



HOUSE OF LORDS

Liaison Committee

---

5th Report of Session 2021–22

**The Ties that Bind:  
Citizenship and  
Civic Engagement in  
the 21st Century**  
*Follow-up report*

---

Ordered to be printed 17 March 2022 and published 29 March 2022

---

Published by the Authority of the House of Lords

HL Paper 179

### *Liaison Committee*

The Liaison Committee is appointed by the House of Lords to advise the House on the resources required for select committee work and to allocate resources between select committees; to review the select committee work of the House; to consider requests for Special Inquiry Committees and report to the House with recommendations; to ensure effective co-ordination between the two Houses; and to consider the availability of members to serve on committees

### *Membership*

The Members of the Liaison Committee are:

[Lord Blencathra](#)

[Earl Howe\\*](#)

[Lord Bradley](#)

[Lord Judge](#)

[Lord Collins of Highbury](#)

[Baroness Scott of Needham Market](#)

[Baroness Coussins](#)

[Lord Taylor of Holbeach](#)

[Lord Davies of Oldham](#)

[Baroness Walmsley](#)

[Lord Gardiner of Kimble](#) (Chair)

\*Earl Howe recused himself on grounds of ministerial propriety

### *Declaration of interests*

A full list of Members' interests can be found in the Register of Lords' Interests:

<https://members.parliament.uk/members/lords/interests/register-of-lords-interests>

### *Publications*

All publications of the Committee are available at:

<http://www.parliament.uk/lords-liaison>

### *Parliament Live*

Live coverage of debates and public sessions of the Committee's meetings are available at:

<http://www.parliamentlive.tv>

### *Further information*

Further information about the House of Lords and its Committees, including guidance to witnesses, details of current inquiries and forthcoming meetings is available at:

<http://www.parliament.uk/business/lords>

### *Committee staff*

The staff who worked on this inquiry were Heather Fuller (Committee Operations Officer), Lucy Molloy (Policy Analyst), David Shiels (Clerk) and Philippa Tudor (Clerk).

### *Contact details*

All correspondence should be addressed to the Liaison Committee, Committee Office, House of Lords, London SW1A 0PW. Telephone 020 7219 3130. Email

[hlliaisoncmttee@parliament.uk](mailto:hlliaisoncmttee@parliament.uk)

## CONTENTS

---

	<i>Page</i>
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
The Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement	3
The Civic Journey	3
Devolution	4
Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities	4
Follow-up work	4
<b>Chapter 2: Progress on key recommendations</b>	<b>6</b>
Cross-Government Coordination	6
Minister for Citizenship and Civic Engagement	6
Levelling up policy	9
Education	13
Citizenship education in schools in England	13
The role of Ofsted	16
Investment in Citizenship teachers	21
The role of the NCS	24
The citizenship test (Life in the UK)	27
<b>Summary of conclusions and recommendations</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Appendix 1: List of members and declarations of interests</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Appendix 2: List of witnesses</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Acronyms and glossary</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Letter from Lord Hodgson of Astley Abbots to Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (3 April 2019)</b>	<b>38</b>

Evidence is published online at <https://committees.parliament.uk/work/1730/citizenship-and-civic-engagement-followup/publications/> and available for inspection at the Parliamentary Archives (020 7219 3074).

Q in footnotes refers to a question in oral evidence.



# The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century

## *Follow-up report*

### CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

---

1. This report is the fifth using the new follow-up procedure recommended by our July 2019 report on the review of House of Lords Committees.<sup>1</sup> In this report, we examine the progress which has been made by the Government, Ofsted and key stakeholders on the implementation of some of the recommendations made by the Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement in its 2018 report, *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*.<sup>2</sup>

#### The Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement

2. The Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement was appointed on 29 June 2017 “to consider citizenship and civic engagement.”<sup>3</sup> The Committee was chaired by Lord Hodgson of Astley Abbots and the original report was published on 18 April 2018. The Government response was received on 28 June 2018 and the report was debated on 19 November 2018.<sup>4</sup>

#### *The Civic Journey*

3. The 2018 report outlined the concept of the ‘civic journey’. This was defined as “the manner in which an individual’s relationship with the state and with their fellow citizens, where they might live or how they view their position in the world, tends to change with the passage of time.”<sup>5</sup> The report ascertained that there may be variation in people’s expectations in terms of “rights and protections” from citizenship and their ability to contribute to society depending on their life stage and capacity.<sup>6</sup> The report concluded that the civic journey framework was a useful concept for considering cross-government coordination. It stated that: “Thinking in terms of the civic journey should also have significant benefits in terms of joined-up Government ... political leadership, government planning and strategic policy-making.” The report warned that the absence of a coherent government strategy towards citizenship could lead to confusion over accountability and “unrealised civic potential”, and noted that changes in policy were associated with frequent machinery of Government changes.<sup>7</sup>

---

1 Liaison Committee, *Review of House of Lords Investigative and Scrutiny Committees: towards a new thematic committee structure* (6th Report, Session 2017–19, HL Paper 398)

2 Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement, *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century* (Report of Session 2017–2019, HL Paper 118)

3 Liaison Committee, *New investigative committees in the 2017–18 Session* (2nd Report, Session 2016–2017, HL Paper 144)

4 HL Deb, 19 November 2018, cols 68-112

5 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 9

6 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 9

7 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 10

4. The 2018 report also found that “the United Kingdom’s approach to citizenship has in many policy areas become synonymous with an arguably over-narrow and individualised emphasis.”<sup>8</sup> It noted that there was an important distinction between defining citizenship in terms of “volunteering, social action, or learning facts” and “learning about practising democracy in the sense of political engagement and democratic participation.”<sup>9</sup> The report defined the “citizenship challenge” as “the cultivation of shared British values, respect for diversity and an understanding of what British citizenship entails—rights and responsibilities, giving and taking, talking and listening, putting in and taking out.”<sup>10</sup> The report was presented as a “framework for cultivating a sense of belonging, for defining and supporting a model of citizenship that emphasises what we have in common” and offered a “starting point for a national conversation” of what the Committee deemed to be “possibly the defining challenge of our present times.”<sup>11</sup>

### *Devolution*

5. The 2018 report made recommendations on a wide range of policy areas, some of which are devolved. Education is a devolved matter in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Immigration and the constitution are reserved and excepted matters.<sup>12</sup> The 2018 report stated that “whilst some recommendations apply only to some parts of the UK, we hope that the devolved administrations will find them useful.”<sup>13</sup> This report echoes that sentiment.

### *Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities*

6. Following the 2021 Cabinet reshuffle and a machinery of government change, the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) was renamed the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC). The Prime Minister said this change was intended to “embed levelling up commitments and policy on governance in the United Kingdom and elections within a single Department which already manages relationships with local communities, local government and the housing sector.”<sup>14</sup> The Secretary of State for the DLUHC was also appointed as the Minister for Intergovernmental Relations, with responsibility for leading “coordination with the devolved administrations on the Prime Minister’s behalf.”<sup>15</sup>

### *Follow-up work*

7. On 3 April 2019, Lord Hodgson wrote to the late Rt Hon James Brokenshire MP, the then Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to follow-up on the report’s recommendations. On 31 January

8 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 13

9 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 13

10 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 14

11 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, paras 13-16

12 Cabinet Office, Office of the Secretary of State for Scotland, Northern Ireland Office, and Office of the Secretary of State for Wales, *Devolution of powers to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland* (8 May 2019): <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/devolution-of-powers-to-scotland-wales-and-northern-ireland> [accessed 10 March 2022]

13 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 27

14 HC Deb, 23 September 2021, cols 19WS-20WS

15 Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, ‘Ministerial role: Minister for Intergovernmental Relations’: <https://www.gov.uk/government/ministers/minister-for-intergovernmental-relations> [accessed 10 March 2022]

2020, the then Chair of the Liaison Committee, The Rt Hon The Lord McFall of Alcluith, wrote to Mr Brokenshire’s successor, Rt Hon Robert Jenrick MP, regarding the Committee’s recommendations and with reference to the previous correspondence between Lord Hodgson and Mr Brokenshire.<sup>16</sup> Lord Greenhalgh, the then Minister of State for Building Safety and Communities, responded on 28 April 2020.<sup>17</sup>

8. Lord Hodgson wrote to the Chair of the Liaison Committee on 20 January 2021 making the case for follow-up.<sup>18</sup> At its meeting on 15 November 2021 the Liaison Committee considered the proposal and agreed that follow-up work would commence in February 2022.<sup>19</sup>
9. The Liaison Committee held three oral evidence sessions on 10 February 2022, and were joined by four former members of the Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement: Lord Hodgson (former Chair), Baroness Barker, Lord Blunkett and Baroness Eaton. We also received a number of written evidence submissions and are grateful to all our witnesses.
10. This report focuses on three areas:
  - Cross-Government coordination and strategy
  - Citizenship education
  - The Citizenship test (Life in the UK test)
11. We consider each of these in turn in chapter two. Our conclusions and recommendations are summarised at the end of this report. We look forward to the Government’s response.

---

16 Letter from The Rt Hon The Lord McFall of Alcluith, Chair of the Liaison Committee to The Rt Hon Robert Jenrick MP, Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (31 January 2020): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/64/documents/706/default/>

17 Letter from Lord Greenhalgh, Minister of State for Building Safety and Communities to The Rt Hon The Lord McFall of Alcluith, Chair of the Liaison Committee (28 April 2020): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/4133/documents/40824/default/>

18 Letter from Lord Hodgson of Astley Abbots to The Rt Hon The Lord McFall of Alcluith, Senior Deputy Speaker and Chair of the Liaison Committee, regarding follow-up to the Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement (20 January 2021)

19 Liaison Committee, Decisions document (15 November 2021): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/8015/documents/82664/default/>

## CHAPTER 2: PROGRESS ON KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

---

### Cross-Government Coordination

#### *Minister for Citizenship and Civic Engagement*

12. In the 2018 report, the Citizenship and Civic Engagement Committee recommended that “a single minister in a single department, presumably the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government, [be] given responsibility for coordinating all matters related to citizenship and civic engagement.”<sup>20</sup>
13. The Government’s response to the report stated:
 

“We welcome the Committee’s concept of a ‘civic journey’ and ensuring that we address barriers to active citizenship, so that everyone has the rights, responsibilities and opportunities of living in modern Britain. This is an important and complex area, and the Committee makes a strong case for centralising responsibility for coordination of these issues which fall across a wide range of Government Departments. We note the Committee believes that a lead Minister on all matters relating to citizenship and civic engagement would bring advantages. We will consider this recommendation further and respond to the Committee in due course.”<sup>21</sup>
14. On 3 April 2019, Lord Hodgson wrote to James Brokenshire MP making the case for a single cross-Government champion for citizenship and civic engagement and pressing for an update.<sup>22</sup> In his response, Mr Brokenshire stated that “this was one of the core purposes of the Inter-Ministerial Group (IMG) on the Safe and Integrated Communities, whose terms of reference had been amended specifically to include citizenship and civic engagement.”<sup>23</sup>
15. On 31 January 2020, the then Chair of the Liaison Committee, Lord McFall, followed up this correspondence with a letter to Mr Brokenshire’s successor, Robert Jenrick MP.<sup>24</sup> Replying on 20 April 2020, the then Minister of State at MHCLG, Lord Greenhalgh, replied, stating:
 

“In your letter you make reference to the Safe and Integrated Communities Inter-Ministerial Group (IMG). The IMG has coordinated the work of a number of departments to deliver on the commitments in the Integrated Communities Action Plan, including the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government; Home Office; Department for Education; Department for Culture, Media and Sport; Department for Work and Pensions; and Ministry of Justice. Following the General

---

20 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 22

21 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, *Government response to the Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement*, Cm 9629 (June 2018), p 2: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/720554/CCS207\\_CCS0618952710-001\\_Government\\_Response\\_to\\_House\\_of\\_Lords\\_Select\\_Co....pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/720554/CCS207_CCS0618952710-001_Government_Response_to_House_of_Lords_Select_Co....pdf)

22 Letter from Lord Hodgson of Astley Abbots to The Rt Hon James Brokenshire MP, Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (3 April 2019), see Appendix 4

23 This correspondence is referred to in a follow-up letter from Lord McFall of Alcluith: Letter from The Rt Hon The Lord McFall of Alcluith, Chair of the Liaison Committee to The Rt Hon Robert Jenrick MP, Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (31 January 2020): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/64/documents/706/default/>

