence, he went on to say that he thought “there would be many schools blissfully unaware of the Action Plan”.<sup>30</sup> We asked Mr Michael Stevenson, Director for Strategy and Communications at DfES how the SDAP had been disseminated and communicated to schools in particular. Mr Stevenson said that the SDAP had been “disseminated broadly across partners and agencies, specifically to schools”<sup>31</sup> and he went on to explain how this was done:

“...it was made available on the website and we directed attention to that using our panoply of communications channels with schools, and predominantly our other web portals, including “TeacherNet”,<sup>32</sup> our Teachers’ Magazine, which goes out to every single school in the country, our governors’ magazine likewise.”<sup>33</sup>

41. This was not the way in which the DEA viewed the implementation of the SDAP. In its written evidence it stated:

“...a major weakness of the implementation of the Plan is that far too few people know about it. There has been very little press or media coverage around it. The Department made little attempt to work in partnership with key stakeholders in education to identify how we could communicate our common key messages and goals. As a result, if and where teachers and other educators hear about the Plan, they are all too dismissive because it is perceived as ‘just another short-term initiative’ with no extra resources.”<sup>34</sup>

42. The way in which the SDAP was disseminated and communicated could well explain why so few schools appear to be aware of it. Mr Stevenson said that it was DfES policy to

---

29 Ev164

30 Q478

31 Q541

32 [www.teachernet.gov.uk](http://www.teachernet.gov.uk)

33 Q543

34 Ev159

try to limit the number of pieces of paper that teachers and school staff are sent, hence the switch to greater use of websites. However, the heavy reliance on websites as a means of communication has been the focus of a number of negative comments from those who have provided evidence to this inquiry. This is particularly relevant when we look at the National Curriculum and how ESD is, or is not, taught, but it is also very important here when we consider that the SDAP is the document that brings together in one place the four objectives which presumably schools and other institutions need to meet, or at the very least aspire to.

43. The original explanation of the way in which the SDAP was disseminated to schools, given to us in oral evidence by Mr Michael Stevenson, was repeated in the first DfES supplementary memoranda but this time it was qualified by an additional statement which said:

“The Action Plan is a high-level description of action and so it was felt that it was not essential to send it to every school, particularly as part of our aim is of reducing bureaucracy.”<sup>35</sup>

We find this contradiction troubling. If the SDAP is judged by DfES to be high-level and feel it is not essential for it to be sent to every school, why does it need to be sent to any schools? This statement suggests that the SDAP is either not relevant to schools or needs to be summarised in some way so that schools only have to be sent those parts of the Plan they need to know about. Partial dissemination of a Plan which may not be fit for purpose for those schools which did receive it seems to be a waste of time for everyone concerned and sends entirely the wrong message to those receiving the Plan.

44. Of course we understand why DfES might want to steer away from the more traditional, hard copy, methods of information dissemination in many cases; we are only too aware of how very busy teachers are and how difficult it can be for them to stay on top of their paperwork. However, we are not at all convinced by this argument when it comes to important strategy documents, such as a department’s Action Plan. Even where only part of a document is relevant to a school and its staff, surely it is only right that that part is properly communicated to those who need to see it?

45. We asked Ofsted whether it thought DfES had handled properly the delivery of the SDAP so that it might have maximum exposure at all schools across England and we received the response that “perhaps more could have been done in that sense”.<sup>36</sup> When pressed for an opinion, Mr Iwaskow awarded DfES just two marks out of ten for communication of the SDAP.<sup>37</sup> **DfES must review the way in which it communicates key strategic documents, such as the Sustainable Development Action Plan, to those in the Department who need to know about it and who may well have responsibility for delivering parts of the Plan.**

---

35 Ev136

36 Q371

37 Q373

46. As for the success of the SDAP, in its written evidence, Waste Watch was quite clear that its success or otherwise was impossible to judge. It said:

“It is difficult to measure the progress of the Sustainable Development Action Plan as it has no targets, timeframe or reporting structure. Those involved in delivery of ESD cannot easily monitor progress or identify ways of involvement. No real consultation with the environmental education sector (particularly NGOs) has taken place and no comprehensive identification of existing programmes and projects has been undertaken to assess how they might contribute to a wider framework and the key targets contained within it.”

**47. The absence of any system for measurement of progress against the SDAP is a significant failing and threatens the credibility of the Plan itself. This is a critical error on the part of DfES and must be reviewed by the department as a matter of some urgency.**

## Leadership

48. The Sustainable Development Action Plan received a markedly less high profile launch than that afforded to PE and Sports in Schools, for example, when the latter was launched in December 2004. That initiative was considered important enough to merit the Prime Minister’s involvement and had £519 million of funding attached to it. Whilst the SDAP was launched by the Education Secretary, it did not have any funding overtly attached to it.

49. Not only was the SDAP the subject of a relatively low key media launch, but it was delivered to schools via websites and magazines and without any additional supporting training for those expected to help achieve the Plan. There were no indicators or targets set for the measurement of progress against the four objectives contained within it and it was almost completely starved of funding. This was not a very auspicious beginning for a Plan that promised so much. With so little priority attached to it by the centre, and with so many other competing priorities against which they are tested, is it any wonder that many schools put the SDAP some way down their “to do” list?

**50. The lack of leadership from DfES in particular has been a constant theme throughout the course of this inquiry. The fact that the new Secretary of State for Education and Skills, the Rt. Hon Ruth Kelly MP, has decided not to continue to act as Green Minister, as her predecessor did, is disappointing and serves only to emphasise the lack of priority given to this issue in DfES.** Over twelve months after the publication of the SDAP, regardless of what other progress has or has not been made, it is surely not acceptable to hear from witnesses like Trewin Restorick, (GAP) that leadership is a critical issue and is currently not being offered by DfES:

“There is a big question about leadership and desire here. I do not think DfES have the desire to deal with this particular issue. The mantra that is coming out of DfES civil servants when I speak to them is that they want to push the resource down to the schools for the schools to make the decisions about what they want to spend their budget on. It does not correspond with what is happening on things like sport. What DfES do not seem to be willing to take a leadership role on and an understanding of



is that, if schools get to the stage where they decide they want to embrace this agenda and they need support to do it, they need an infrastructure that can provide them with that support. They need localised, specific, thought through support. DfES are avoiding that whole particular part of the need to promote environmental education in schools. They are not willing to put any investment in at all, not just resource but also intellectual thinking, support and guidance into the infrastructure that will enable schools at all levels to take the lead in this.”<sup>38</sup>

51. This was by no means the only criticism of the DfES leadership role, with a number of memoranda linking this lack of leadership with a failure to think strategically. We were particularly interested to see the written evidence from the Development Education Association (DEA). The DEA were concerned about the loss of the Government Sustainable Development Education Panel (SDEP), which was wound up in 2003, and attributed the failure of the SDEP to its demise. DEA told us:

“This panel achieved a great deal which in our view has not informed the current delivery of the strategy. It operated at a strategic level and worked in partnership with a range of key stakeholders in education [...] a fundamental weakness of progress since 2003 has been the failure by DfES to recognise the importance of strategic ownership and engagement on a collective basis. This has led to the delivery of the Plan in a fragmented manner with NGOs and educational bodies competing for resources, status and engagement with the department. The consequence has been that the actions of DfES have led to a more divided, more competitive and less strategically engaged ESD NGO sector. This is a missed opportunity as the nature of ESD should bring together a broad coalition of policymakers, educators, NGOs and learners from varied traditions working towards achieving shared aims of sustainable development.”<sup>39</sup>

52. The loss of the Panel is felt by some to have led to a significant reduction in the opportunities for bringing together, under one umbrella, some of the very good, but often isolated, conceptual thinking on ESD which is being conducted in England. Ofsted refers to it as looking at “the development of the whole child rather than one curriculum area”.<sup>40</sup> When we asked QCA where it thought this very important conceptual thinking was being undertaken it was interesting and telling to hear that all of its examples referred to universities or NGOs, most notably the Council for Environmental Education (CEE) and Forum for the Future, and not DfES itself. Given the parlous state of funding for many NGOs, this is far from ideal. **DfES and Defra should consider how it fills the gap left by the demise of the Government’s Sustainable Development Education Panel, to provide a central home for important conceptual thinking on ESD and thereby help to provide a strategic dimension to the work of DfES.**

53. Before we move on from the SDAP we must return to the question of whether or not we had unrealistically high expectations for progress against the Plan given its relatively short time in existence. If what we had been expecting was for every school and college,

---

38 Q183

39 Ev159

40 Q397

every adult education centre and work-based learning programme, to be fully up to speed with ESD and happily teaching the subject, then we most certainly would have been doomed to disappointment, and legitimately could have been seen as naïve. However, what we hoped to find was that the SDAP had laid the foundation for this degree of progress but in this we were badly disappointed.