24 Letter from The Rt Hon The Lord McFall of Alcluith, Chair of the Liaison Committee to The Rt Hon Robert Jenrick MP, Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government (31 January 2020): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/64/documents/706/default/>

Election of 2019, the Government is considering what governance arrangements will best ensure we deliver the commitments made in the 2019 Conservative manifesto - to build a country that has confidence in its own identity and values, and where the Government trusts people and communities to make the decisions that are right for them.”<sup>25</sup>

16. The Inter-Ministerial Group on Safe and Integrated Communities has not met since 2019.<sup>26</sup>
17. When questioned about the importance of a Minister for Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the course of the follow-up inquiry, witnesses were unanimous in their support for this recommendation.<sup>27</sup> Dr Andrew Mycock, Reader, Department of Behavioural and Social Sciences, University of Huddersfield, said:
 

“There is a clear logic in this proposal. The recommend[ation] that the Minister should be based in the MHCLG (now DLUHC) ... is consistent with the recent machinery of government changes that saw policy on the Union and Constitution move from the Cabinet Office to this department.”<sup>28</sup>
18. Dr Mycock recommended additional mechanisms to support the cross-government coordination of citizenship and civic engagement policy, including cabinet committees and inter-ministerial groups, arguing that this would “encourage a more connected and coherent approach” to policy making.<sup>29</sup> Dr Mycock identified that previous attempts to “enhance cross-government coordination and delivery ... of policy related to citizenship and civic engagement have lacked such support and thus have been undermined by changes in government.”<sup>30</sup> According to Dr Mycock there is some evidence that, since the 2018 report was published, “departments have sought to better integrate citizenship and civic engagement policymaking.”<sup>31</sup> Nevertheless, he added that: “The overall picture is one where work across government still lacks coherence, coordination, and connectivity in terms of overarching policy aims, delivery, or evaluation of outcomes.”<sup>32</sup>
19. Liz Moorse, Director of the Association for Citizenship Teaching (ACT), told the Committee that, in her view, there was widespread interest in the policy area at present, describing the situation as “positive.”<sup>33</sup> She said: “If we look across government, there are a range of policy areas where citizenship plays in specifically and clearly ... [including] the climate education strategy ... [and] the DCMS [Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport] media literacy strategy.”<sup>34</sup> Ms Moorse argued that the existence of multiple initiatives “highlights the need ... for very clear, cross-governmental co-ordination.” According to Ms Moorse, coordination:

---

25 Letter from Lord Greenhalgh, Minister of State for Building Safety and Communities to The Rt Hon The Lord McFall of Alcluith, Chair of the Liaison Committee (28 April 2020): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/4133/documents/40824/default/>

26 Written Answer [HL4550](#), Session 2021–2022

27 [Q 3](#) (David Goodhart, Ashley Hodges, Liz Moorse)

28 Written evidence from Dr Andrew Mycock ([CCE0005](#))

29 Written evidence from Dr Andrew Mycock ([CCE0005](#))

30 Written evidence from Dr Andrew Mycock ([CCE0005](#))

31 Written evidence from Dr Andrew Mycock ([CCE0005](#))

32 Written evidence from Dr Andrew Mycock ([CCE0005](#))

33 [Q 2](#) (Liz Moorse)

34 [Q 2](#) (Liz Moorse)

“... used to exist in a more concrete way. The Department for Education (DfE) previously had a Minister dedicated to citizenship and a working party that met regularly to work with the ministerial team and civil servants to advise them. One of the calls we would make today is that ... we rebuild that idea of cross-governmental support to support this area.”<sup>35</sup>

Ashley Hodges, CEO of Young Citizens, argued that: “We need a cross-governmental champion ... We need ... a strategy that hangs on the strength of communities, relationships and trust.”<sup>36</sup>

20. When asked about cross-departmental coordination and the fact that the Inter-Ministerial Group on Safe and Integrated Communities group has not met since 2019, Eddie Hughes MP, Minister for Rough Sleeping and Housing, DLUHC, argued that the Government had lacked capacity to address this due to other policy issues. He told the committee that:

“We have been through a period of turbulence. We have had Brexit. We have had two years of the pandemic, and the machinery of government has been considerably more focused in the previous two years in helping us to get through the pandemic.”<sup>37</sup>

21. Mr Hughes then expressed the view that that the COVID-19 pandemic had “genuinely strengthened ... the interconnectivities between government departments.”<sup>38</sup> Mr Hughes referred to the country experiencing a less acute phase of the pandemic, stating that the Government was “looking forward to a post-Covid world.”<sup>39</sup> Mr Hughes argued nonetheless that Government coordination in this policy area was sufficient, stating that: “... although you may feel that a Minister with specific responsibility was necessary, I would say that we are doing a very good job with the structures that we have in place at the moment.”<sup>40</sup>
22. **Whilst the Committee sympathises with the immense workload created by the COVID-19 pandemic, this does not provide an explanation for the lack of Inter-Ministerial group meetings preceding the pandemic. The Committee is pleased to hear that the pandemic has led to cross-government coordination in some areas; however, it does not agree that the coordination of citizenship and civic engagement policies is sufficient. It does not find the Government’s arguments against appointing a Minister for Citizenship and Civic Engagement to be convincing.**
23. **The Government has implied that the Inter-Ministerial Group for Safe and Integrated Communities is a substitute for a Minister for Citizenship and Civic Engagement. Given that the group has not met for three years, it is clearly not a suitable mechanism for coordinating this policy area and strengthens the argument for the appointment of a dedicated Minister.**

---

35 [Q 2](#) (Liz Moorse)

36 [Q 4](#) (Ashley Hodges)

37 [Q 33](#) (Eddie Hughes MP)

38 [Q 33](#) (Eddie Hughes MP)

39 [Q 33](#) (Eddie Hughes MP)

40 [Q 33](#) (Eddie Hughes MP)

24. ***Coordination of citizenship and civic engagement policy is insufficient. The Government should appoint a Minister with responsibility for Citizenship and Civic Engagement without delay. The location of this Minister is crucial, and the Committee believes that the Minister would have greatest impact if located in the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) or the Cabinet Office. The new Minister should be given appropriate authority and remit to facilitate integrated policymaking across UK Government departments. This Minister should be a permanent member of the Domestic and Economic (Levelling Up) Cabinet Committee.***

*Levelling up policy*

25. In 2021, the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) was renamed the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC). The Prime Minister said that the change in machinery of Government was intended to “embed levelling up commitments and policy on governance in the United Kingdom and elections within a single Department.”<sup>41</sup> The Declaration on Government Reform, published in June 2021, stated that the Government’s levelling up mission “means restoring and enhancing local and civic pride” and “strengthening the ties that bind us across the whole United Kingdom.” The policy paper also highlighted that “the Covid crisis revealed weaknesses in government and society” necessitating “a bold new reform agenda.”<sup>42</sup>
26. Prior to publication, the Government announced that the forthcoming Levelling Up white paper would “focus on challenges including improving living standards ... increasing and spreading opportunity.”<sup>43</sup> On 2 February 2022, the Government published its white paper, *Levelling up the United Kingdom*.<sup>44</sup> Civic institutions are referred to frequently throughout the paper, with the Government stating an intention to “tackle geographical disparities” through “root and branch reform of government and governance of the UK.”<sup>45</sup> Cross-government coordination and long-term planning are cited as critical aspects of the levelling up strategy and the paper draws a link between these factors and successful policy implementation:
- “System change is not about a string of shiny, but ultimately short-lived, new policy initiatives ... It is about putting power in local hands, armed with the right information and embedded in strong civic institutions.”<sup>46</sup>

27. The white paper identifies six core elements of the levelling up framework, which it refers to as ‘six capitals.’ These core elements include ‘Social capital’,

---

41 HC Deb, 23 September 2021, [cols 19WS-20WS](#)

42 Cabinet Office, *Declaration on Government Reform* (15 June 2021): [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/993902/FINAL\\_Declaration\\_on\\_Government\\_Reform.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/993902/FINAL_Declaration_on_Government_Reform.pdf) [accessed 10 March 2022]

43 Cabinet Office, Press Release: *Government to publish Levelling Up White Paper* (4 May 2021): <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-to-publish-levelling-up-white-paper> [accessed 10 March 2022]

44 Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, *Levelling Up the United Kingdom* (2 February 2022): [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1052708/Levelling\\_up\\_the\\_UK\\_white\\_paper.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1052708/Levelling_up_the_UK_white_paper.pdf) [accessed 10 March 2022]

45 Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, *Levelling Up the United Kingdom* (2 February 2022), p 16: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1052708/Levelling\\_up\\_the\\_UK\\_white\\_paper.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1052708/Levelling_up_the_UK_white_paper.pdf) [accessed 10 March 2022]

46 Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, *Levelling Up the United Kingdom, Executive Summary*, (2 February 2022), p xvii: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1052708/Levelling\\_up\\_the\\_UK\\_white\\_paper.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1052708/Levelling_up_the_UK_white_paper.pdf) [accessed 10 March 2022]

which is described as “the strength of communities, relationships and trust,” and ‘Institutional capital,’ which is described as “local leadership, capacity and capability.”<sup>47</sup> The white paper states that both social capital and institutional capital are intrinsically interlinked with other typical measures of success such as GDP and infrastructure projects. It therefore suggests that a lack of investment in social capital and institutional capital can lead to “a depletion of skills, business, finance and culture [and the decline of] communities and town centres” in some parts of the country.<sup>48</sup>

28. When asked about how the link between the levelling up agenda and citizenship and civic engagement policy, some witnesses welcomed the Government’s recent policy announcements. Professor Matthew Flinders, Director of the Sir Bernard Crick Centre for the Public Understanding of Politics, stated that: “The insights and arguments presented by the Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement are of greater relevance today than when they were first made.”<sup>49</sup> According to Professor Flinders, the recommendations in the 2018 report, “complement contemporary governmental priorities regarding community-powered innovation, placed-based [sic] policymaking, equality of opportunity and ‘levelling-up’ regional economic disparities.”<sup>50</sup>
29. Professor Flinders stated that consideration needs to be given to coordination of this policy area, arguing that:
- “There is a need to think about ... these various policies and opportunities together if the Government’s broader objectives concerning equality of opportunity, economic fairness and the creation a country where everyone feels they belong and to which everyone feels they can contribute are to be achieved.”<sup>51</sup>
30. Referring to the Government’s levelling up policy, and comparing it to other policy initiatives, David Goodhart, Head of Demography, Immigration & Integration, Policy Exchange, told the Committee that: “One thing that is different this time around ... is the way in which pride of place ... is central.”<sup>52</sup> Mr Goodhart also thought that the white paper had built in effective accountability mechanisms that would ensure meaningful change: “The White Paper was an important piece of work in many ways ... the accountability regime [will mean that] the Government [will] really hold their own feet to the fire.”<sup>53</sup>
31. Dr Mycock argued that citizenship and civic engagement could be a key theme of the levelling up policy. He said:

---

47 The levelling up white paper defines these core elements as “capitals.” Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, *Levelling Up the United Kingdom, Foreword by the Secretary of State and Andrew Haldane* (2 February 2022), p xvi: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1052708/Levelling\\_up\\_the\\_UK\\_white\\_paper.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1052708/Levelling_up_the_UK_white_paper.pdf) [accessed 10 March 2022]

48 The levelling up white paper defines these core elements as “capitals.” Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, *Levelling Up the United Kingdom, Foreword by the Secretary of State and Andrew Haldane* (2 February 2022), p xvi: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1052708/Levelling\\_up\\_the\\_UK\\_white\\_paper.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1052708/Levelling_up_the_UK_white_paper.pdf) [accessed 10 March 2022]

49 Written evidence from Professor Matthew Flinders (CCE0001)

50 Written evidence from Professor Matthew Flinders (CCE0001)

51 Written evidence from Professor Matthew Flinders (CCE0001)

52 Q 5 (David Goodhart)

53 Q 5 (David Goodhart)

“If we accept that ‘levelling up’ is conceived as more than an economic regeneration agenda, citizenship, education and NCS, working in a connected and integrated manner with the wider framework of school and non-school based programmes and initiatives supporting children and young people’s Civic Journeys, can play a significant role.”<sup>54</sup>

32. Some witnesses were concerned about the absence of citizenship education in the strategy. This is discussed in the education section of this chapter (paragraphs 41–56).
33. Ashley Hodges said that the aims of the levelling up policy would be unrealised if citizenship education and civic engagement programmes were not given due consideration in the strategy. She told the Committee that:

“If you look at the levelling up agenda in strengthening local participation and engagement, and the fact that [the strategy is] if anything, looking at putting power back into the hands of people locally, I think you will see a real struggle if we do not invest in [citizenship education] because people do not have the basic education ... or the confidence to engage with these institutions and with the Government ... Youth work is fantastic ... but a tiny fraction of the population is reached by that ... [There] needs to be a mixed approach that includes formal education ... from primary to university.”<sup>55</sup>

Liz Moorse said:

“We desperately need to see education as part of the answer to addressing the inequalities in society ... citizenship [education] engages young people with their communities. It gives them a sense of agency and empowerment. We absolutely need to see that, and we need to see more of that in more schools.”<sup>56</sup>

34. According to ACT the pandemic has “brought some opportunities for Citizenship, such as “discussing the role of government in protecting citizens.” It has also highlighted “the need for media literacy education in relation to conspiracy theories, and the anti-vax protests.”<sup>57</sup> Dr Mycock told the Committee that: “The need to ensure all young people have appropriate opportunities to support their civic literacy, engagement, and activism is acute.”<sup>58</sup> Dr Mycock said that in the internet age, where children have increased access to online devices, “delivery of citizenship education ... is integral in ensuring young people ... are able to navigate the internet in an informed and critical manner.”<sup>59</sup>
35. It is also notable that the first recommendation made in the recent Independent Human Rights Act Review was related to citizenship education, with the panel calling on the Government to “develop and effective programme of

---

54 Written evidence from Dr Andrew Mycock (CCE0005)

55 Q 5 (Ashley Hodges)

56 Q 5 (Liz Moorse)

57 Media literacy consists of practices that allow people to access, critically evaluate, and create or manipulate media. Media literacy is not restricted to one medium and is understood as a set of competencies that are essential for work, life, and citizenship. See also written evidence from the Association for Citizenship Teaching (ACT) (CCE0003)

58 Written evidence from Dr Andrew Mycock (CCE0005)

59 Written evidence from Dr Andrew Mycock (CCE0005)

civic and constitutional education in schools, universities and adult education ... [with a particular focus on] human rights.”<sup>60</sup>

*Cabinet Committee*

36. The Government has appointed a Cabinet Committee to lead on the levelling up policy. In answer to a question for written answer (QWA) the Government confirmed that the terms of reference for the Domestic and Economic (Levelling Up) Cabinet Committee are as follows: “To set direction for place-based strategies and embed levelling up within government policy and delivery.”<sup>61</sup> The membership of the Committee comprises of: the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities; the Chief Secretary to the Treasury; and the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Levelling Up, The Union and Constitution. The Government confirmed that “other ministers are invited according to the agenda”<sup>62</sup> and declined to elaborate on the frequency of the Cabinet Committee’s meetings.
37. *The Committee is reassured to hear that the Government has appointed a cabinet committee to coordinate this policy area and does not doubt the commitment of the Domestic and Economic (Levelling Up) Cabinet Committee. Nevertheless, the Committee saw good intent in relation to the Inter-Ministerial Group for Safe and Integrated Communities and yet that group did not meet for three consecutive years. Whilst the Committee respects that the Government organises its business how it sees fit and has stated that it does not usually share details of the frequency of cabinet committee meetings publicly, the Committee would be reassured to see evidence of the scale of the work expected to be undertaken by the Domestic and Economic (Levelling Up) Cabinet Committee.*
38. *Given the cross-cutting nature of the levelling up agenda, the Committee is surprised to see that the permanent membership of the Domestic and Economic (Levelling Up) Cabinet Committee does not span more departments. The Committee recommends that the Government consider making office holders within the Cabinet Office and the Department for Education (DfE) permanent members of the Cabinet Committee.*
39. *The Committee hopes that the Domestic and Economic (Levelling Up) Cabinet Committee can address the issues identified with institutional memory and recommends that a community-led and data-led approach is taken to the coordination of citizenship and civic engagement policies.*
40. *Citizenship education and civic engagement opportunities are essential parts of a well-functioning democratic society. The Committee finds it difficult to comprehend how the levelling up strategy could be effective without adequate investment in and coordination of citizenship education and civic engagement initiatives. The Government should ensure that provision for citizenship education is included in the levelling up policy and*

---

60 Ministry of Justice, *Independent Human Rights Act Review*, (14 December 2021), p 7: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1040525/ihrar-final-report.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1040525/ihrar-final-report.pdf) [accessed 10 March 2022]

61 Written answer [HL6250](#), Session 2021-22

62 Written answer [HL6250](#), Session 2021-22

*consideration given to its role in addressing fake news, conspiracy theories and feelings of disenfranchisement.*

## Education

### *Citizenship education in schools in England*

41. The 2018 report found that the education system had a pivotal role to play in developing active citizens and ensuring that individuals have the skills and knowledge to engage with civic institutions throughout their lives. The Committee concluded that: “Whilst many parts of the school experience can contribute to creating an active citizen, citizenship education [played] a specific [role].”<sup>63</sup> The report identified that the benefits of effective citizenship education are significant in addressing inequality and widening access to civic engagement. James Weinberg told the Committee that: “those in the top quintile for household income are five times more likely to participate in political activities than those in the lowest” and he advised that, “Citizenship education ... where [delivered] effectively and consistently ... can redress this balance.”<sup>64</sup> Other witnesses stated that citizenship education could lead to “greater social cohesion, greater resilience and aspiration among young people” giving children “the critical debate and public speaking skills ... that will set [them] up for life.”<sup>65</sup>
42. Citizenship was introduced into the curriculum for key stages 3 and 4 (ages 11-16) in 2002 “following concerns about declining democratic involvement and worries about social decline” in the publication of the 1998 report of the Advisory Group for the Teaching of Citizenship and Democracy in Schools (the Crick report).<sup>66</sup> It remains a curriculum subject, with an optional GCSE. The 2018 report identified that the quality of citizenship teaching varied significantly.<sup>67</sup> The Development Education Centre South said that: “Very few schools take Citizenship Education seriously and most secondary schools are failing their statutory duty to teach it.”<sup>68</sup> They also expressed concern that citizenship was “often hidden in [PSHE]” and as a result “pupils are unaware of the difference between the two subjects.”<sup>69</sup>
43. The 2018 report found numerous examples of citizenship education being conflated with PSHE (Personal, Social, Health and Economic Education) which is focused on “individual development ... [rather than] teaching young people about their role in society” and “ignoring the political elements of being a citizen.”<sup>70</sup> The Committee summarised this approach with the phrase “PSHE is about ‘me’ [and citizenship is about] ‘us.’”<sup>71</sup>
44. In written evidence to the 2022 inquiry, ACT stated that some of their membership had expressed concern that some Ofsted inspectors did

---

63 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 88

64 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 92

65 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, paras 89-93

66 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 95 see also Citizenship Advisory Group, *Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools* (22 September 1998): [https://www.teachingcitizenship.org.uk/sites/teachingcitizenship.org.uk/files/6123\\_crick\\_report\\_1998\\_0.pdf](https://www.teachingcitizenship.org.uk/sites/teachingcitizenship.org.uk/files/6123_crick_report_1998_0.pdf)

67 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 96

68 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 105

69 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 105

70 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 101

71 [Q 26](#) (Baroness Barker), see also [Q 14](#) (Lord Blunkett)

not distinguish between PSHE and citizenship education. They told the Committee that:

“The teachers felt that there was a general lack of knowledge and understanding of the subject by inspectors of what Citizenship is, how it is best planned, sequenced and taught and, how it is different and distinct from PSHE education. They expressed frustration with the lack of subject understanding of those inspecting their provision and with the depth and seriousness with which some inspectors appeared to give their evidence.”<sup>72</sup>

45. According to ACT, “there is an urgent need for Ofsted Inspectors to be properly trained in Citizenship” and they hoped that “Ofsted will undertake a rigorous subject review and report into the quality of Citizenship, to support good practice.”<sup>73</sup> **The Committee agrees with this and makes a number of recommendations to Ofsted in (Paragraph 72–77).**
46. The 2018 report found that citizenship education is more effective if started at an early age. Tom Franklin, former CEO of the Citizenship Foundation (now Young Citizens), stated that citizenship education when delivered at key stage 2 (ages 7-11) can “give children a sense of agency ... even at a young age [they feel that] they can make a difference ... it is too late to wait until secondary school.”<sup>74</sup> Following a visit to a primary school, where they observed citizenship teaching first hand, the former Committee concluded that “a focus on citizenship can help children see what they have in common and provide a narrative that binds the school together.”<sup>75</sup>
47. The 2018 report recommended that:
- “The Government should create a statutory entitlement to citizenship education from primary to the end of secondary education. This should be inspected by Ofsted to ensure the quantity and quality of provision. Ofsted should give consideration to this in deciding whether a school should be rated as Outstanding.”<sup>76</sup>
48. In its response to the report, the Government stated that:
- “We recognise that high quality citizenship education helps to provide pupils with the knowledge, skills and understanding to prepare them to play a full and active part in society. We want all pupils to understand democracy, government and how laws are made and to understand the different ways that citizens can work together to improve their communities and society. We want children and young people to use this understanding to become constructive, active citizens.”<sup>77</sup>
49. However, the Government rejected the Committee’s recommendation on the basis that: “The national curriculum was comprehensively reviewed and then published in 2013 and, in April 2018, the Secretary of State for Education

---

72 Written evidence from the Association for Citizenship Teaching (ACT) ([CCE0003](#))

73 Written evidence from the Association for Citizenship Teaching (ACT) ([CCE0003](#))

74 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 120

75 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 121

76 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 123

77 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, *Government response to the Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement*, Cm 9629 (June 2018), p 9: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/720554/CCS207\\_CCS0618952710-001\\_Government\\_Response\\_to\\_House\\_of\\_Lords\\_Select\\_Co....pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/720554/CCS207_CCS0618952710-001_Government_Response_to_House_of_Lords_Select_Co....pdf)

committed to making no further reforms to the national curriculum in this parliament.”<sup>78</sup>

50. In 2013, the national curriculum for key stages 3 and 4 was revised and this framework is still in place. The aims of the current National Curriculum on citizenship are to ensure that all pupils:
- “acquire a sound knowledge and understanding of how the United Kingdom is governed, its political system and how citizens participate actively in its democratic systems of government;
  - develop a sound knowledge and understanding of the role of law and the justice system in our society and how laws are shaped and enforced;
  - develop an interest in, and commitment to, participation in volunteering as well as other forms of responsible activity, that they will take with them into adulthood;
  - are equipped with the skills to think critically and debate political questions, to enable them to manage their money on a day-to-day basis, and plan for future financial needs.”<sup>79</sup>
51. There is a non-statutory framework for citizenship for key stages 1 and 2 and schools are not required to follow it. This framework focuses on broader concepts such as learning right from wrong and how to articulate opinions.<sup>80</sup>
52. During the course of the follow-up inquiry, witnesses were supportive of the recommendation to create a statutory entitlement to citizenship education for children from primary through to secondary education. Liz Moorse said: “We know that if we prepare our youngest children well with education for citizenship and democracy, it leads to better outcomes further down the line in later school life.”<sup>81</sup> Ms Moorse added that “the primary curriculum for citizenship has not been updated since the day when ... it was introduced in 2001.” She believed that “investment, attention and ministerial leadership” are needed.<sup>82</sup>
53. Ashley Hodges argued that as citizenship education was not “solely a knowledge-based subject” but one that involved “building skills, practice and habit[s]” it was vital to “start younger.”<sup>83</sup> Ms Hodges asserted that “we cannot start with young people when they are going to vote.”<sup>84</sup> She said that “without the Department for Education ... making this a priority, the uptake is not going to be there” and cautioned that the outcome of this would be

---

78 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, *Government response to the Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement*, Cm 9629 (June 2018), p 12: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/720554/CCS207\\_CCS0618952710-001\\_Government\\_Response\\_to\\_House\\_of\\_Lords\\_Select\\_Co....pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/720554/CCS207_CCS0618952710-001_Government_Response_to_House_of_Lords_Select_Co....pdf)

79 Department for Education, *Citizenship programmes of study: key stages 3 and 4, National curriculum in England* (11 September 2013): [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/908347/SECONDARY\\_national\\_curriculum\\_-\\_Citizenship.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/908347/SECONDARY_national_curriculum_-_Citizenship.pdf) [accessed 16 March 2022]