## The Tomlinson Report and the White Paper

---

54. The Tomlinson Working Group’s final report, “*14-19 Curriculum and Qualifications Reform*”, was published in October 2004. The Working Group was set up in the Spring of 2003 to make recommendations to the Government on the reform of education for 14-19 year olds. The Group had eighteen members and approximately eleven sub-groups which looked at a variety of related issues. Sir Mike Tomlinson, introducing the Report, said that the Working Group had been asked to make reforms to achieve:

- greater coherence in 14-19 learning programmes and strengthened structure and content of full-time vocational programmes:
- suitable 14-19 assessment arrangements; and
- a unified framework of qualifications.

55. Announcing the Tomlinson Report in the House of Commons on 18<sup>th</sup> October 2004, the then Education Secretary the Rt. Hon Charles Clarke MP said that his Department would take into account the Report and its conclusions when preparing the Department’s then anticipated education White Paper. Whilst clearly this does not constitute a commitment to accept or adopt any or all of the Reports recommendations, it does suggest that the Report would be considered as a basis for some of the White Paper. We were keen, therefore, to see what consideration and weight had been given to ESD in the Report. **What we found, however, was a total absence of ESD in the Tomlinson Report, despite ESD being recommended to the Working Group as a “key cross-cutting theme” by many of those who responded to the consultation.**<sup>41</sup>

56. In fact, almost everyone we spoke to, and the vast majority of the memoranda we received, expressed the view that the Tomlinson Report represented a lost opportunity as far as ESD was concerned. In its written evidence, RSPB said:

“The 14-19 report represented a real opportunity to integrate education for sustainable development into the heart of the Government strategy [...] RSPB is particularly disappointed that no consideration of ESD appeared in the report and the significance of sustainable development has been substantially ignored. If the Government is to live up to its commitment to sustainable development it is difficult to understand why such an opportunity was missed.”<sup>42</sup>

---

41 Ev258

42 EV227

57. This view was repeated again and again throughout the evidence. The World Wildlife Fund (WWF) said that ESD would “not be adequately represented in any forthcoming White Paper based on the report [Tomlinson] as it did not figure here and is clearly not on the agenda of the 14-19 Working Group.”<sup>43</sup> WWF went on to say ESD needed to be “embedded in to the heart of the 14-19 Curriculum and Qualifications Reform and not placed as a post-publication add-on”.<sup>44</sup>

58. The Development Education Association (DEA) went further, referring to the Tomlinson Report, not only as a missed opportunity, but also as evidence of the lack of strategic thinking across the Department. It went on to say that, “by concentrating on short-term and specific initiatives, the Department has lost sight of the bigger picture and where, for example, sustainable development needs to be located within the learning for 14-19 year olds”.<sup>45</sup>

59. A few witnesses took a more positive view of the Tomlinson Report. Forum for the Future, for example, was optimistic about the value of the Tomlinson Report, saying that “the general blending, the more holistic approach of Tomlinson is something which we could applaud [...]its overall direction and the fact that it is so radical [...] means that whoever is affected by it will be going through a change process and that is an opportunity to intervene and get sustainable development on to the agenda”<sup>46</sup> Ofsted too was able to be more optimistic about the possibilities falling out of the Report. During oral evidence, Mr Peter Daw, Divisional, Curriculum and Dissemination Division (Ofsted) responding to the suggestion that Tomlinson was a wasted opportunity, said:

“Clearly the view was that perhaps more could have been done to explicitly raise this part of the agenda. There are clearly opportunities in the Tomlinson recommendations for the development of core studies [...] there are opportunities that can be taken for elements of the ESD agenda to be pushed forward.”<sup>47</sup>

**60. Whilst the Tomlinson Report may well have provided an opportunity for ESD to be somehow “hooked on” to the various references in the Report to vocational and skills training, the Report itself falls far short of expectations. When introducing the Sustainable Development Action Plan, the Rt. Hon Charles Clarke MP was quite clear that sustainable development should no longer be a “bureaucratic add-on” but this is exactly what the Tomlinson Report consigns it to being.**

## Unrealistic expectations

61. Not all of those we spoke to in the course of this inquiry shared the view that the Tomlinson Working Group had failed to recognise and incorporate ESD into its final Report or that the White Paper should necessarily contain any greater reference to ESD than any other subject. Of particular interest was the evidence we took from Mr Brian

---

43 Ev262

44 Ev262

45 Ev162

46 Q125

47 Q381

Stevens, of the Finance and Education Services (FEEdS). Mr Stevens had been directly involved in two of the Tomlinson sub-groups. In his written evidence, Mr Stevens, was quite clear about the lack of priority attached to ESD when he stated:

“The point has not been made that Education for Sustainable Development is a key central lever. If it were, it would have been mentioned in the report and its effect would have been seen to be driving through both main and core learning. It formed no part of the discussions that I was party to as a member of the United Qualifications Framework Group and as Chairman of the Employers’ Group. Education for Sustainable Development forms one of those large rather shadowy issues like financial literacy, which everyone is aware of, which everyone agrees is somehow important but which very few get to grips with. It is not seen in the first order of importance and will not be so seen if the business case for it is not made more precisely and forcefully.”<sup>48</sup>

62. Mr Stevens’ assessment that ESD has not been identified as a key lever reflects the view expressed in many of the memoranda we received and so was not surprising. However, Mr Stevens also offers a very revealing insight into the inner-workings of the Tomlinson Working Group and goes a long way to explaining why ESD did not figure in the final Report. During oral evidence Mr Stevens explained further. He told us that the Tomlinson Group had not been looking “at this sort of detail, it was setting a learning framework” and he went on to say that it was “wrong to think of it as a specific opportunity for sustainable development. It was no more specifically for financial literacy either. It was setting up a much, much broader framework.”<sup>49</sup>

63. It would seem that we, and the majority of those who contributed to this inquiry, may have been labouring under a false impression if Mr Stevens’ assessment of the remit of the Tomlinson Working Group is accurate; and given his membership of two of the sub-groups we have no reason to disbelieve him. **Whether intentionally or not, as a result of poor communication, deliberate omission or ignorance on the part of those who set the remit for the Tomlinson Working Group, ESD was not considered by the Group.**

## The 14-19 Education and Skills White Paper

64. DfES published its 14-19 Education and Skills White Paper on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2005.<sup>50</sup> It is fair to say that, by the end of this inquiry, we had little hope left that ESD would figure to any significant degree in the White Paper. The Tomlinson Report, said to be one of the key documents which would feed into the White Paper, was silent on the subject of ESD. In its original written evidence, DfES offered no reassurance either, again consigning ESD to being a “bureaucratic add-on”. It said simply:

“DfES will publish a White Paper to respond to the final Report of the Working Group in the New Year. If proposals are accepted implications for sustainable

---

48 Ev101

49 Q438 & Q440

50 [www.dfes.gov.uk](http://www.dfes.gov.uk)

development will be one aspect to be considered as implementation and development work is carried out.”<sup>51</sup>

65. In the event, we could find nothing meaningful or substantive in the one reference to ESD to be found in Chapter Five of the White Paper where it refers to “Preparation for society”.<sup>52</sup> It says,

“The KS4 requirements in RE, PE, sex education, citizenship and the non-statutory framework for personal, social and health education (PSHE) provide a foundation of knowledge and skills crucial to living, learning and working in modern society. Education about sustainable development, for example, can help young people to understand the consequences of their actions for themselves and others, both in their own communities and globally.”<sup>53</sup>

**66. Both the Tomlinson Report and the 14-19 Education and Skills White Paper have failed to recognise Education for Sustainable Development as a priority. As an indication of the way in which ESD is viewed by DfES this omission cannot be ignored. The implications for any progress to be made in moving ESD forward in any meaningful way have been significantly reduced as a result.**

## ESD and the National Curriculum

---

67. The Education Act 2002, which incorporates the Education Act 1996, requires that Programmes of Study should be taught. The law also requires that pupils between the ages of 5-16 should be taught about “sustainable development” in the National Curriculum Programmes of Study in Geography, Science and Citizenship and that “economic, social, cultural and environmental considerations” should be taught as part of Design and Technology. The revision of the National Curriculum in 2000 was supposed to raise the profile of ESD, asking schools to promote pupils’ commitment to sustainable development. The DfES publication, *National Curriculum Handbook for Teachers*, defines this commitment as enabling pupils to, “develop the knowledge, values and skills to participate in decisions about the way that we do things individually and collectively, both locally and globally, that will improve the quality of life now without damaging the planet for the future”.<sup>54</sup>

68. In response to our original inquiry DfES conceded that more could be done to embed ESD in the school curriculum and said that it would lead on strengthening ESD links within geography, design and technology, science and citizenship. When we announced the follow-up inquiry therefore, we were particularly interested to see what progress had been made towards strengthening ESD in those four subject areas.

---

51 Ev121

52 [www.dfes.gov.uk](http://www.dfes.gov.uk)

53 Ibid

54 Ibid

69. DfES provided us with examples of the progress it said had been made so far. Referring to the QCA Schemes of Work for National Curriculum Subjects, DfES said it had been working with a number of partners, namely, QCA, the Council for Environmental Education, the Design and Technology Association, the Association for Science Education, the Royal Geographical Society, the Association for Citizenship Teaching and the Geographical Association, to develop a suite of primary and secondary units for the four subjects (Design and Technology, Science, Citizenship and Geography). The remaining examples referred again to the Building Schools for the Future programme and various websites DfES is developing to support teachers and help them, and schools in general, to learn more about sustainable development.