80 Department for Education, *Guidance, Citizenship programmes of study for key stages 1 and 2* (16 February 2015): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/citizenship-programmes-of-study-for-key-stages-1-and-2> [accessed 16 March 2022]

81 Q 6 (Liz Moorse)

82 Q 6 (Liz Moorse)

83 Q 6 (Ashley Hodges)

84 Q 6 (Ashley Hodges)

“primary school children not building the skills ... for citizenship and they go into secondary school and beyond.”<sup>85</sup>

54. When asked to confirm if he was “personally committed to ensuring that [citizenship] is seen as a high-quality, major contribution to the education system,” Robin Walker MP, Minister of State for School Standards, said: “Yes.”<sup>86</sup> Mr Walker informed the Committee that the Government is due to publish “a schools White Paper later this year” and stated that he was “confident that you will see a focus in it on areas such as personal development, citizenship and some of the areas that this covers.”<sup>87</sup> When asked about the long-term benefits of investment in citizenship education for social cohesion, capacity building within communities, and engaging in ‘bottom up’ policy implementation, Mr Walker replied: “you are absolutely right that it is a long-term investment, I very much agree with that ... there is a really active citizenship drive going on ... that we should foster and encourage.”<sup>88</sup>
55. *The Committee is reassured to hear that the Government is committed to ensuring the effective delivery of citizenship education within schools. If children are to be able to develop the skills required to become active citizens, they must be taught citizenship throughout their education. The Committee reiterates the 2018 recommendation that the Government should create a statutory entitlement to citizenship education from key stages 1-4.*
56. *The Committee looks forward to the publication of the Schools White Paper and was reassured to hear that it will contain the Government’s plans for citizenship education policy. The related recommendations in this report should be addressed through the white paper. The implementation timetable should be published within six months.*

#### *The role of Ofsted*

57. The Office for Standards in Education Children’s Services and Skills (Ofsted) is a non-ministerial department of the UK government, reporting to Parliament. Ofsted is responsible for inspecting a range of educational institutions, including state schools and some independent schools, in England.<sup>89</sup>
58. The 2018 report considered Ofsted’s approach to citizenship in detail. The report found that there was a lack of data on current teaching of citizenship, with some witnesses stating that the data on citizenship education is “virtually non-existent” and that “it is very difficult to speak with certainty about the true picture of citizenship education.”<sup>90</sup> When questioned about this, Ofsted referred to data from 2009–2011, which the Committee found to be unsatisfactory.<sup>91</sup>

---

85 [Q 6](#) (Ashley Hodges)

86 [Q 25](#) (Robin Walker MP)

87 [Q 28](#) (Robin Walker MP)

88 [Q 31](#) (Robin Walker MP)

89 Ofsted, ‘What Ofsted does’: <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ofsted/about> [accessed 17 March 2022]

90 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 136

91 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 137

59. The Expert Subject Advisory Group for Citizenship said that “Ofsted should be asked to undertake a special survey ... to find examples of best practice.”<sup>92</sup> The Committee agreed with this, concluding that: “The Government should have a solid understanding of whether citizenship is being taught, how it is being taught, and what good teaching looks like.”<sup>93</sup>

60. The 2018 report recommended that:

“Ofsted should undertake a review of the current provision and quality of citizenship education in schools and highlight best practice. This should be followed up with long term monitoring of whether citizenship education achieves the set of criteria or goals that the Government sets out for it.”<sup>94</sup>

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the Committee also made the related recommendation:

“The Government should create a statutory entitlement to citizenship education from primary to the end of secondary education. This should be inspected by Ofsted to ensure the quantity and quality of provision. Ofsted should give consideration to this in deciding whether a school should be rated as Outstanding.”<sup>95</sup>

61. In its response to the 2018 report, the Government stated that:

“Ofsted does not inspect individual curriculum subjects but there is a statutory requirement on inspectors to consider how schools support pupils’ spiritual, moral, social and cultural development. This includes consideration of a number of factors which are relevant to citizenship.”<sup>96</sup>

62. The Government response advised that Ofsted was not “undertaking reviews of individual subjects” but was “undertaking work looking at the curriculum as a whole.”<sup>97</sup> The Government stated that “Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector attaches great importance to schools having a broad and rich curriculum.” In addition, the response stated that a “new education inspection framework” was due to be introduced in 2019 and this framework would “build on findings from the curriculum review” and was “expected to have a particular focus on the curriculum.”<sup>98</sup>

63. The Liaison Committee followed up on these recommendations via correspondence in 2019, by which time the new inspection framework was in place. Lord Greenhalgh wrote that the:

92 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 142

93 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 142

94 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 143

95 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 123

96 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, *Government response to the Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement*, Cm 9629 (June 2018), p 9: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/720554/CCS207\\_CCS0618952710-001\\_Government\\_Response\\_to\\_House\\_of\\_Lords\\_Select\\_Co....pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/720554/CCS207_CCS0618952710-001_Government_Response_to_House_of_Lords_Select_Co....pdf)

97 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, *Government response to the Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement*, Cm 9629 (June 2018), p 11: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/720554/CCS207\\_CCS0618952710-001\\_Government\\_Response\\_to\\_House\\_of\\_Lords\\_Select\\_Co....pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/720554/CCS207_CCS0618952710-001_Government_Response_to_House_of_Lords_Select_Co....pdf)

98 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, *Government response to the Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement*, Cm 9629 (June 2018), p 11: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/720554/CCS207\\_CCS0618952710-001\\_Government\\_Response\\_to\\_House\\_of\\_Lords\\_Select\\_Co....pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/720554/CCS207_CCS0618952710-001_Government_Response_to_House_of_Lords_Select_Co....pdf)

“new inspection framework ... has a strong emphasis on ensuring schools provide a broad and rich curriculum for all their pupils. That means the full national curriculum, which of course includes citizenship, or in the case of academies, a curriculum similar in breadth and ambition.”<sup>99</sup>

Lord Greenhalgh confirmed that, “whilst inspectors will not report separately on each individual subject, they will take a series of ‘deep dives’ into sample subjects, selected across the school’s curriculum in order to understand the quality of education.”<sup>100</sup>

64. The education inspection framework, published in May 2019 and last updated in July 2021, sets out how Ofsted will inspect state schools, further education and skills providers, non-association independent schools and registered early years settings in England.<sup>101</sup> There are four criteria that are used to make graded judgements that feed into the overall rating of the school (‘outstanding’, ‘good’, ‘requires improvement’ or ‘inadequate’). These criteria are: Quality of Education; Behaviour and Attitudes; Personal Development; Leadership and Management.<sup>102</sup>
65. The Quality of Education inspection includes evaluation of:
- (a) Intent: “the extent to which the school’s curriculum sets out the knowledge and skills that pupils will gain at each stage.”
  - (b) Implementation: “the way that the curriculum developed or adopted by the school is taught and assessed in order to support pupils to build their knowledge and to apply that knowledge as skills.”
  - (c) Impact: “the outcomes that pupils achieve as a result of the education they have received.”<sup>103</sup>
66. In reference to the ‘Personal Development’ criteria, Ofsted’s handbook states that: “the curriculum provided by schools should extend beyond the academic, technical or vocational. Schools support pupils to develop in many diverse aspects of life.” The personal development judgement evaluates:
- (a) “the school’s intent to provide for the personal development of all pupils, and the quality with which the school implements this work.”<sup>104</sup>
  - (b) The handbook states that: “the impact of the school’s provision for personal development will often not be assessable during pupils’ time

---

99 Letter from Lord Greenhalgh, Minister of State for Building Safety and Communities to The Rt Hon The Lord McFall of Alcluith, Chair of the Liaison Committee (28 April 2020): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/4133/documents/40824/default/>

100 Letter from Lord Greenhalgh, Minister of State for Building Safety and Communities to The Rt Hon The Lord McFall of Alcluith, Chair of the Liaison Committee (28 April 2020): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/4133/documents/40824/default/>

101 Ofsted, *Guidance, Education inspection framework (EIF)* (23 July 2021): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/education-inspection-framework/education-inspection-framework> [accessed 1 March 2022]

102 Ofsted, *Guidance, Education inspection framework (EIF)* (23 July 2021): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/education-inspection-framework/education-inspection-framework> [accessed 1 March 2022]

103 Ofsted, *School inspection handbook* (1 October 2021): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-inspection-handbook-eif/school-inspection-handbook#quality-of-education> [accessed 22 February 2022]

104 Ofsted, *School inspection handbook* (1 October 2021): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-inspection-handbook-eif/school-inspection-handbook#quality-of-education> [accessed 22 February 2022]

at school.” Therefore, “inspectors will seek to evaluate the quality and intent of what a school provides ... but will not attempt to measure the impact of the school’s work on the lives of individual pupils.”<sup>105</sup>

67. **The Committee notes that there is an important distinction between the ‘Quality of Education’ inspection criteria and the ‘Personal Development’ criteria.** The Ofsted inspection criteria for ‘Quality of Education’ measures intent, implementation and impact. The personal development criteria is not designed to assess ‘hard knowledge’ as it only measures intent and not impact. **The Committee therefore concludes that the ‘Personal Development’ criteria is not the appropriate metric for assessing citizenship. All Ofsted inspectors should be assessing citizenship education via the ‘Quality of Education’ criteria, as outlined in more detail in this chapter.**
68. ‘Deep dives’ are a key part of assessing subjects under the ‘Quality of Education’ metric.<sup>106</sup> Evidence received in 2022 suggests that Ofsted has not been completing regular ‘deep dives’ into citizenship. ACT told us that:
- “The Ofsted Inspection Handbook describes the main activities undertaken during inspection and sets out the evaluation criteria that inspectors will use as a basis for their judgements. The Handbook acknowledges the status of citizenship as a national curriculum subject but does not reveal that it will not be inspected in the same way as other subjects. In 2021, Ofsted advised us in correspondence that: ‘we have decided therefore to judge Citizenship through personal development, rather than through QE [Quality of Education].’”<sup>107</sup>
69. Ofsted confirmed this approach, stating that, “we evaluate citizenship largely within the personal development judgement.”<sup>108</sup> Ofsted defended their approach to assessing citizenship, stating that they: “do not confuse or conflate citizenship with P/RSHE or other aspects of personal development.” Ofsted expressed the view that: “Although we evaluate citizenship largely within the context of personal development, that doesn’t mean that we have low or inappropriate expectations for it.”<sup>109</sup>
70. The evidence received counters these assertions. Liz Moorse criticised Ofsted’s decision to assess citizenship in this manner, stating that: “if you read the Ofsted inspection handbook and framework, it is very clear that the framework is to look at the quality of education based on the national curriculum which includes citizenship.”<sup>110</sup> Ms Moorse explained that as a result of this approach from Ofsted: “Citizenship is not, therefore, being treated with the same fairness, rigour and equity as other national curriculum

105 Ofsted, *School inspection handbook* (1 October 2021): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-inspection-handbook-eif/school-inspection-handbook#quality-of-education> [accessed 22 February 2022]

106 Letter from Lord Greenhalgh, Minister of State for Building Safety and Communities to The Rt Hon The Lord McFall of Alcluith, Chair of the Liaison Committee (28 April 2020): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/4133/documents/40824/default/>

107 Written evidence from the Association for Citizenship Teaching (CCE0003)

108 Letter from Chris Russell, National Director of Education, Ofsted to Lord Gardiner of Kimble, Chair of the Liaison Committee (21 February 2022): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/9100/documents/159384/default/>

109 Letter from Chris Russell, National Director of Education, Ofsted to Lord Gardiner of Kimble, Chair of the Liaison Committee (21 February 2022) <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/9100/documents/159384/default/>

110 [Q 7](#) (Liz Moorse)

subjects.”<sup>111</sup> Ms Moorse described this as approach as “damaging” and argued that “it indicates that Ofsted has a preconceived idea of how schools deliver this subject” which Ms Moorse saw as mission creep, stating that this was “not really its business.”<sup>112</sup>