70. In its written evidence, DfES also used part of the Prime Minister's speech in London in September 2004 to illustrate its response. It is worth reproducing all of this part of the speech in this report. The Prime Minister said:

“There is a huge school building programme underway. All new schools and City Academies should be models for sustainable development: showing every child in the classroom and the playground how smart building and energy use can help tackle global warming. The government is now developing a school specific method of environmental assessment that will apply to all new school buildings. Sustainable development will not just be a subject in the classroom: it will be in the bricks and mortar and the way the school uses and even generates its own power. Our students won't just be told about sustainable development, they will see and work within it: a living, learning place in which to explore what a sustainable lifestyle means.”<sup>55</sup>

71. The focus of the Prime Minister's speech with regard to schools is on non-Curriculum activity and this is clearly reflected in the DfES response to this part of our inquiry. We have already heard that this area of DfES work is moving forward and it has been the subject of positive comment from some of those who have contributed to this inquiry. However, for us, the key words in this part of the Prime Minister's speech are, “sustainable development will not just be a subject in the classroom” and “our students won't just be told about sustainable development”. The assumption is that ESD is a fully-fledged subject and that children are being taught it. On the basis of the evidence we have seen and heard we believe this assumption to be wrong.

72. **It is clear to us that, for far too many schools, ESD is either not known about or is judged to be a low priority.** In its written evidence Ofsted referred us to its report, *“Taking the first step forward...towards an education for sustainable development”*, which it said concluded more than a year ago that, “while good practice exists there is still much to do, even in those successful schools, before they can claim to have met their own aspirations for ESD, or, indeed, implemented their policies in full”.<sup>56</sup> Ofsted go on to say that this situation “remains unaltered today and in the majority of schools there is a genuine lack of understanding about what this concept actually means and how it can be

---

55 [www.number10.gov.uk](http://www.number10.gov.uk) and EE49 page 5

56 Ev91

used to promote a positive ethos to support learning and personal development”<sup>57</sup> In his oral evidence Mr Leszek Iwaskow, HM Inspector of Schools for Ofsted, told us:

“...the key issue that we are faced with in schools is a lack of understanding exactly as to what education for sustainable development is. I think it is this lack of understanding which means that schools are having difficulty in identifying where they are delivering it[...] a lot of schools do have school councils, but they do not see that as part of ESD, and I think there is a lack of understanding of ESD in general which is then seen to be compartmentalised perhaps in one or two subject areas. In those subject areas it is very much dependant on how the teachers have looked at their schemes of work and implemented it into their teaching programme.”<sup>58</sup>

### Has ESD been embedded in the National Curriculum?

73. QCA was unequivocal in its response to the question of whether there had been any improvement in the four subject areas we referred to when announcing our inquiry. In its written evidence it stated, “there is no evidence to suggest that there has been a discernible improvement in these areas in schools.”<sup>59</sup> Ofsted also raised doubts about the strength of the foothold of ESD in the National Curriculum in its written evidence when it said:

“Despite the raising of the profile of education for sustainable development (ESD) through the revision of the National Curriculum in 2000 and the launch of the Sustainable Development Action Plan by Charles Clarke a year ago, ESD is not easily identifiable in the majority of schools in England. It is more evident and better organised in primary schools, where teachers are more used to working across a range of subjects. In secondary schools work on ESD is limited because individual departments have not fully explored the wide range of opportunities open to them [...] Few schools, too, are aware of the ways in which ESD can support teaching and learning in geography, science, design and technology, citizenship, personal, social and health education and the wider school curriculum.”<sup>60</sup>

74. We were also fortunate to be able to take oral evidence from Mr Hadrian Southorn, Secretary of the National Association of School Governors. In addition to his national role, Mr Southorn is also a Governor at a number of schools in Kent. We found Mr Southorn’s evidence to be very interesting, even though it painted a less than encouraging picture of life at the sharp end. With regard to the DfES commitment to do more to embed ESD into the National Curriculum Mr Southorn said it had come as a surprise to him to see this in our original press release when we announced this inquiry. He told us:

“It did not appear to me, or to my colleagues, that I could see anything, having been involved since the National Curriculum started. I had no knowledge whatsoever that

---

57 Ev91

58 Q363

59 Ev110

60 Ev91

suddenly DfES had jumped on to this particular bandwagon and said, ‘We want this to be at the forefront’.”<sup>61</sup>

75. We have already expressed our concerns about the very limited achievements so far made against Objective One of the SDAP; the lack of progress in embedding ESD in the curriculum is symptomatic of this failing. **It seems increasingly clear to us that DfES is able to be much more focused on developing schools which aspire to be designed, built and managed sustainably, but is unable, or perhaps unwilling, to make the same commitment to teaching pupils about Education for Sustainable Development.** This focus on non-curriculum areas was the subject of comments from RSPB in its written evidence when it said:

“DfES has embarked on specific and worthy initiatives such as Growing Schools but has failed to address the fundamental lack of status of ESD in schools. In comparison with initiatives such as literacy, numeracy, citizenship and health there is a lamentable lack of commitment. It is unreasonable to expect teachers to knit together ESD in seven subjects to form a coherent whole. If DfES is to take ESD seriously, it must give a clear commitment to support the concept at all levels. This support must include teacher’s professional development, head teachers training and the raising of governor awareness.”<sup>62</sup>

76. Indeed, RSPB goes on to say that it believes the whole approach to ESD as a subject in schools “has been tackled from the wrong angle”<sup>63</sup> by DfES. It said:

“Rather than fragmented initiatives, the Department should have assessed and identified the key components to effective delivery in schools and built their actions around that framework. Our fear is that current practice is like expecting a dot-to-dot picture to yield a Rembrandt portrait.”<sup>64</sup>

77. **The best that can be said about the integration of ESD into the National Curriculum is that it is “patchy”. This represents a failure of DfES policy so far.** However, the picture is not completely bleak, and we have seen evidence of some admittedly isolated examples of good practice and even excellence. Mr Iwaskow, of Ofsted, used a very apt description when he said, “if you were to look down on England from above you would probably see a relative desert for ESD. If you homed in there would be some oases of some excellent practice”.<sup>65</sup> However, these oases of excellence identified by Ofsted, amongst them Crispin’s School in Somerset and Farnborough Grange in Hampshire, have succeeded largely because they have committed individuals within the school who are prepared to go the extra mile and who have a personal interest in the subject.

---

61 Q613

62 Ev227

63 Ibid

64 Ibid

65 Q351



## Teachers' time and the reliance on Websites

78. Much of the work which has been highlighted by DfES during the course of this inquiry is towards web-based dissemination and communication tools. This is partly a sign of the times, of course, but also partly in response to the need to ensure that teaching staff are not buried under a deluge of paper which prevents them getting on with their core tasks. However, this very heavy reliance on websites has drawn some criticism from contributors to this inquiry, some of whom argue that teachers need more support than a website can offer and others who argue that websites are being used by DfES simply to allow them to tick the ESD box. When we spoke to Dr David Lambert, Chief Executive of the Geographical Association (GA), he told us that one of the results of the GA's recent needs analysis report, "Education for Sustainable Development, Specialist Teachers: a needs analysis", was that "teachers need to make sense of the area [ESD] themselves" and he went on to say:

"It really is not appropriate, I think, to put material on a website and hope that somehow it will have an impact across the system. Sustainable development itself is quite a complicated idea, it is also contested. If you are going to work with that in your subject, you have to converse and have a dialogue about how your subject contributes and where it can take you."<sup>66</sup>

79. The Development Education Association (DEA) was vociferous in its rejection of the reliance on websites to the exclusion of other means of communication. In its written evidence it stated:

"The evidence from the key stakeholders in ESD showed that the primary need was to support effective delivery at a local and regional level. By refusing to work in partnership to build on existing work and identify how best to work strategically, DfES have reduced their work on ESD to a series of minor initiatives, based primarily around a website [...] producing a new website is the one thing that DfES should not have prioritised [...] we are concerned that websites are sometimes perceived by DfES as something which are produced and then left."<sup>67</sup>

**80. Switching the method of dissemination and communication of important information from hard to electronic copy might be better environmentally, and may also prevent teaching staff being overwhelmed with paper, but it does not address some fundamental issues. Whether hard or electronic copy, the information still has to be accessed, read and then, in some cases, actioned by teaching staff who have no greater amount of time to devote to this than previously. Combine this with the fact that, as it currently stands, there is no real priority attached to ESD, nor is it an aspect of the curriculum against which teachers and schools are judged, and it is little wonder that we have so very few schools that are aware of the SDAP, or that teachers are not comfortable teaching ESD.**

---

66 Q623

67 Ev160

## Ofsted Inspections and a comparison with Wales

81. It is with regard to the National Curriculum, and the role of Ofsted in particular, that we saw the value of making a comparison between how ESD is dealt with in England as opposed to Wales. We were very pleased to be able to take evidence from organisations and individuals, like Estyn and the Centre for Alternative Technologies (CAT), both of which are based in Wales. Wales is in a quite different position to that in England with regard to Sustainable Development and Education for Sustainable Development. The Government of Wales Act 1998 specifies that the statutory duty of the National Assembly of Wales is to promote sustainable development along with equal opportunities, tackling disadvantage and bilingualism. To this end, Estyn, which fulfils a similar role in Wales as that undertaken by Ofsted in England, has a duty to inspect and report on the teaching of ESD in Welsh schools. In fact, as Ms Susan Lewis, Chief Inspector of Education and Training at Estyn told us, their remit is much wider than that:

“we inspect virtually everything that there is to inspect in education and training—it is almost easier to tell you which bits we do not inspect. We do not inspect higher education other than teacher training, but everything else, from nursery education through to adult and community education, taking in various things like youth offending teams...”<sup>68</sup>

82. Estyn was certain that its statutory duty to inspect ESD performance gave it an advantage, saying that “if we inspect it, it tends to get done more than if we do not inspect it in terms of things in education and training [...] the fact that we inspect Sustainable Development and sustainability and what organisations are doing on those issues tends to get them more attention”.<sup>69</sup> Whilst conceding that its lot is not an entirely easy one, with a similarly congested curriculum given as an example of some of the problems it faces, Estyn clearly gives ESD a high priority. It trains its inspectors in ESD, including those contracted as school inspectors, and actively looks for ways in which to keep their knowledge up to date. Estyn’s annual conference last year, for example, was on Sustainable Development.

83. This is not the case in England, where Ofsted is not required to include ESD in its inspections. This position has not changed despite the greater commitment DfES said would be applied to embedding ESD into the National Curriculum. Ofsted has not been asked to inspect ESD. Ofsted does not train its inspectors in ESD. As a consequence, many of those who contributed to this inquiry, identified the role of Ofsted as a critical factor in the failure to embed ESD in the National Curriculum. The widely held and often expressed view was that, if Ofsted was required to inspect ESD in the same way it does many other subjects, the status of ESD in schools would be very different indeed. Whether intentionally or not, Ofsted illustrated this point very well when, during oral evidence, and comparing ESD with citizenship, Mr Peter Daw, Ofsted, told us that:

“if you look at the citizenship agenda that is very high profile; it is now an established subject in the national curriculum. It is taught in all secondary schools; it has a much higher profile as such because it is a distinct subject. ESD is less clear; it is not a

---

68 Q277

69 Q278

subject, it is a sort of theme that is supposed to permeate various aspects of both curriculum and school life and, therefore, like many cross-curricular themes, it is more difficult [...] to pin down.”<sup>70</sup>

**84. The difference between ESD and citizenship is marked and we are left to ponder what the deciding factor is here. Is it the case that ESD is not high profile enough, not distinct enough as a subject, to merit Ofsted inspection? Or is it low priority and indistinct exactly because it is not inspected? In fact, it is a combination of both, a vicious circle which is unlikely to be broken until DfES takes the decision to attribute sufficient status to ESD and to request that Ofsted include it in its inspection framework.**

85. Ofsted is not convinced, however, that England could, or should, follow the example set by Estyn in Wales in terms of their Common Inspection Framework. Ofsted’s preference, which was also reflected in the Education Bill is for a self-evaluation system, as it explained in its written evidence. It said:

“The proposed new inspection process [...] has an increased emphasis on using a school’s self-evaluation to shape the inspection process [...] Inspectors will have to consider how a school is promoting healthy living, contribution to society and economic well-being. This process also allows schools to build into their self-evaluation any aspects they feel reflect the particular characteristics of the school [...] schools are able to include an evaluation of how effectively they are promoting education for sustainable development. Where a school includes material on ESD, it will help shape the inspection for that school, although schools are not obliged to include this area in their self-evaluation.”<sup>71</sup>

**86. We are not persuaded that an inspection based on a system of self-evaluation, which allows schools to decide whether or not to include material on ESD is any kind of improvement. We have already heard that very few schools attach priority to ESD and we cannot see this new system changing that fact. Unless ESD is made a mandatory part of the self-evaluation conducted by schools we see little value in the system.**

87. As it currently stands, and notwithstanding the self-evaluation process, Ofsted intends to return to look at ESD in more detail in its programme for 2007/08. This is part of a three year plan it has agreed with DfES. However, this detailed look will, in fact, only involve what Ofsted refers to as a “representative sample of schools”.<sup>72</sup> We do not consider this to be sufficient, and once again it will fail to give any impetus to schools across England.

## Out of Classroom learning

88. We are aware that out of classroom learning has been the subject of a separate inquiry by the Education and Skills Select Committee,<sup>73</sup> and we do not intend to encroach too far

---

70 Q417

71 Ev91

72 Q408

73 Education and Skills Committee, Second Report of Session 2004-05, *Education Outside the Classroom*, HC120

into this area. However, a number of the memoranda we received referred to this issue and the impact the decline on learning opportunities outside of the classroom has had on ESD. In its written evidence, RSPB was clear about the value of this form of learning, stating that “firsthand experience is the most effective form of generating commitment to the environment and [we] are disappointed that the DfES Action Plan contains no reference to the importance of firsthand experience”.<sup>74</sup>

89. Mr David Lambert, Chief Executive of the Geographical Association spoke about the importance of field studies during his oral evidence. Having told us he believed a school garden was not a suitable replacement for a week of field study, he went on to say:

“Field work in this country is an absolute jewel which has built up over many years, many decades and has a long tradition, and it would be a great shame for it to wither any further. It is not just work outside school during the day locally but it is residential trips, where children can engage at a very deep level with each other and with teachers, with the real world.”<sup>75</sup>

90. We are led to believe, however, that this previous mainstay of our education system is under threat largely because of increasing concerns about possible litigation should anything untoward happen during such a school outing.<sup>76</sup> There is no doubt that we live in an increasingly litigious society; nor is there any question that schools should take the utmost care when removing children from school, for whatever reason. And yet, many schools still manage to muster the courage to take children away on skiing and snowboarding trips, surely as dangerous a venture as any parent can imagine.

91. Furthermore, we have seen that out of classroom learning can be done, and is being done in some, albeit isolated, areas. We have already mentioned the very positive evidence we received from the National Museum of Science and Industry, in relation to getting the ESD message across to the general public. Mr Ben Gammon, Head of Learning and Audience Development, told us that the Museum reaches around 30,000 school children a year through outreach activities and it receives around 300,000 school visitors each year. Mr Gammon explained that the Museum found that teachers were “eager and very welcoming of any support that we can provide for them [...] particularly subjects which they themselves were not taught at school are subjects which they feel they need extra resources, support and training to help them get that effectively across to their pupils”.<sup>77</sup> He also gave us some insight into the way in which ESD can be sold to teachers who juggle the competing priorities of the National Curriculum. He told us that success had been as a result of:

“...linking subject areas such as sustainable development to science and to other subjects, primary schools particularly are very keen if they can tick off more than one curriculum area for their trip [...] by very closely interweaving it [ESD] with the

---

74 Ev227

75 Q647

76 Q57

77 Q56

science programming that we do, the history programme that we do, it becomes a very much more attractive package for schools.”<sup>78</sup>

92. We are not entirely convinced, therefore, that the fear of litigation is wholly to blame for the decline in enthusiasm for out of classroom learning. Rather, we would tend to agree with the view put forward by Groundwork in their oral evidence,<sup>79</sup> which is that **it is, in part, a fear of litigation, but also a lack of training and experience on the part of teaching staff, which dictates whether or not a class will venture outside of the classroom. An overcrowded curriculum, and the perception that ESD is a low priority for schools, serves to stifle any remaining urges to decant from the classroom.**

## Resources

---

93. Ask someone whether they have enough resources to do their job and the likelihood is that they will say that they do not. On that basis, when we asked whether there were sufficient resources available to deliver the Government’s commitment to education for sustainable development, we fully expected to receive some negative responses, and we received many. In these circumstances it then falls to us to examine how valid these claims are and to make a judgement, based on all the evidence to hand, as to how important and realistic the additional funding needs are. However, during the course of this inquiry, we saw at first hand the impact of a significant reduction in funding for ESD.