71. Ofsted confirmed that ‘deep dives’ which are a core part of the Quality of Education metric are not undertaken for citizenship, stating that: “While inspectors could undertake a ‘deep dive’ into citizenship, they are unlikely to do so, except on rare occasions, because they take full account of citizenship on every inspection as part of the personal development judgement.”<sup>113</sup> Ofsted said that the subjects chosen for deep dives were chosen “in discussion with a head teacher” and that inspections could focus on “particular strengths of the school ...” whilst also assessing “areas that have been weak, and that the school has been working on.”<sup>114</sup> **Given that the evidence taken in the 2018 and the 2022 inquiries show that the delivery of citizenship education is weak in many schools, it is logical that deep dives should be undertaken on a regular basis across the board to measure progress in this area and, in the words of Chris Russell, “give us [Ofsted] the best picture and view of a school and its curriculum.”**<sup>115</sup>
72. **The Committee is deeply concerned with Ofsted’s disregard for citizenship as a statutory curriculum subject and its insistence on assessing it through personal development alone. Citizenship is an academic subject and when taught properly should involve the development of knowledge, skills and understanding that pupils need to become active and responsible citizens. Citizenship should not be treated solely as part of pupils’ personal development. To do so is to misunderstand the nature of the subject in its entirety.**
73. *The evidence received demonstrates that Ofsted is misinterpreting the Government’s policy and assessment criteria for Citizenship. The Government must outline how it will address this discrepancy and monitor Ofsted’s assessment of Citizenship moving forward.*
74. *Citizenship is a curriculum subject and should be treated as such. Ofsted should use ‘Quality of Education’ when inspecting and assessing citizenship education. Regular deep dives should be undertaken. Ofsted should ensure that citizenship is not conflated with PSHE. Effective delivery of Citizenship education should be considered when awarding school ratings, including practical as well as theoretical delivery.*
75. *The Committee does not agree with Ofsted’s assertion that evaluating citizenship through the personal development metric is appropriate. Ofsted’s intention to review citizenship education provision through*

---

111 Q 7 (Liz Moorse)

112 Q 7 (Liz Moorse)

113 Letter from Chris Russell, National Director of Education, Ofsted to Lord Gardiner of Kimble, Chair of the Liaison Committee (21 February 2022): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/9100/documents/159384/default/>

114 Letter from Chris Russell, National Director of Education, Ofsted to Lord Gardiner of Kimble, Chair of the Liaison Committee (21 February 2022): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/9100/documents/159384/default/>

115 Letter from Chris Russell, National Director of Education, Ofsted to Lord Gardiner of Kimble, Chair of the Liaison Committee (21 February 2022): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/9100/documents/159384/default/>

*its upcoming review of personal development is insufficient. The Committee reiterates its 2018 recommendation that Ofsted should undertake a review of the current provision and quality of citizenship education in schools and highlight best practice. This should be followed up with long term monitoring of the impact of citizenship education as a standalone curriculum subject.*

76. *Ofsted must recognise the importance of citizenship education, particularly in the light of the challenges facing young people today and the acute need for them to develop political and media literacy skills. Furthermore, there are clear links between the Government’s levelling up agenda and citizenship, and an opportunity to ensure that this policy is successful could be missed, should schools not provide pupils with the appropriate foundation for civic engagement. The Government should outline what steps will be taken to improve Ofsted’s understanding of the wider context of citizenship education and ensure that Ofsted refrains from side-lining the subject.*
77. *Ofsted should review the support and training given to their inspectors and should ensure that the inspectors are able to understand and effectively assess citizenship as a curriculum subject.*

#### *Investment in Citizenship teachers*

78. The 2018 report found that Citizenship is one of the few curriculum subjects that is not granted a bursary.<sup>116</sup> The report also found that non-specialist teachers are not as well equipped to teach the subject as specialists are.<sup>117</sup> The Committee recommended that the Government:
- “establish citizenship education as a priority subject for teacher training and provide bursaries for applicants. Urgent action should be taken to step up programmes of Continuing Professional Development for those willing to take on and lead citizenship education in their school.”<sup>118</sup>
79. The Committee also recommended that the Government: “establish a target of having enough trained citizenship teachers to have a citizenship specialist in every secondary school.”<sup>119</sup> In its response to the 2018 report the Government did not support the Committee’s recommendations in this area. It stated that it does not “impose a limit on the number of trainee teachers in citizenship that are recruited for initial teacher training,”<sup>120</sup> although the Committee did not suggest an upward limit for citizenship teachers. It added that their supply model was incompatible with setting individual targets for recruiting citizenship teachers in schools: “DfE uses the Teacher Supply Model to estimate the number of postgraduate Initial Teacher Training (ITT) places ... The model is not used to set targets that relate to individual schools in the fashion.” The Government explained that: “The model estimates the need for citizenship teachers at a national level based on the number of citizenship lessons that are being taught across the country and how this is expected to

116 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 128

117 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 130

118 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 133

119 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 132

120 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, *Government response to the Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement*, Cm 9629 (June 2018), p 9: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/720554/CCS207\\_CCS0618952710-001\\_Government\\_Response\\_to\\_House\\_of\\_Lords\\_Select\\_Co....pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/720554/CCS207_CCS0618952710-001_Government_Response_to_House_of_Lords_Select_Co....pdf)

change going forward.”<sup>121</sup> **The Committee fails to see the logic of this argument, as the number of lessons taught must directly correlate to the number of pupils and schools.**

80. **The Committee fails to understand why the Government cannot collect data on trained citizenship teachers and recruit accordingly, as they do for other subjects.**<sup>122</sup> In the response to the 2018 report, the Government stated that: “it is for head teachers to decide how to best deliver their curriculum through the effective use of teachers in their schools.”<sup>123</sup> However, if there are not enough trained citizenship teachers available, and the Government does not support collecting data on subject specialists, or encouraging their recruitment, it is difficult to see how headteachers can ensure effective delivery of citizenship within their schools.
81. In correspondence with the Chair of the Liaison Committee in 2020, Lord Greenhalgh said: “We have had to take difficult decisions about where to focus our budget in relation to initial teacher training bursaries.”<sup>124</sup> He stated that EBacc (the English Baccalaureate) subjects were being given priority for bursaries.<sup>125</sup> It is notable that the Government had in this instance decided to set subject specific targets for recruitment, in spite of their previous assertion that this was not compatible with their recruitment model. Lord Greenhalgh added that: “as more schools enter more pupil for EBacc subjects we expect there will be more demand for specialist teachers in these subject. We have therefore focused the bursaries budgets on EBacc subjects to ensure as many applicants as possible in the subjects that are in the highest demand by schools.”<sup>126</sup>
82. In 2021, Lord Hodgson submitted the following question for written answer to the Department for Education: “To ask Her Majesty’s Government how many teachers self-identified as citizenship education teachers in between 2016–2021.”<sup>127</sup> The Government response stated that data on citizenship

---

121 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, *Government response to the Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement*, Cm 9629 (June 2018), p 10: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/720554/CCS207\\_CCS0618952710-001\\_Government\\_Response\\_to\\_House\\_of\\_Lords\\_Select\\_Co....pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/720554/CCS207_CCS0618952710-001_Government_Response_to_House_of_Lords_Select_Co....pdf)

122 House of Commons Library, *Teacher recruitment and retention in England*, Research Briefing, **CBP-7222**, (24 November 2021) see also: Department for Education, *Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategy* (15 January 2019): [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/786856/DFE\\_Teacher\\_Retention\\_Strategy\\_Report.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/786856/DFE_Teacher_Retention_Strategy_Report.pdf) [accessed 10 March 2022]

123 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, *Government response to the Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement*, Cm 9629 (June 2018): [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/720554/CCS207\\_CCS0618952710-001\\_Government\\_Response\\_to\\_House\\_of\\_Lords\\_Select\\_Co....pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/720554/CCS207_CCS0618952710-001_Government_Response_to_House_of_Lords_Select_Co....pdf)

124 Letter from Lord Greenhalgh, Minister of State for Building Safety and Communities to The Rt Hon The Lord McFall of Alcluith, Chair of the Liaison Committee (28 April 2020): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/4133/documents/40824/default/>

125 EBacc subjects are: English language and literature, maths, the sciences, geography or history, and a language. Department for Education, *Guidance on the English Baccalaureate (EBacc)* (20 August 2019): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/english-baccalaureate-ebacc/english-baccalaureate-ebacc> [accessed 10 March 2022], see also: Letter from Lord Greenhalgh, Minister of State for Building Safety and Communities to The Rt Hon The Lord McFall of Alcluith, Chair of the Liaison Committee (28 April 2020): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/4133/documents/40824/default/>

126 Letter from Lord Greenhalgh, Minister of State for Building Safety and Communities to The Rt Hon The Lord McFall of Alcluith, Chair of the Liaison Committee (28 April 2020): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/4133/documents/40824/default/>

127 Written Answer **HL500**, Session 2021–22

trainees stopped being collected in 2019.<sup>128</sup> The Government did not explain the rationale behind this decision. The latest Initial Teacher Training (ITT) Census for 2021–22 in England does not include any information on Citizenship, in fact citizenship appears to be the only curriculum subject which is not included.<sup>129</sup>

83. During the course of the 2022 follow-up inquiry, when asked about data collection on citizenship teachers, Robin Walker MP told the Committee that:

“When we come to targets for training, we do not restrict in any way the numbers for subjects, including citizenship. The key areas where we tend to look for targets are in the EBacc subjects; and the bursary support that we provide has been targeted at the EBacc targets, particularly those in which there have been shortages. As you will be aware, that has been a particular challenge in areas such as physics and maths.”<sup>130</sup>

84. When asked if the bursary system would affect the recruitment of citizenship teachers, Mr Walker said: “Not necessarily. We see over-recruitment in other subjects that have not attracted bursaries.” He confirmed that the system was designed to “target scarce resources to where they are most needed.”<sup>131</sup> **The Committee agrees that support should be targeted and data-driven.** According to ACT, the number of trained citizenship teachers has halved in the past decade. The data for 2020–2021 indicate that there are “4,226 trained citizenship teachers,” whereas a decade ago there were “9,958 teachers.”<sup>132</sup> **Given the significant decline in trained citizenship teachers, the Committee considers it regrettable that the Government is not providing bursaries for this subject and it urges the Government to reconsider its position.**
85. *The Committee is disappointed about the lack of investment in citizenship teaching. The Committee recommends that the following recommendations are included in the Government’s forthcoming schools white paper.*
86. *The Government should reinstate bursaries for citizenship teachers for the 2023–24 academic year. The citizenship bursaries should remain in place until there are equivalent numbers to ensure that there is at least one trained specialist in every secondary school. The Government should also set a target for having at least one trained citizenship teacher in every primary school.*

---

128 Written Answer [HL500](#), Session 2021–22

129 Department for Education, *Guidance Initial teacher training bursaries funding manual: 2020 to 2021 academic year* (last updated 10 February 2022): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/initial-teacher-training-itt-bursary-funding-manual/initial-teacher-training-bursaries-funding-manual-2022-to-2023-academic-year#annex-a-list-of-subjects-eligible-for-a-bursary> [accessed 17 March 2022]

130 [Q 26](#) (Robin Walker MP)

131 [Q 26](#) (Robin Walker MP) see also: Department for Education guidance states that the current eligible subjects are: biology, chemistry, computing, design and technology, geography, languages, mathematics, physics. Department for Education, *Guidance Initial teacher training bursaries funding manual: 2022 to 2023 academic year, Annex A* (Last Updated 10 February 2022): <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/initial-teacher-training-itt-bursary-funding-manual/initial-teacher-training-bursaries-funding-manual-2022-to-2023-academic-year#annex-a-list-of-subjects-eligible-for-a-bursary> [accessed 22 February 2022]

132 Written evidence from the Association for Citizenship Teaching (ACT) ([CCE0003](#))

87. ***The Committee is concerned to hear that the Government is no longer collecting data on citizenship trainee teachers. The Committee does not see any reasonable explanation for this. The Committee recommends that the data collection resumes without delay.***