94. A number of the witnesses we saw and the memoranda we received, have mentioned specifically the very important role played by the NGOs in the ESD sector, without whom, it was argued, there would be very little happening with regard to ESD. In his oral evidence, for example, Mr Leszek Iwaskow, HM Inspector, Ofsted, was unequivocal about his estimation of the value of the NGOs working in the ESD sector. He told us:

“I think the NGOs have played an extremely valuable role in raising awareness in a number of schools, and particularly some of the work in primary schools has been front-line. They have certainly had a strong impact. One of the richnesses about the system in England is that we have this vast richness of NGOs working across a number of areas within a wide range of schools, and I think that has been a strength [...] The schools that I have visited which have been successful have often used the input of NGOs, but built on it and developed a whole-school approach”<sup>80</sup>

95. Similarly, RSPB also highlighted the role of NGOs and compared it to the role of DfES, an unfavourable comparison in fact. It stated:

“...the NGO sector is currently carrying most of the expenditure involved with the promotion of Education for Sustainable Development. DfES is involved in funding

---

78 Q66

79 Q21

80 Q378

its own projects but there is currently no funding stream to develop new initiatives.”<sup>81</sup>

96. These NGOs largely rely, however, on streaming funds from Government departments, supplemented for a lucky few by corporate or charitable funding. In the last few years the criteria by which funds are allocated from two major Government funding streams have been altered, cutting off funding to a number of NGOs and condemning them to live what some, like Groundwork, have called “a hand to mouth existence”.<sup>82</sup> The funding streams which have been largely lost to the ESD sector are the Landfill Tax Credit Scheme and the Environmental Action Fund, both are operated by Defra.

### The Landfill Tax Credit Scheme (LTCS)

97. The Landfill Tax Credit Scheme (LTCS) was introduced with the landfill tax in October 1996. It enables landfill site operators to donate up to 6.8 % of their landfill tax liability to environmental projects in return for a 90% tax credit. The LTCS had been a source of funding for the ESD NGO sector for a number of years but on 1 April 2003 the criteria by which funds could be accessed was changed. Objects C and CC, *The provision of education, information or research and development to encourage the use of sustainable waste management practices such as waste reduction and recycling*, were removed from the eligibility criteria for funding. That left just one category within the LTCS community fund which recognises education but this is limited and limiting as Object DA (biodiversity) states that within this category, education *cannot be the main intent of the project*. In addition to this stipulation, any project applying under this criteria must be within a ten mile radius of a landfill site.

98. It is no surprise, therefore, that we have heard evidence of significant loss of funding for many ESD NGOs. During oral evidence, Mr Trewin Restorick, (GAP), told us that GAP had been in receipt of £300,000 from the LTCS fund for its school work last year (2003) but that had been lost.<sup>83</sup> Indeed, in its written evidence, the Council for Environmental Education (CEE) said that, along with GAP and Waste Watch, it had conducted research which indicated “a loss of funding on the scale of more than £4 million a year”.<sup>84</sup> However, this is at variance with estimated figures provided by Defra, in their supplementary evidence, where it referred to an estimated total of £1.8 million “spent on projects with a formal education basis – equivalent to about £0.4 million a year or 0.8% of the category C/CC funding stream”.<sup>85</sup> It is possible that this discrepancy may be caused because Defra is referring to a slightly different time period and only in relation to formal education. The CEE figures also relate to informal education. On this basis, we have been unable to establish the true cost the loss of the LTCS represents to the ESD NGO sector but we have heard enough evidence to suggest that it is significant and will have a negative impact on the sector’s ability to continue its work.

---

81 E228

82 Q41

83 Q184

84 Ev269

85 Ev55

99. When we asked Mr Restorick how he was attempting to replace the funding lost through the LTCS, he told us:

“We have scoured high and low, as have most of the other organisations we talk to. We have managed to pick up a pittance from some charitable trusts and local authorities and some companies. There is no large source of funding to replace it. There is a new lottery fund aimed at young people and you could, at a really tight squeeze, get environmental education into that, but that is the only source.”<sup>86</sup>

## The Environmental Action Fund (EAF)

100. The Environmental Action Fund was launched in 1992 and was intended to help voluntary organisations in England to support government environmental objectives in the absence of more direct and obvious funding. The fund, which has a value of approximately £4 million per year, is managed by Defra and a funding round is held every three years. For the period 2002-05, the focus of the fund was to support understanding and awareness of sustainable development and biodiversity. A number of the NGOs who have contributed to this inquiry received money from the EAF for that period. However, for the funding round 2005-08, the focus of the fund was changed to “sustainable consumption and production” and to projects “that find ways of making sustainable living attractive to consumers and sustainable behaviour attractive to producers”.<sup>87</sup> This change in focus has had a dramatic impact, as can be seen from the tables below, which have been taken from written evidence provided to this inquiry by the Council for Environmental Education (CEE).

**Table 1: Comparison of 2002-2005 and 2005-2008 Defra Environmental Action Fund Grant Award of funding of education and related projects**

2002-2005 grant scheme (estimates from project descriptions)

<b>Total projects</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>Total awarded</b>	<b>£11.772 million</b>
Education projects	13	Total awarded	£3.671 million (31%)
Community awareness projects	6	Total awarded	£0.874 million (7%)
Other	15	Total awarded	£7.227 million (62%)

86 Q185

87 [www.defra.gov.uk](http://www.defra.gov.uk)

## 2005-2008 grant scheme (estimates from project descriptions)

Total projects	36	Total awarded	£7.133 million
Education projects	3	Total awarded	£0.509 million (7%)
Community awareness projects	14	Total awarded	£2.847 million (40%)
Other	19	Total awarded	£3.777 million (53%)

### A game of pass the parcel

101. It is not surprising that, once DfES assumed responsibility for ESD, Defra would take the opportunity to look at the focus of the funds it manages to ensure that they are going to deliver against its own revised objectives. In these circumstances it is entirely appropriate for Defra to decide to revise the criteria by which NGOs can access the funding streams it manages if it believes a change of focus is necessary. This is good financial management. However, this only works for any NGOs likely to be affected by the changed criteria if the new Department, the one under which their work now sits, picks up the baton and, always supposing the new Department considers the work important and of value, makes funding available so that their work might continue. This does not appear to have happened with regard to ESD and far too many ESD sector NGOs have fallen through the funding cracks.

102. Again, describing the funding crisis GAP had found itself in, Mr Restorick, of GAP, told us:

“It has been a fantastic game of pass the parcel. The fact that DfES have taken a lead on this particular issue has been a great opportunity for Defra to throw the ball to them and say, “You run with it”. Defra have therefore taken out the environmental education aspect [...] the Environmental Action Fund, which is one of the few grants that are available to environmental education. DfES have not caught the ball, basically. They have been highly specific in saying that they will not put more resources into these areas. They have been specific in what they wrote in the action plan and in conversations.”<sup>88</sup>

Mr Restorick was speaking about a funding situation which, for GAP and a number of other organisations, related to the known loss of income from the LTCS, and the possible loss of funding through the EAF. Since giving evidence, both GAP, and others, associated with this inquiry, have failed to secure funding through the EAF.



103. In its original response to this inquiry, DfES said it thought ESD did have sufficient resources, in both manpower and funding, devoted to it.<sup>89</sup> Given the withdrawal of Defra funding streams to ESD sector NGOs, however, we asked DfES to provide us with additional information relating to its funding provision for ESD. We were particularly interested in how the funding for ESD compares with subjects like sport and music. We are grateful to DfES for the timeliness of its response.<sup>90</sup>

104. DfES does not have a separate budget for ESD but told us:

“It is DfES policy to embed funding for ESD within the different policies which have responsibility for some part of ESD. This is to enable ESD to be embedded within the relevant policy area and to spread ownership of the agenda within DfES. In 2004-2005, NGOs will be funded by about £1million for ESD projects. In addition, DfES will be spending £161,000 over the next two years for the Sustainable Development Commission to help us implement the Department’s SD Action Plan, including the recruitment of Dr Jake Reynolds as Senior Adviser.”<sup>91</sup>

**105. We welcome the appointment of Dr Jake Reynolds as Senior Adviser and look forward to seeing what progress he can make on implementing the Sustainable Development Action Plan. One of his first tasks must surely be to ensure that the SDAP is properly monitored, evaluated and reported on.**

**106. It is regrettable that DfES has failed so completely to understand or accept the extent of the funding crisis in the ESD sector and even now continues to turn a blind eye to it. DfES must show leadership and work quickly to contain the damage already done by developing a national strategy to provide effective long-term funding to ensure that there is sufficient and continued support for ESD at all levels.**

107. In its further supplementary memorandum DfES said it was “difficult to draw comparisons between ESD and school sport, healthy living and citizenship” because “ESD is covered by most of DfES’ work”.<sup>92</sup> We find this statement astonishing, not least because, if that really is the case, on the basis of the evidence we have seen, it can only mean that a great deal of the DfES’ work is failing. We asked DfES what it intended to do to ensure that the work of those NGOs who have lost out on funding through the LTCS and the EAF was continued in schools. The response we received was not encouraging. DfES told us:

“It would not be in line with the Department’s overall policies to take on the specialized work of NGOs or to fund the many services available to schools. Rather, we are diverting as much funding as possible directly to schools so that they can make appropriate decisions locally as to which services they wish to buy in.”<sup>93</sup>

108. DfES does not make it clear in their evidence whether the funds to be diverted to schools will be ring-fenced for ESD, or whether it is a general fund to be spent on a number

---

89 Ev123

90 Ev277 (Appendix 52)

91 Ibid

92 Ibid

93 Ev278

of competing priorities identified by each individual school. If it is the latter, and given that we have been told that ESD has a profile which is patchy at best in far too many schools, and virtually unknown in some; and if, as we suspect, it remains a low priority until such time as it is made clear that DfES considers it a priority and has Ofsted inspect it as it does other subjects, what realistic hope is there that schools will use these funds for ESD? Similarly, **given the lack of understanding of the complexities of Sustainable Development, which we are told is prevalent in so many schools, we are interested to know what additional training school governors and managers are to receive to help them make informed decisions with regard to what ESD support they buy in to the school.**

### ESD: a comparison with Sport and Music

109. It is in funding that the lack of priority and value attached to ESD becomes very obvious indeed. In the short period during which this inquiry has been running, DfES have made a number of high profile announcements, launching particular initiatives. For example, on 14 December 2004, the Prime Minister announced “a half-billion pound boost for PE and Sport in our schools”.<sup>94</sup> This funding, some £519 million, was in addition to funding of £459 million announced in 2002. The Prime Minister said:

“This investment will give today's children new opportunities to take part in sport - inside and outside the school gate and before, during and after the school day. Sport is not only important in its own right; teaching kids how to win, lose and be part of a team. It is also important in tackling obesity in young people and can act as an antidote to the anti-social behaviour of a minority by channeling their energies.”

110. Similarly, on 24 November DfES issued a press notice trumpeting the appointment of a Music Manifesto Champion and additional funding of £30million over three years. Announcing the funding, David Milliband, then School Standards Minister said:

“At the time of the Music Manifesto launch in the summer I announced that we were continuing with the ring-fenced Music Standards Fund until 2008 – almost £180 million between now and 2008. I am pleased today to announce a further £30million in 2007-08, which will be aimed primarily at giving every primary school pupil the opportunity to learn a musical instrument. This will be a key supplement to rising school budgets as we expand music provision in primary and secondary schools”.<sup>95</sup>

111. When the Rt. Hon Charles Clarke MP launched the SDAP on 23 September 2003 there was no mention of what funding was attached to the Plan, quite the contrary in fact, as Mr Clarke said that “often it will not require extra funding – we simply need to use our existing resources more wisely”.<sup>96</sup> The derisory level of funding for Education for Sustainable Development, when compared with that for Sport and Music, for example, is telling. It is clearly the case that Music and Sport form an important part of school life. However, the disparity of funding between these activities and ESD, when seen in the

94 [www.dfes.gov.uk/pns](http://www.dfes.gov.uk/pns)

95 *Ibid*

96 [www.dfes.gov.uk](http://www.dfes.gov.uk)

context of the Prime Minister's description of the "far reaching impact" and "irreversible destructive power" of climate change, is anomalous. **If the Government is serious about climate change and about protecting and enhancing the environment, then it also has to be serious and realistic about the levels of funding for ESD.**

## A long-term strategy

112. There is a clear need for a commitment to long-term, strategic funding. It needs to be long-term, not only to avoid the "hand-to-mouth" existence of many NGOs, but also to guarantee that the work continues. Ms Jacky Ramsden of GirlGuiding UK told us that what was needed was "funding which is not a tap which opens and shuts, open, shuts; we want to set up projects that are really worthwhile so it needs to be long-term strategic ideas and funding".<sup>97</sup> However, whilst we entirely agree with the need for long-term funding we are also mindful of the comments made by Dr Andy Johnston, Head of Education and Learning at Forum for the Future. Talking about potential barriers to changing behaviours, Dr Johnston said:

"what we are referring to there is what you might call the 'project mindset', or the 'initiative mindset' within government and the feeling that if sustainable development comes along, that is something they may be able to put a little cash behind and run as a project [...] this is not a great approach to any particular thinking that you want to achieve, but if there is one particular ambition that is completely scuppered by initiative and project thinking, it is sustainable development. Sustainable development is all about joining up things and it is all about doing things at the same time, and government joining up, as we all know, is a challenging agenda at the best of times, as is Civil Service joining up [...] if sustainable development is going to happen, core funding streams need to be supporting it, core policy streams need to be supporting it, and the achievement of those core funding streams is very difficult within government as it stands at the moment."<sup>98</sup>

113. Although we have made comparisons with spending on Sports and Music to illustrate the total disparity between the funds made available for those subjects and ESD, we do not believe that simply increasing the funding for ESD is the answer. In their supplementary memorandum, DfES explained that there is a statutory requirement for Sport within the National Curriculum and that the reason the Government is investing £1.5 billion in PE and school sport between April 2002 and March 2008 is because there is a requirement to meet a Public Service Agreement (PSA) target. There is no PSA target attached to ESD. If we had needed any further indication of the lack of urgency and priority attached to ESD by DfES we need look no further than the oral evidence we took from Derek Twigg, MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Schools when, in response to the widespread concerns about funding for ESD, he told us:

"I appreciate the concern and the reasons for that. To be frank as well, we have got priorities within the budget as a whole, but within that we will look at the criteria to

97 Q78

98 Q130

see whether we can actually find any way of helping. At the end of the day, I have got to look at the overall priorities I have got in this particular role that I have. I will come back to you when I have examined it and had time to think about it and reflect on the way we might be able to take this forward.”<sup>99</sup>

**114. Unless and until there is a strategic review of the way in which ESD is perceived and prioritised within government, and within DfES in particular, so that there is a coherent, long-term plan for progressing ESD, it is likely that what little funds are allocated to ESD will not be used to best effect. To increase funding without this review and commitment would be unwise and counter-productive. We look forward to hearing from the Parliamentary Under Secretary for Schools, Derek Twigg MP in the very near future and once he has had time to deliberate on the ESD funding crisis.**

115. A long-term strategy must also seek to resolve the issue of competition within the NGO sector and, in some cases, the negative impact that has had. We have already heard that RSPB consider that “the actions of DfES have led to a more divided, more competitive and less strategically engaged ESD NGO sector” and Ofsted too has concerns about this. Whilst it too agrees that NGOs are currently responsible for the majority of the work in the sector it attributes the “patchy and unstructured development across schools” to the fact that this work is not co-ordinated from the centre. **DfES, in reviewing both its commitment to ESD and the SDAP, should make full use of the wide range of expertise offered by the NGOs to help create a coherent framework for their work, thereby ensuring consistency of approach throughout the education sector.**

## UK Sustainable Development Strategy

---

116. When we launched this inquiry, the UK Sustainable Development Strategy was still under review. We were anxious, therefore, to canvass the ESD sector’s opinion as to what the Strategy should contain best to serve the furtherance of ESD in the coming years. Whilst the review involved all departments across Government, it was led and championed by Defra. The launch of the new UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy occurred before we had completed our deliberations and has therefore allowed us to assess how the new Strategy now represents Education for Sustainable Development and whether it meets the hopes of those who have contributed to this inquiry.

117. In its original memorandum DfES, responding on behalf of the Government, said that the Government had “consulted on how it can help and encourage people to adopt more sustainable behaviour” and it confirmed that education, at all levels, was identified as a “key issue” by many of those responding to the consultation. In response, we were told that an interdepartmental group had been established to develop work on changing behaviours and ESD, which would be feeding its work into the final strategy. The group included representatives from DfES, Defra, DCMS and the Sustainable Development Commission (SDC).

---

118. A summary of the consultation responses received by Defra was published on 29 October 2004. We were pleased to see that one of the three key themes to have emerged during the consultation, to which 844 organisations or individuals responded, was the need for “improved education, provision of information and communication of sustainable development”.<sup>100</sup> This was also reflected in the evidence we received. Most of those who contributed to our inquiry saw the review as an excellent opportunity to incorporate Education for Sustainable Development into the Strategy to a much greater degree than before. In its written evidence the Learning and Skills Development Agency (LSDA) said that “the new strategy should clearly state the key role of education for sustainable development in the delivery of the country’s sustainable development agenda”.<sup>101</sup>

119. Another very important addition which it was felt should be incorporated into the Strategy was the inclusion of ESD as a headline indicator. This was a need highlighted by many of those who contributed to this inquiry. Whilst there was already a headline indicator for education contained in the original Strategy, it was far too general and made no reference to ESD. We raised the need for ESD indicators in the Strategy with the then Secretary of State for Education and Skills, the Rt. Hon Charles Clarke MP, at the end of 2003. In his response, Mr Clarke said that his department was “working closely with Defra officials on the Review of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy to influence the inclusion of Education for Sustainable Development in the revised indicators”. We confirmed that this was the case when we spoke to Defra officials during oral evidence where they were able to confirm that constructive discussions about ESD indicators had taken place.<sup>102</sup>

120. Given the assurance we received from the then Secretary of State the Rt. Hon Charles Clarke MP, the more recent confirmation from Defra that indicators for ESD had been discussed in connection with the new Strategy, and the fact that many of those who contributed to this inquiry, and who highlighted the need for indicators for ESD, also requested broadly similar outcomes in their response to the Government consultation on the Strategy, we looked forward to seeing a new UK Sustainable Development Strategy which would take full account of ESD.