*The role of the NCS*

88. The National Citizen Service (NCS) is a voluntary personal and social development programme for 16–17 year olds in England and Northern Ireland, established in 2010. The National Citizen Service Act 2017 formally established the National Citizen Service Trust which runs the project, and the Trust was granted a Royal Charter.<sup>133</sup> The aim of the programme has been to help 16–17 year olds develop “the skills needed to be active and responsible citizens, mix with people from different backgrounds and start getting involved in their communities.”<sup>134</sup>
89. The format of the NCS has typically been comprised of a two-to-four-week programme with three parts—the first stage consisting of “adventure activities;” the second stage consisting of “learning the skills for work and life;” and the third stage being a “local social action project.” The delivery of programme itself has been contracted out to local providers.<sup>135</sup>
90. The 2018 report found that the guidance provided to the NCS on working with schools was limited. In evidence to the Committee in 2018 the NCS stated that they had formed a number of “partner[ships] with schools” and they anticipated that if successful, this model could be used to grow the organisation.<sup>136</sup>
91. The 2018 report found that whilst the NCS appeared to have positive effects on long-term volunteering and helping others, it was difficult to evaluate the true value of the NCS in terms of increasing democratic engagement. At £1863 per head, the Committee felt that the cost of the programme was too high. However, the Committee found that the NCS was achieving better representation than other youth organisations and was “over-representing young people from deprived families.”<sup>137</sup>
92. The report stated that: “If the NCS is to become an important part of the civic journey it cannot simply be a one-off case of civic action; it must be followed up by a concerted effort to keep young people civically engaged.” The Committee recommended that:
- “The National Citizen Service should work with Government, the voluntary sector and schools to ensure that NCS graduates are encouraged to continue to find opportunities for further civic engagement.”<sup>138</sup>
93. With regard to partnership working with schools, the Committee recommended that:
- “The Government should encourage and facilitate the National Citizen Service in making greater connections with schools and should

---

133 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 164

134 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 164

135 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 164. See also NCS, ‘The NCS Delivery Network’: <https://wearencs.com/what-is-ncs> [accessed 22 February 2022]

136 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 206

137 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 166

138 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 197

ensure that it is integrated with citizenship education provision. This should include encouraging NCS coordinators in schools to engage with citizenship courses and be given the Continuing Professional Development they need in order to do so.”<sup>139</sup>

94. In its response to the 2018 report, the Government stated that “consecutive independent evaluations” had shown that taking part in the NCS led to increased volunteering, stating that “NCS participants are more likely to use their time to help others.”<sup>140</sup> According to the Government, the associated increased volunteering undertaken by NCS graduates was worth “£61.1 million.”<sup>141</sup> The Government stated that the NCS Trust would continue to “promote ‘follow on’ social action opportunities to young people through the online Opportunity Hub.” In addition, it stated that the DCMS would work with the NCS Trust on these initiatives.<sup>142</sup>
95. The Government response stated that non-statutory guidance for joint working between schools, colleges and the NCS had been in effect since 2017, and that the aim of this guidance was to “... improv[e] joint working at the local level between NCS providers and schools and colleges.”<sup>143</sup> The Government reiterated its commitment to supporting this partnership working stating that they would “continue to encourage and facilitate these connections, including considering the role of citizenship education and NCS school coordinators.”<sup>144</sup>
96. In his 2020 letter to the Chair of the Liaison Committee, Lord Greenhalgh confirmed the importance of the NCS, stating that the programme: “addresses three large-scale social issues: social cohesion, social mobility and civic engagement ...” Lord Greenhalgh confirmed that the DCMS was working with the DfE to “explore what more can be done to ensure the education system promotes NCS as effectively as possible and continue to foster engaged citizens.”<sup>145</sup> Lord Greenhalgh confirmed that funding had been provided to ACT to run the ‘Embedding Citizenship in Schools’

---

139 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 209

140 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, *Government response to the Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement*, Cm 9629 (June 2018), p 15: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/720554/CCS207\\_CCS0618952710-001\\_Government\\_Response\\_to\\_House\\_of\\_Lords\\_Select\\_Co....pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/720554/CCS207_CCS0618952710-001_Government_Response_to_House_of_Lords_Select_Co....pdf)

141 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, *Government response to the Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement*, Cm 9629 (June 2018), p 15: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/720554/CCS207\\_CCS0618952710-001\\_Government\\_Response\\_to\\_House\\_of\\_Lords\\_Select\\_Co....pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/720554/CCS207_CCS0618952710-001_Government_Response_to_House_of_Lords_Select_Co....pdf)

142 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, *Government response to the Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement*, Cm 9629 (June 2018), p 15: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/720554/CCS207\\_CCS0618952710-001\\_Government\\_Response\\_to\\_House\\_of\\_Lords\\_Select\\_Co....pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/720554/CCS207_CCS0618952710-001_Government_Response_to_House_of_Lords_Select_Co....pdf)

143 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, *Government response to the Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement*, Cm 9629 (June 2018), p 16: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/720554/CCS207\\_CCS0618952710-001\\_Government\\_Response\\_to\\_House\\_of\\_Lords\\_Select\\_Co....pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/720554/CCS207_CCS0618952710-001_Government_Response_to_House_of_Lords_Select_Co....pdf)

144 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, *Government response to the Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement*, Cm 9629 (June 2018), p 16: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/720554/CCS207\\_CCS0618952710-001\\_Government\\_Response\\_to\\_House\\_of\\_Lords\\_Select\\_Co....pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/720554/CCS207_CCS0618952710-001_Government_Response_to_House_of_Lords_Select_Co....pdf)

145 Letter from Lord Greenhalgh, Minister of State for Building Safety and Communities to The Rt Hon The Lord McFall of Alcluith, Chair of the Liaison Committee (28 April 2020): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/4133/documents/40824/default/>

programme.<sup>146</sup> He stated that one of the key aims of the programme is to “demonstrate how active citizenship and social action support a high-quality education” and “... provide a pathway to ongoing action and the NCS programme.”<sup>147</sup>

97. During the course of the follow-up inquiry, the Committee heard about the progress that has been made with the NCS. When asked about the NCS’s role as a delivery mechanism for citizenship education in schools, Liz Moorse was sceptical, stating that “we very much see the citizenship teacher as being the right teacher in the school to facilitate this, to do the work that is needed, and to retain that idea of the NCS as a rite of passage and a fantastic and positive experience for young people progressing into adult life.”<sup>148</sup> Ashley Hodges was of the view that the NCS had a role to play in the sector as a partner: “We welcome the revised approach to the NCS in some forms”. She cautioned, however, that “in education and youth work ... there is no silver bullet.”<sup>149</sup>
98. When asked about the role of the NCS in delivering citizenship education, Mark Gifford, Chair of the NCS Trust, said that the primary vision for the NCS as a social development programme is:
- “A country of connected, confident, caring citizens where everybody feels at home. Part of that is social cohesion ... social mobility ... helping young people to be world-ready and work-ready ... Part of it is social inclusion ... respecting and celebrating differences while uniting behind the values that unite us. Then there is social good ... an opportunity to volunteer to help solve the issues that we have [in this society].”<sup>150</sup>
99. In regard to active citizenship, Mr Gifford told the Committee that “structured interventions in schools and outside schools show great impact.”<sup>151</sup> He stated that young people who had taken part in an NCS programme “volunteer on average eight hours a month more” than peers who have not and they are “12% more likely to have political engagement.”<sup>152</sup> Mr Gifford confirmed that comparative data was collected and independently assessed and reported to the Government.<sup>153</sup> **The Committee welcomes this and recommends that the DCMS continues to monitor the output of NCS programmes in comparison to other programmes within the sector.**
100. Mr Gifford outlined the ways in which the NCS had adapted its offering in light of the COVID-19 pandemic, giving support to schools in place of running their usual residential programme and developing the “skills booster, which is a curriculum delivered either by our network in schools or by schools.”<sup>154</sup> **The Committee believes that the NCS could play a key role in delivering the practical aspect of citizenship, in close partnership**

---

146 Letter from Lord Greenhalgh, Minister of State for Building Safety and Communities to The Rt Hon The Lord McFall of Alcluith, Chair of the Liaison Committee (28 April 2020): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/4133/documents/40824/default/>

147 Letter from Lord Greenhalgh, Minister of State for Building Safety and Communities to The Rt Hon The Lord McFall of Alcluith, Chair of the Liaison Committee (28 April 2020): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/4133/documents/40824/default/>

148 [Q 10](#) (Liz Moorse)

149 [Q 10](#) (Ashley Hodges)

150 [Q 15](#) (Mark Gifford)

151 [Q 15](#) (Mark Gifford)

152 [Q 15](#) (Mark Gifford)

153 [Q 15](#) (Mark Gifford)

154 [Q 17](#) (Mark Gifford)

with trained citizenship teachers. The Committee agrees with ACT that partnership working with schools should be in addition to, rather than instead of, citizenship education.

101. *The Committee was reassured to hear that the NCS is committed to improving “its relationship with the youth sector, Local Government Association [LGA] and others.” It agrees that the NCS could use its resources to amplify and support the work of other organisations, and this is in line with the Committee’s view that civic engagement programmes must be tailored to their specific audience. In the light of the evidence received on the importance of early engagement with citizenship education, the Committee recommends that the NCS expands its target audience (currently 16–17 year olds) to key stages 3 and 4 (11–18 year olds) and develops its partnership working with organisations set up to work with children at key stages 1 and 2 (5–11).*
102. *The Committee was pleased to hear that the NCS is strengthening its partnerships. The Committee recommends that the NCS continues this practice and that the DCMS takes a data-led and outcome focused approach to monitoring the effectiveness of these partnerships.*
103. *The DCMS’ decision to re-distribute funding for youth organisations more evenly amongst the youth sector seems appropriate. The Committee recommends that the DCMS and DfE continue to work closely with the NCS, with a focus on life-long civic engagement, political and media literacy.*
104. *The Committee is pleased to hear about the NCS’ renewed focus on supporting schools and delivering programmes such as the “skills booster’ during the COVID-19 pandemic. The NCS should scale up its partnership working with schools, delivering practical citizenship education and opportunities for civic engagement at key stages 3 and 4. It should support partnership working with organisations that are set up to deliver programmes for key stages 1 and 2. The Committee believes that the NCS could add particular value in educational institutions with pupils who require additional support as part of the levelling up agenda.*

### **The citizenship test (Life in the UK)**

105. The Life in the UK test is a computer-based test constituting one of the requirements for anyone seeking Indefinite Leave to Remain in the UK or naturalisation as a British citizen.<sup>155</sup> The Life in the UK test is based on the Life in the UK handbook, *Life in the UK: a guide for new residents*.<sup>156</sup> The 2018 report identified several issues with the test and the accompanying handbook including factual errors; obscure trivia and the exclusion of key information on public services.<sup>157</sup> The report included a number of recommendations regarding the test and the accompanying handbook, suggesting ways in which the process could be improved to ensure that it measured active citizenship.
106. The report recommended that:

---

155 Home Office, *Life in the UK Test*: <https://www.gov.uk/life-in-the-uk-test> [accessed 22 February 2022]

156 Home Office, *Life in the UK Test*: <https://www.gov.uk/life-in-the-uk-test> [accessed 22 February 2022]

157 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, p 116, Box 8

“The Government should set up an advisory group to conduct a comprehensive review of the citizenship test, focusing on the key knowledge that supports citizenship in various forms, including becoming an active citizen. Knowledge of the working of bodies like local authorities and the NHS is essential, and the group should include representatives of these bodies.”<sup>158</sup>

“The advisory group should revise the book on Life in the UK to focus on the knowledge required for active citizenship. Sections of the book on British history should concentrate on those parts that played a key role in the development of the Shared Values of British Citizenship.”<sup>159</sup>

107. The 2018 report found that: “The current test seems to be, and to be regarded as, a barrier to acquiring citizenship rather than a means of creating better citizens.”<sup>160</sup> In 2018, in evidence to the Committee, Professor Thomas Brooks, Department of Law and Government, Durham University, said that: “The test is regularly seen as the test for British citizenship that few British citizens can pass, with many migrants seeing it as an opportunity by the Home Office to extract increasingly more expensive fees through a test of random trivia meant to make more fail.”<sup>161</sup>
108. In 2022, in written evidence to the current follow-up inquiry, Professor Brooks said: “It is unproven that the Life in the UK tests measures such progress at all and doubtful any similar memory test can do so adequately.”<sup>162</sup> He also stated that: “The Government does not appear to have made any progress relating to the 2018 report’s recommendations.” He viewed this as an indication of “a deeper lack of commitment or interest” in improving the test.<sup>163</sup>
109. In a joint written evidence submission received in 2022, Professor Leah Bassel, Professor of Sociology, University of Roehampton, Dr Pierre Monforte, Associate Professor, University of Leicester, and Dr Kamran Khan, Research Associate, University of Copenhagen, stated that “citizenship tests cannot fully measure progress towards active citizenship.”<sup>164</sup> They argued that:
- “due to its content and nature, the test does not take into account the active involvement of migrants into networks through which they participate in civic life at the local level and construct their own sense of belonging. The test does not take into account (and in fact discourages) critical forms of citizenship (such as protest) which demonstrate an interest and an active participation in British politics and the public sphere and demand change.”<sup>165</sup>
110. The Committee was concerned to hear that the research undertaken by these academics had shown that “the citizenship test process can exacerbate pre-existing social inequalities leading to more, not less social isolation.”<sup>166</sup> Professor Bassel et al. made a number of recommendations regarding the