121. The new Strategy entitled “Securing the Future”, which was issued on Monday 7<sup>th</sup> March 2005, and does appear to be giving greater priority to the very real need to get the ESD message across to the general public. For example, we are particularly interested to hear about new initiatives and programmes, such as “Community Action – Together We Can”, which seems to have been given the challenge to “re-invigorate community action on sustainable development by promoting new and existing opportunities to get involved in action of this kind. It will set out what is to be done to enable, encourage, engage and exemplify community action to increase sustainability and contribute to the priorities set...”<sup>103</sup> **We accept that some of the initiatives and programmes of work referred to in the Strategy are new and will need time to bed down before any serious analysis of their**

100 [www.sustainable\\_development.gov.uk/news](http://www.sustainable_development.gov.uk/news)

101 Ev209

102 Q225

103 The UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy, CM6467, page 29

worth can be conducted. We hope that our successor Committee will return to the subject of Education for Sustainable Development during 2006 and this will be one of the key areas of that inquiry.

122. Whilst we are pleased to see that there is now an indicator entitled “Sustainable development education”, our pleasure is muted. Of the sixty eight indicators now contained within the Strategy, this is one of only five which remains stubbornly blank, with no “Related Public Service Agreement or other relevant policy statements” attached to it. Indeed, this omission is recognised in the Strategy where we are told that both Defra and DfES are “actively seeking to develop an indicator to show the impact of formal learning on knowledge and awareness of sustainable development.” We are told that “further work is needed on this” but that “the Government hopes that a suitable indicator will be agreed later in 2005”.<sup>104</sup> **It is unclear why there is a delay in the development of the ESD indicator, more than twelve months after we raised the issue with the Secretary of State in DfES. We are left to speculate on whether it is yet another example of the low priority afforded to ESD, or whether it is an indication that Defra and DfES simply don’t know what to do with it. Whatever the reason for the delay, it is extremely disappointing and we would urge Defra and DfES to agree a suitable indicator as soon as possible.**

123. We are also compelled to comment on those parts of the new Strategy which relate directly to ESD in schools, the SDAP and the National Curriculum. The Strategy acknowledges the important place that formal education holds when it says,

“[it] has a crucial role to play in both raising the awareness among young people of sustainable development, giving them the skills they need to put sustainable development into practice in later life; but also in forming good habits at an early age. Sustainable development principles must lie at the core of the education system, such that schools, colleges and universities become showcases of sustainable development among the communities that they serve [...]the Department for Education and Skills aims to ensure that sustainable development is embedded in the core education agenda across all education and skills sectors.”<sup>105</sup>

124. We agree entirely with this view but we must also stress that this is just not happening. **It is in regard to ESD in formal education, perhaps more than anywhere else in the Strategy, that the Prime Minister’s “moratorium on further words”, requested in his preface to the new Strategy, is most needed. What is important now is focused action, not more rhetoric.** When it refers to the role of DfES and the actions it will be taking to move ESD forward, the Strategy relies heavily on the SDAP, the many web-based information projects the Department seems to favour, and its belief that ESD is being embedded in the National Curriculum. We believe that this reliance is unwise and the progress made in those areas in particular does not justify such faith.

---

104 The UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy, CM6467, page22

105 The UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy, CM 6467, page 37

## Endnote

---

“My own personal view is that there is little or no doubt about it [the science of climate change]. Also, I think, incidentally, even if there was a residual doubt, any sensible precautionary policy would say, ‘well the consequences of it being right are so severe that it is best to change behaviour’.”

Rt. Hon Tony Blair MP, House of Commons Liaison Committee, 8 February 2005

125. This statement from the Prime Minister, just a few weeks ago, confirms that his view of the threat of climate change has not altered. Indeed, he goes so far as to suggest that, even if the science is not 100% proven, the sensible course of action is to proceed as if it were. As a Committee, we have often stressed the importance of applying the precautionary principle, and we entirely support this view. Even if climate change does not happen to the degree expected, the damage already caused by the way in which far too many people live, means that it is still vital that people understand that they can no longer continue to pollute the environment and plunder the earth’s natural resources with impunity.

126. It was particularly reassuring to hear the Prime Minister’s words given that we had felt compelled to begin this report by asking whether there was a need for Education for Sustainable Development. We posed this question, not because we were in any doubt about the need for and value of ESD, but because we had been left with the uncomfortable suspicion that there were still some people who do have doubts.

127. As we conclude this inquiry we are very aware that there are many people, including some in Government, who remain unconvinced by the arguments in favour of Education for Sustainable Development. It is very difficult not to sound alarmist when talking about climate change and the need for sustainable development to safeguard our planets survival but lest anyone be tempted to discount the threat, they should take heed of the warning given by Mr Paul Allen, Development Director at the Centre for Alternative Technology. Mr Allen’s view is that there are some desperately urgent issues which need action now, and then there are some which could be tackled over the next fifty years or so, when action would still be timely. Climate change is “cryingly urgent” and at the top of his list. He explained the threat as follows:

“...if we continue to behave as we are then climate change may start to run away with itself, and even if we all switched everything off and sat quietly it would not stop [...] We must not be seen as tinkering around the edges.”<sup>106</sup>

128. Unfortunately, the only conclusion we are able to reach is that the DfES response to climate change, as demonstrated by its lamentable attitude to ESD, is exactly that, “tinkering”. **It is now clear that the Prime Minister’s sense of urgency about the threat of climate change, and his commitment to do something about it, is not matched by the actions of the Department for Education and Skills. DfES has failed to ensure sufficient**

---

funds for ESD, has lost the impetus that led to the creation of the Sustainable Development Action Plan and continues to treat ESD as a “bureaucratic add-on”, and a low priority one at that. We are deeply concerned about this failure and look to the Prime Minister, if necessary, to ensure that DfES moves ahead and gives ESD the financial and policy priority that it needs.



# Formal minutes

---

**16 March 2005**

Members present:

Mr Peter Ainsworth, in the Chair

Mr Gregory Barker  
Mr Colin Challen  
Mr David Chaytor  
Sue Doughty

Mr John McWilliam  
Mr Malcolm Savidge  
Mr Simon Thomas  
Joan Walley

The Committee deliberated.

Draft Report (Environmental Education: a follow-up to Learning the Sustainability Lesson), proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read.

*Ordered*, That the Chairman's draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 128 read and agreed to.

*Resolved*, That the Report be the Fifth Report of the Committee to the House.

Several papers were ordered to be appended to the Minutes of Evidence.

*Ordered*, that The Chairman do make the Report to the House.

*Ordered*, that the provisions of Standing Order No.134 (Select committees (reports)) be applied to the Report.

The Committee further deliberated.

[Adjourned till Tuesday 22 March 2005 at 3pm.]

## Witnesses

---

### Tuesday 7 December 2004

Page

**Mr Richard Sharland**, Director of Development, and **Ms Christine Southwood**, Policy Co-ordinator – Education and Learning, Groundwork UK Ev1

**Mr Ben Gammon**, Head of Learning and Audience Development, and **Ms Rebecca Dawson**, Executive Assistant, NMSI Masterplanning and Sustainable Development, The National Museum of Science and Industry; and **Ms Jacky Ramsden**, Outdoor Activity Adviser, and **Ms Connie Wessels**, Project Co-ordinator, International Education, GirlGuiding UK Ev14/Ev15

### Tuesday 14 December 2004

**Dr Andy Johnston**, Head of Education and Learning, Forum for the Future. Ev23

**Mr John Baines**, Chairman of the PP4SD Project), and **Mr Glenn Strachen**, Professional Practice for Sustainable Development (PP4SD). Ev32

**Mr Trewin Restorick**, Director, and **Ms Alexandra Woodsworth**, Environmental Communications Officer, Global Action Plan. Ev39

### Tuesday 11 January 2005

**Ms Bronwen Jones**, Head of the Sustainable Development Unit, **Ms Kelly Freeman**, Acting Director of Communications, and **Mr Bob Ryder**, Deputy Head of Environment, Business and Consumers Division, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra). Ev48, Ev55, Ev58, Ev119

**Ms Susan Lewis**, Chief Inspector of Education and Training, and **Mr Gareth Wyn Jones**, HM Inspector of Education and Training, ESTYN. Ev68/Ev81

**Mr Paul Allen**, Development Director, and **Ms Ann McGarry**, Education Officer, Centre for Alternative Technology (CAT). Ev81

### Tuesday 18 January 2005

**Mr Leszek Iwaskow**, HM Inspector of Schools and Subject Specialist Adviser for Geography, and **Mr Peter Daw**, Head of the Curriculum Dissemination Division, Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED). Ev91

**Mr Brian Stevens**, Director, Finance and Education Services (FEs) Ev101

**Mr Ian Colwill**, Director of Curriculum, and **Mr John Westaway**, Consultant for ESD, Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA). Ev109

**Wednesday 19 January 2005**

**Mr Derek Twigg MP**, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Schools, and **Mr Michael Stevenson**, Director for Strategy and Communications, Department for Education and Skills. Ev119, Ev137, Ev277