---

158 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 472

159 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 473

160 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 468

161 *The Ties that Bind: Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*, para 468

162 Written evidence from Professor Thomas Brooks ([CCE0004](#))

163 Written evidence from Professor Thomas Brooks ([CCE0004](#))

164 Written evidence from Professor Leah Bassel, Dr Pierre Monforte and Dr Kamran Khan ([CCE0002](#))

165 Written evidence from Professor Leah Bassel, Dr Pierre Monforte and Dr Kamran Khan ([CCE0002](#))

166 Written evidence from Professor Leah Bassel, Dr Pierre Monforte and Dr Kamran Khan ([CCE0002](#))

test including that “material that has disappeared in recent versions of the test (practical material about Life in the UK and access to services) ... be reintroduced.”<sup>167</sup> They also recommended that more information regarding the civic institutions and content related to local and national democracy be included so that “people who become UK citizens have a stronger sense of their ability and entitlement to participate.”<sup>168</sup>

111. Professor Brooks, who has undertaken qualitative research with test participants, also made a number of recommendations regarding potential improvements to the test.<sup>169</sup> He stated that the handbook required “substantively new text” and advocated for the appointment of a “new Citizenship Advisory Group to consult with public on content of next citizenship test.”<sup>170</sup> Professor Brooks argued that: “the test must be seen as part of a larger strategy for improving integration rather than an afterthought” and the test should be one that “most, if not all, British citizens can pass and not only migrants wishing to remain [in the country].”<sup>171</sup>

112. In its response to the 2018 report the Government stated:

“The Government published the Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper on 14 March. The Green Paper included a proposal to review the Life in the UK Test. Consultation on the Green Paper closed on 5 June. The Government is currently reviewing the responses, which will inform how this proposal is taken forward. We will consider the recommendations from the House of Lords Select Committee further and respond to the Committee in due course.”<sup>172</sup>

113. In 2020, Lord Greenhalgh told the Liaison Committee that:

“Regular amendments are made to the Life in the UK handbook to ensure the content and related test questions remain factually accurate. The 2019 version of the handbook made a number of amendments to update the handbook and clarify issues identified by the Committee and others. The Home Office is currently considering the review of the Life in the UK handbook. It has noted the Committee’s recommendations and intends to write to you/ Lord Hodgson providing further details of the review as soon as a decision has been taken on the review process.”<sup>173</sup>

114. In evidence to the Committee in 2022, the Government confirmed that the proposed review of the Life in the UK handbook and test had not been actioned. When asked if the Government had set up an advisory group to review the test, Kevin Foster MP, Minister for Safe and Legal Migration at the Home Office, said: “To be clear, no.”<sup>174</sup> Mr Foster told the Committee

---

167 Written evidence from Professor Leah Bassel, Dr Pierre Monforte and Dr Kamran Khan ([CCE0002](#))

168 Written evidence from Professor Leah Bassel, Dr Pierre Monforte and Dr Kamran Khan ([CCE0002](#))

169 Written evidence from Professor Thomas Brooks ([CCE0004](#))

170 Written evidence from Professor Thomas Brooks ([CCE0004](#))

171 Written evidence from Professor Thomas Brooks ([CCE0004](#))

172 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, *Government response to the Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement*, Cm 9629 (June 2018), p 36: [https://old.parliament.uk/documents/lords-committees/Citizenship-civic-engagement/180628%20CCS207\\_CCS0618952710-001\\_Government%20Response%20to%20House%20of%20Lords%20Select%20Committee%20on%20Citizenship\\_Text\\_PRINT.pdf](https://old.parliament.uk/documents/lords-committees/Citizenship-civic-engagement/180628%20CCS207_CCS0618952710-001_Government%20Response%20to%20House%20of%20Lords%20Select%20Committee%20on%20Citizenship_Text_PRINT.pdf)

173 Letter from Lord Greenhalgh, Minister of State for Building Safety and Communities to The Rt Hon The Lord McFall of Alcluith, Chair of the Liaison Committee (28 April 2020): <https://committees.parliament.uk/publications/4133/documents/40824/default/>

174 [Q 34](#) (Kevin Foster MP)

that the Government was currently undertaking “one of the biggest reforms of our immigration system in the last 20 years.”<sup>175</sup> Referring to the Government’s timetable for reviewing the citizenship test and associated materials, Mr Foster stated that the Government would not consider this until the completion of several other reviews, and that any review would “potentially [be actioned] as part of that wider package of change on citizenship.”<sup>176</sup> **Whilst the Committee is reassured to hear that the Government is committed to reviewing the Life in the UK test and associated materials, it sees no logical argument for delaying this further.**

115. When asked if the Government would embed active citizenship within the naturalisation process, Kevin Foster MP said: “Absolutely ... we have to make sure that people do not see it as a tick-box exercise.”<sup>177</sup> The Committee agrees that the test should not be a ‘tick box exercise’ but believes that in its current form, the test resembles exactly that. **The Committee is reassured to hear that the Government is “looking to consult widely” when reviewing the test.**<sup>178</sup> It notes that Mr Foster stated that the Government would “consider whether it would be appropriate to have a [migration advisory group]” and it would argue that a group of this nature is essential to ensure that the Life in the UK test is a meaningful and inclusive process that facilitates and measures active citizenship.<sup>179</sup>
116. *The Committee agrees with the Government that “the Life in the UK test should not be seen as a tick-box exercise”. The Committee is pleased to see that the test has been updated since 2018 and that some of the issues identified by the Committee have been addressed. Nevertheless, the Committee remains unconvinced that the test supports and measures active citizenship. The Committee recommends that the Government sets up an advisory group with a diverse and expert membership to review the content of and outcomes generated by the test within 12 months. The Committee can see no reasonable explanation to delay this work until after the completion of other immigration policy reviews.*

---

175 [Q 34](#) (Kevin Foster MP)

176 [Q 34](#) (Kevin Foster MP)

177 [Q 34](#) (Kevin Foster MP)

178 [Q 34](#) (Kevin Foster MP)

179 [Q 34](#) (Kevin Foster MP)

## SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

### Cross-Government Coordination

1. The Government has implied that the Inter-Ministerial Group for Safe and Integrated Communities is a substitute for a Minister for Citizenship and Civic Engagement. Given that the group has not met for three years, it is clearly not a suitable mechanism for coordinating this policy area and strengthens the argument for the appointment of a dedicated Minister. (Paragraph 23)
2. *Coordination of citizenship and civic engagement policy is insufficient. The Government should appoint a Minister with responsibility for Citizenship and Civic Engagement without delay. The location of this Minister is crucial, and the Committee believes that the Minister would have greatest impact if located in the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) or the Cabinet Office. The new Minister should be given appropriate authority and remit to facilitate integrated policymaking across UK Government departments. This Minister should be a permanent member of the Domestic and Economic (Levelling Up) Cabinet Committee.* (Paragraph 24)
3. *The Committee is reassured to hear that the Government has appointed a cabinet committee to coordinate this policy area and does not doubt the commitment of the Domestic and Economic (Levelling Up) Cabinet Committee. Nevertheless, the Committee saw good intent in relation to the Inter-Ministerial Group for Safe and Integrated Communities and yet that group did not meet for three consecutive years. Whilst the Committee respects that the Government organises its business how it sees fit and has stated that it does not usually share details of the frequency of cabinet committee meetings publicly, the Committee would be reassured to see evidence of the scale of the work expected to be undertaken by the Domestic and Economic (Levelling Up) Cabinet Committee.* (Paragraph 37)
4. *Given the cross-cutting nature of the levelling up agenda, the Committee is surprised to see that the permanent membership of the Domestic and Economic (Levelling Up) Cabinet Committee does not span more departments. The Committee recommends that the Government consider making office holders within the Cabinet Office and the Department for Education (DfE) permanent members of the Cabinet Committee.* (Paragraph 38)
5. *The Committee hopes that the Domestic and Economic (Levelling Up) Cabinet Committee can address the issues identified with institutional memory and recommends that a community-led and data-led approach is taken to the coordination of citizenship and civic engagement policies.* (Paragraph 39)
6. *Citizenship education and civic engagement opportunities are essential parts of a well-functioning democratic society. The Committee finds it difficult to comprehend how the levelling up strategy could be effective without adequate investment in and coordination of citizenship education and civic engagement initiatives. The Government should ensure that provision for citizenship education is included in the levelling up policy and consideration given to its role in addressing fake news, conspiracy theories and feelings of disenfranchisement.* (Paragraph 40)

### Education

7. *The Committee is reassured to hear that the Government is committed to ensuring the effective delivery of citizenship education within schools. If children are to be able*

*to develop the skills required to become active citizens, they must be taught citizenship throughout their education. The Committee reiterates the 2018 recommendation that the Government should create a statutory entitlement to citizenship education from key stages 1-4. (Paragraph 55)*

8. *The Committee looks forward to the publication of the Schools White Paper and was reassured to hear that it will contain the Government's plans for citizenship education policy. The related recommendations in this report should be addressed through the white paper. The implementation timetable should be published within six months. (Paragraph 56)*
9. *The evidence received demonstrates that Ofsted is misinterpreting the Government's policy and assessment criteria for Citizenship. The Government must outline how it will address this discrepancy and monitor Ofsted's assessment of Citizenship moving forward. (Paragraph 73)*
10. *Citizenship is a curriculum subject and should be treated as such. Ofsted should use 'Quality of Education' when inspecting and assessing citizenship education. Regular deep dives should be undertaken. Ofsted should ensure that citizenship is not conflated with PSHE. Effective delivery of Citizenship education should be considered when awarding school ratings, including practical as well as theoretical delivery. (Paragraph 74)*
11. *The Committee does not agree with Ofsted's assertion that evaluating citizenship through the personal development metric is appropriate. Ofsted's intention to review citizenship education provision through its upcoming review of personal development is insufficient. The Committee reiterates its 2018 recommendation that Ofsted should undertake a review of the current provision and quality of citizenship education in schools and highlight best practice. This should be followed up with long term monitoring of the impact of citizenship education as a standalone curriculum subject. (Paragraph 75)*
12. *Ofsted must recognise the importance of citizenship education, particularly in the light of the challenges facing young people today and the acute need for them to develop political and media literacy skills. Furthermore, there are clear links between the Government's levelling up agenda and citizenship, and an opportunity to ensure that this policy is successful could be missed, should schools not provide pupils with the appropriate foundation for civic engagement. The Government should outline what steps will be taken to improve Ofsted's understanding of the wider context of citizenship education and ensure that Ofsted refrains from side-lining the subject. (Paragraph 76)*
13. *Ofsted should review the support and training given to their inspectors and should ensure that the inspectors are able to understand and effectively assess citizenship as a curriculum subject. (Paragraph 77)*
14. *The Committee is disappointed about the lack of investment in citizenship teaching. The Committee recommends that the following recommendations are included in the Government's forthcoming schools white paper. (Paragraph 85)*
15. *The Government should reinstate bursaries for citizenship teachers for the 2023–24 academic year. The citizenship bursaries should remain in place until there are equivalent numbers to ensure that there is at least one trained specialist in every secondary school. The Government should also set a target for having at least one trained citizenship teacher in every primary school. (Paragraph 86)*

16. *The Committee is concerned to hear that the Government is no longer collecting data on citizenship trainee teachers. The Committee does not see any reasonable explanation for this. The Committee recommends that the data collection resumes without delay. (Paragraph 87)*

### **The NCS**

17. *The Committee was reassured to hear that the NCS is committed to improving “its relationship with the youth sector, Local Government Association [LGA] and others.” It agrees that the NCS could use its resources to amplify and support the work of other organisations, and this is in line with the Committee’s view that civic engagement programmes must be tailored to their specific audience. In the light of the evidence received on the importance of early engagement with citizenship education, the Committee recommends that the NCS expands its target audience (currently 16–17 year olds) to key stages 3 and 4 (11–18 year olds) and develops its partnership working with organisations set up to work with children at key stages 1 and 2 (5–11). (Paragraph 101)*
18. *The Committee was pleased to hear that the NCS is strengthening its partnerships. The Committee recommends that the NCS continues this practice and that the DCMS takes a data-led and outcome focused approach to monitoring the effectiveness of these partnerships. (Paragraph 102)*
19. *The DCMS’ decision to re-distribute funding for youth organisations more evenly amongst the youth sector seems appropriate. The Committee recommends that the DCMS and DfE continue to work closely with the NCS, with a focus on life-long civic engagement, political and media literacy. (Paragraph 103)*
20. *The Committee is pleased to hear about the NCS’ renewed focus on supporting schools and delivering programmes such as the “skills booster’ during the COVID-19 pandemic. The NCS should scale up its partnership working with schools, delivering practical citizenship education and opportunities for civic engagement at key stages 3 and 4. It should support partnership working with organisations that are set up to deliver programmes for key stages 1 and 2. The Committee believes that the NCS could add particular value in educational institutions with pupils who require additional support as part of the levelling up agenda. (Paragraph 104)*

### **The citizenship test (Life in the UK)**

21. *The Committee agrees with the Government that “the Life in the UK test should not be seen as a tick-box exercise”. The Committee is pleased to see that the test has been updated since 2018 and that some of the issues identified by the Committee have been addressed. Nevertheless, the Committee remains unconvinced that the test supports and measures active citizenship. The Committee recommends that the Government sets up an advisory group with a diverse and expert membership to review the content of and outcomes generated by the test within 12 months. The Committee can see no reasonable explanation to delay this work until after the completion of other immigration policy reviews. (Paragraph 116)*

## APPENDIX 1: LIST OF MEMBERS AND DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

---

### Members

Lord Blencathra  
 Lord Bradley  
 Lord Collins of Highbury  
 Baroness Coussins  
 Lord Davies of Oldham  
 Lord Gardiner of Kimble  
 Lord Howe\*  
 Lord Judge  
 Baroness Scott of Needham Market  
 Lord Taylor of Holbeach  
 Baroness Walmsley

The following members of the former Citizenship and Civic Engagement Committee participated in the meetings:

Baroness Barker  
 Lord Blunkett  
 Baroness Eaton  
 Lord Hodgson of Astley Abbots

### Declaration of interests

Baroness Barker  
*I run a management consultancy ThirdSectorBusiness which provides advice on strategy, governance and management to a range of voluntary organisations and social enterprises.*

Lord Blencathra  
*No relevant interests to declare*

Lord Blunkett  
*Professor of Politics and Practice at the University of Sheffield  
 Honorary president of the Association for Citizenship Teaching  
 Trustee of the Community Interest Company/ NCS and former Trustee of what is now the NCS Royal Charter Body*

Lord Bradley  
*Chair of Council, University of Salford*

Lord Collins of Highbury  
*No relevant interests to declare*

Baroness Coussins  
*No relevant interests to declare*

Lord Davies of Oldham  
*No interests declared*

Baroness Eaton  
*A Vice-President of the Local Government Association  
 Previously a Chair and Trustee of Near Neighbours  
 Deputy Lieutenant for West Yorkshire*

Lord Gardiner of Kimble  
*No relevant interests to declare*

Lord Hodgson of Astley Abbotts

*Author of a pamphlet “Britain’s demographic challenge?” published by Civitas*

Lord Judge

*No relevant interests to declare*

Baroness Scott of Needham Market

*Trustee Community Action Suffolk*

*Advisory Board Institute for Volunteering Research*

*Advisory Board NCVO*

Lord Taylor of Holbeach

*No relevant interests to declare*

Baroness Walmsley

*No relevant interests to declare*

\*Earl Howe has recused himself from this inquiry on grounds of ministerial propriety.

A full list of members’ interests can be found in the Register of Lords’ Interests: <https://members.parliament.uk/members/lords/interests/register-of-lords-interests>

## APPENDIX 2: LIST OF WITNESSES

---

Evidence is published online at <https://committees.parliament.uk/work/1730/citizenship-and-civic-engagement-followup/publications/> and available for inspection at the Parliamentary Archives (020 7219 3074).

Evidence received by the Committee is listed below in alphabetical order.

### Alphabetical list of witnesses

Association for Citizenship Teaching	<a href="#"><u>CCE0003</u></a>
Professor Leah Bassel, Department of Social Science, University of Roehampton	<a href="#"><u>CCE0002</u></a>
Professor Thom Brooks, Department of Law and Government, Durham University	<a href="#"><u>CCE0004</u></a>
Professor Matthew Flinders, Director of the Sir Bernard Crick Centre for the Public Understanding of Politics	<a href="#"><u>CCE0001</u></a>
Kevin Foster MP, Minister for Safe and Legal Migration, Home Office	<a href="#"><u>QQ 24–36</u></a>
Mark Gifford, Chief Executive, National Citizen Service	<a href="#"><u>QQ 12–23</u></a>
David Goodhart, Head of Demography, Immigration & Integration, Policy Exchange	<a href="#"><u>QQ 1–11</u></a>
Ashley Hodges, CEO, Young Citizens	<a href="#"><u>QQ 1–11</u></a>
Eddie Hughes MP, Minister for Rough Sleeping and Housing, Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities	<a href="#"><u>QQ 24–36</u></a>
Siobhan Jones, Director for Local Government and Communities, Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities	<a href="#"><u>QQ 24–36</u></a>
Dr Kamran Khan, Associate Professor, University of Copenhagen	<a href="#"><u>CCE0002</u></a>
Dr Pierre Monforte, Research Associate, University of Leicester	<a href="#"><u>CCE0002</u></a>
Liz Moore, Chief Executive, Association for Citizenship Teaching	<a href="#"><u>QQ 1–11</u></a>
Dr Andrew Mycock, Reader, Department of Behavioural and Social Sciences, University of Huddersfield	<a href="#"><u>CCE0005</u></a>
Chris Russell, National Director for Education, Ofsted	<a href="#"><u>QQ 12–23</u></a>
Robin Walker MP, Minister of State for School Standards, Department for Education	<a href="#"><u>QQ 24–36</u></a>

**APPENDIX 3: ACRONYMS AND GLOSSARY**

---

ACT	Association for Citizenship Teaching
Cabinet Committee	Cabinet committees are groups of ministers that can ‘take collective decisions that are binding across government.’ They are partly designed to reduce the burden on the full cabinet by allowing smaller groups of ministers to take decisions on specific policy areas. Prime ministers choose the remit and membership and can make decisions to establish or abolish cabinet committees.
Civic journey	A concept developed in the 2018 report, to describe the way in which an individual’s relationship with the state and their fellow citizens may change over a lifetime.
DfE	Department for Education
DLUHC	Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities.
Inter-Ministerial Group	Inter-ministerial groups (IMGs) are groups that bring together ministers to ‘support the collective policy development process, including feeding into a relevant cabinet committee, and support decision-making by ministers within departments where collective agreement is not required.’ They cannot make binding decisions. These groups tend to be approved by the prime minister.
Life in the UK test	A computer-based test constituting one of the current requirements for anyone seeking Indefinite Leave to Remain in the UK or naturalisation as a British citizen.
MHCLG	Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (now DLUHC)
NCS	National Citizen Service
Ofsted	The Office for Standards in Education Children’s Services and Skills
PSHE	Personal, Social, Health and Economics Education
Safe and Integrated Communities Inter-Ministerial Group	The Safe and Integrated Communities Inter-Ministerial Group was appointed in February 2018. Its terms of reference is: ‘To ensure that the necessary action is taken to build integrated communities and to counter those who seek to sow discord and disharmony within them.’

## **APPENDIX 4: LETTER FROM LORD HODGSON OF ASTLEY ABBOTTS TO SECRETARY OF STATE FOR HOUSING, COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT (3 APRIL 2019)**

---

Dear James,

It has now been twelve months since the Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement, which I chaired, published its Report - *The Ties that Bind - Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the 21st Century*- to which the Government gave a response in June 2018. There are four aspects of our Report which members of the Committee wish to follow up. I am writing to you since your department was the lead department for our inquiry, but I appreciate that on some of these issues you will wish to consult other departments.

### **The importance of having a single cross-Government champion responsible for coordinating all matters related to citizenship and civic engagement (our Recommendation 1)**

We note from a letter from Lord Bourne of Aberystwyth dated 16 November that it is not proposed to appoint a single champion, but to give responsibility to the Interministerial Group on Safe and Integrated Communities. Of course we recognise the wealth of experience available to that Group, but the evidence our Committee received was of a wealth of well-meaning, but too often short lived, initiatives with no coherent follow up as to which initiatives had proved effective and worth following through, and which had not. We are concerned that under this proposed structure this shortcoming may well persist.

Our concerns on this point were not assuaged by the fact that, in preparing for this submission, our enquiries were answered by three different ministers. In particular the Parliamentary answers by Lord Young of Cookham (HL 12923) and (HL 14295) are somewhat at odds with Lord Bourne's letter.

### **The vital importance of every pupil receiving a proper education in citizenship (our recommendations 9-16)**

Firstly, we note in the Action Plan for Integrated Communities published in February 2019 that the plan will be overseen by the Interministerial Group on Safe and Integrated Communities.

We recognise that the Secretary of State of Education has committed to making no further reforms to the national curriculum during this Parliament. We congratulate the Government on introducing the category of specialist teachers of education in citizenship in January 2019. But disappointingly little progress appears to have been made towards having greater availability of teachers trained in citizenship education. The answer to Parliamentary Question HL 12924 revealed that in 2018/19 only 37 postgraduate trainees began training in citizenship. The availability of bursaries for those training as citizenship teachers remains unclear (HL 14258), and we note that no bursaries for citizenship trainees were provided in the academic year 2018–19 (HL 14253).

In the light of the answer to Parliamentary Question HL 12926 there also seems to be a risk of continuing to confuse citizenship education with PSHE education. The Chief Executive of the Association for Citizenship Teaching (ACT) has made this point to me and to other members of the Committee, and has told us that the

ACT will be raising the issue in their response to the consultation on the proposed education inspection framework for September 2019.

As we pointed out in our original report, individuals do not learn about governmental and judicial institutions by osmosis. At a time when trust and confidence in governmental systems is under strain it is surely more than ever important that their role and purpose is explained clearly and taught well. We also drew attention to the important distinction between developing the individual and developing the role of the individual in society. The inculcation of values and an understanding of democratic values come under the heading of ‘citizenship’, and these are further reasons why citizenship must be taught by those with special training. Against this background the fact that the importance of citizenship education was not mentioned in the Integrated Communities Action Plan published earlier this month is disappointing.

### **Availability of English Language teaching (our recommendations 65-71)**

We congratulate the Government on the planned progress laid out in their Integrated Communities Action Plan published in February 2019. The Plan has an impressive number of steps all of which have dates for implementation - some of them as early as April 2019. It will be important that the necessary operational and financial resources are made available to ensure that these ambitious dates are met.

While acknowledging the importance of those who have arrived more recently in the UK having access to good quality English Language teaching, it will be more important to ensure that the needs of the marginalised longer established groups established are not overlooked. (HL 13509)

### **Life in the UK test (our recommendations 75-76)**

One of the recommendations of the Committee’s report was that the *Life in the UK* book on which the citizenship test is based should be revised to focus on the knowledge required for active citizenship. The Government’s response was that the Green Paper published on 14 March 2018 included a consultation on reviewing the *Life in the UK* test, that the consultation had closed on 5 June 2018, that the Government was reviewing the responses, and that it would respond further to the Committee “in due course”.

In a series of questions tabled last month I have tried to find out when the review of *Life in the UK* will take place, and when the Government plans to publish the revised text. The answers I have received so far explain that in its Integrated Communities Action Plan the Government “has committed in the Action Plan to revise the content of the *Life in the UK* test ... We are currently considering how to take forward the process of consulting and seeking input into the *Life in the UK* test”. [HL 14562]

Meanwhile this test, which is accepted by all concerned, including the Government, to be outdated and, in some respects, irrelevant and inappropriate, continues to be the basis for applications for naturalisation. We do not understand how, almost a year after the publication of our report, and nine months after the closure of the first consultation, no plans have yet been made for consultation on the content of *Life in the UK*. We would be grateful for a target date by which it is expected that the review will be completed, and the new version published as the basis for the citizenship test.

I have discussed this letter with other former members of the Select Committee who are in agreement with it. We appreciate that you, other Ministers, and your officials, are particularly busy, but we would be glad to have a detailed reply by the end of May.

LORD HODGSON OF ASTLEY ABBOTTS