**Mr Hadrian Southorn**, Secretary, National Association of School Governors. Ev137

**Dr David Lambert**, Chief Executive, the Geographical Association Ev140

---

## List of written evidence

---

BELS	Ev147
Botanic Gardens Conservation International (BGCI)	Ev150
Botanic Gardens Education Network	Ev150
British Ecological Society	Ev152
Carnyorth Outdoor Education Centre	Ev153
Centre for Alternative Technology (CAT)	Ev81
CITB Construction Skills	Ev154
Council for Education and Environment (CEE)	Ev267
CREATE	Ev157
Department for Education and Skills	Ev119, Ev139, Ev277
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)	Ev55, Ev58, Ev119
Development Education Association (DEA)	Ev158
Development Education Project (DEP), Manchester	Ev163
Education Dialogue Group (EDG)	Ev166
Energy Savings Trust	Ev168
Environment Agency	Ev169
Environment Centre	Ev171
Environmental Campaigns Ltd (ENCAMS)	Ev171
Environmental Education Enforcement Unit (Bolton Metro)	Ev147
Envision	Ev176
Esh Winning Eco-Learning Centre (EWE Centre)	Ev178
ESTYN	Ev68, Ev81
Farmer, Mr Norman	Ev180
Fellows, Mr David	Ev181
Field Studies Council (FSC)	Ev182
Finance and Education Services (FEs)	Ev101,107
Forum for the Future	Ev23
GEMK	Ev187
Geographical Association	Ev140
GirlGuiding UK	Ev15
Global Action Plan	Ev39, Ev46
Global to Local Ltd	Ev189
Golland, Mr Derrick	Ev190
Groundwork UK	Ev13
Hampshire County Council	Ev192
HDRA	Ev193
Hopgood, Mr A	Ev196
Jackson, Ms Kim and the National Association for Environmental Education UK	Ev196
Learning and Skills Development Agency (LSDA)	Ev206
Learning South West and Sustainability South West	Ev196
Leeds City Council	Ev200
MMU	Ev212

National Association for Environmental Education (NAEE)	Ev216
National Institute for Adult and Continuing Education (NIACE)	Ev214
National Museum of Science and Industry (NMSI)	Ev14
Norfolk County Council	Ev217
Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED)	Ev91
Policy Studies Institute	Ev194
Professional practice for Sustainable Development (PP4SD)	Ev32
Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA)	Ev109
Real World Learning Campaign (FSC)	Ev218
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	Ev226
Sheridan, Ms Alona	Ev228
Sterling, Dr Stephen	Ev231
StudentForce	Ev235
Teachers in Development Education (TIDE~)	Ev236
Trade Union Sustainable Development Advisory Committee (TUSDAC)	Ev237
University of Bath	Ev239, Ev241
University of York	Ev245
Warwickshire County Council	Ev245
Waste Watch	Ev246, Ev251
Welchman, Ms Julia	Ev254, Ev256
Wildlife Trusts UK	Ev256
WWF	Ev259
Yorkshire and Humber Education for Sustainable Development Forum	Ev263

# Past reports from the Environmental Audit Committee since 1997

---

## 2004-05 Session

First	Housing: Building a Sustainable Future, HC 135
Second	Corporate Environmental Crime, HC 136
Third	World Summit on Sustainable Development 2002: A UK Progress Report, HC 381
Fourth	The International Challenge of Climate Change: UK Leadership in the G8 and EU

## 2003-04 Session

First	Annual Report 2003, HC 214
Second	GM Foods – Evaluating the Farm Scale Trials, HC 90
Third	Pre-Budget Report 2003: Aviation follow-up, HC 233
Fourth	Water: The Periodic Review 2004 and the Environmental Programme, HC 416 ( <i>Reply, HC 950</i> )
Fifth	GM Foods – Evaluating the Farm Scale Trials, HC 564
Sixth	Environmental Crime and the Courts, HC 126 ( <i>Reply, HC 1232</i> )
Seventh	Aviation: Sustainability and the Government Response, HC 623 ( <i>reply, HC1063</i> )
Eighth	Greening Government 2004, HC 881 ( <i>Reply, HC 1259</i> )
Ninth	Fly-tipping, Fly-posting, Litter, Graffiti and Noise, HC 445 ( <i>Reply, HC 1232</i> )
Tenth	Budget 2004 and Energy, HC 490 ( <i>Reply, HC 1183</i> )
Eleventh	Aviation: Sustainability and the Government's second response, HC1063
Twelfth	Environmental Crime: Wildlife Crime, HC 605
Thirteenth	Sustainable Development : the UK Strategy, HC 624

## 2002-03 Session

First	Pesticides: The Voluntary Initiative, HC100 ( <i>Reply, HC 443</i> )
Second	Johannesburg and Back: The World Summit on Sustainable Development–Committee delegation report on proceedings, HC 169
Third	Annual Report, HC 262
Fourth	Pre-Budget 2002, HC 167 ( <i>Reply, HC 688</i> )
Fifth	Waste – An Audit, HC 99 ( <i>Reply, HC 1081</i> )
Sixth	Buying Time for Forests: Timber Trade and Public Procurement - The Government Response, HC 909
Seventh	Export Credits Guarantee Department and Sustainable Development, HC 689 ( <i>Reply, HC 1238</i> )
Eighth	Energy White Paper – Empowering Change?, HC 618
Ninth	Budget 2003 and Aviation, HC 672 ( <i>Reply, Cm 6063</i> )
Tenth	Learning the Sustainability Lesson, HC 472 ( <i>Reply, HC 1221</i> )
Eleventh	Sustainable Development Headline Indicators, HC 1080 ( <i>Reply, HC 320</i> )
Twelfth	World Summit for Sustainable Development – From rhetoric to reality, HC 98 ( <i>Reply, HC 232</i> )
Thirteenth	Greening Government 2003, HC 961 ( <i>Reply, HC 489,2003-04</i> )

### 2001-02 Session

First	Departmental Responsibilities for Sustainable Development, HC 326 ( <i>Reply, Cm 5519</i> )
Second	Pre-Budget Report 2001: <i>A New Agenda?</i> , HC 363 ( <i>HC 1000</i> )
Third	UK Preparations for the World Summit on Sustainable Development, HC 616 ( <i>Reply, Cm 5558</i> )
Fourth	Measuring the Quality of Life: The Sustainable Development Headline Indicators, HC 824 ( <i>Reply, Cm 5650</i> )
Fifth	A Sustainable Energy Strategy? Renewables and the PIU Review, HC 582 ( <i>Reply, HC 471</i> )
Sixth	Buying Time for Forests: <i>Timber Trade and Public Procurement</i> , HC 792-I, ( <i>Reply, HC 909, Session 2002-03</i> )

### 2000-01 Session

First	Environmental Audit: <i>the first Parliament</i> , HC 67 ( <i>Reply, Cm 5098</i> )
Second	The Pre-Budget Report 2000: <i>fuelling the debate</i> , HC 71 ( <i>Reply HC 216, Session 2001-02</i> )

### 1999-2000 Session

First	EU Policy and the Environment: An Agenda for the Helsinki Summit, HC 44 ( <i>Reply, HC 68</i> )
Second	World Trade and Sustainable Development: An Agenda for the Seattle Summit, HC 45 (Including the Government response to the First Report 1998-99: Multilateral Agreement on Investment, HC 58) ( <i>Reply, HC 69</i> )
Third	Comprehensive Spending Review: Government response and follow-up, HC 233 ( <i>Reply, HC 70, Session 2000-01</i> )
Fourth	The Pre-Budget Report 1999: pesticides, aggregates and the Climate Change Levy, HC 76
Fifth	The Greening Government Initiative: first annual report from the Green Ministers Committee 1998/99, HC 341
Sixth	Budget 2000 and the Environment etc., HC 404
Seventh	Water Prices and the Environment, HC 597 ( <i>Reply, HC 290, Session 2000-01</i> )

### 1998-99 Session

First	The Multilateral Agreement on Investment, HC 58 ( <i>Reply, HC 45, Session 1999-2000</i> )
Second	Climate Change: Government response and follow-up, HC 88
Third	The Comprehensive Spending Review and Public Service Agreements, HC 92 ( <i>Reply, HC 233, Session 1999-2000</i> )
Fourth	The Pre-Budget Report 1998, HC 93
Fifth	GMOs and the Environment: Coordination of Government Policy, HC 384 ( <i>Reply Cm 4528</i> )
Sixth	The Greening Government Initiative 1999, HC 426
Seventh	Energy Efficiency, HC 159 ( <i>Reply, HC 571, Session 2000-01</i> )
Eighth	The Budget 1999: Environmental Implications, HC 326

**1997-98 Session**

- First            The Pre-Budget Report, HC 547 (*Reply, HC 985*)
- Second        The Greening Government Initiative, HC 517 (*Reply, HC 426, Session 1998-99*)
- Third         The Pre-Budget Report: Government response and follow-up, HC 985
- Fourth        Climate Change: UK Emission Reduction Targets and Audit Arrangements, HC 899 (*Reply, HC 88, Session 1998-99*)

ISBN 0-215-02347-1

