



**Section 75 and Schedule 9**  
**The Northern Ireland Act 1998**

**Equality Impact Assessment**  
**on Phase 3 of the**  
**Review of Curriculum and**  
**Assessment at Key Stage 3**

**June 2004**

# Equality Impact Assessment on Phase 3 of the Review of Curriculum and Assessment at Key Stage 3

## CONTENTS

Chapters		Page
1. Introduction		1
2. Defining the aims of the Policy		4
3. Consideration of Available Data and Research		8
4. Assessment of Impacts and Consideration of Measures to Mitigate any Adverse Impact		9
5. Details of the Phase 3 Consultation Process		10
6. Decision by Public Authority		11
7. Monitoring for Adverse Impact in the Future		12
<b>Appendices</b>		
Appendix 1	Summary of Feedback from Equality Focus Groups and Response from CCEA	13
Appendix 2	Summary of Feedback from the Consultation Questionnaire and Response from CCEA	18
Appendix 3	List of Equality Consultees	58
Appendix 4	Focus Groups at Key Stage 3	61

## 1: INTRODUCTION

Under the statutory duties contained within Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998, CCEA gave an undertaking to carry out an Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) on each policy or group of co-joined policies where screening had indicated that there may be significant implications in relation to one or more of the nine equality dimensions.

This report has been made available as part of the Formal Consultation stage of the EQIA relating to Phase 3, Review of Curriculum and Assessment at Key Stage 3.

In carrying out this EQIA, CCEA is co-joined with the Department of Education.

Further copies of this EQIA report are available on the Council's website at [www.ccea.org.uk](http://www.ccea.org.uk)

If you have any queries about this document, and its availability in alternative formats (including Braille, disk and audio cassette, and in minority languages to meet the needs of those who are not fluent in English) then please contact:

**Equality Officer:**

Mr Neil Anderson  
Tel: 028 9026 1200 Ext. 2299  
Text Phone: 028 9024 2063  
Fax: 028 9026 1274  
E-mail: [nanderson@ccea.org.uk](mailto:nanderson@ccea.org.uk)

**Write to:**

Mr Neil Anderson  
People Services and Equality Manager  
CCEA  
29 Clarendon Road  
Clarendon Dock  
Belfast BT1 3BG

## **SECTION 75 AND THE STATUTORY DUTIES**

Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998 requires each public authority, when carrying out its functions in relation to Northern Ireland, to have due regard to the need to promote equality of opportunity between nine categories of persons, namely:

- between persons of different religious belief, political opinion, racial group, age, marital status or sexual orientation;
- between men and women generally;
- between persons with a disability and persons without; and
- between persons with dependants and persons without.

Without prejudice to its obligations above, the public authority must also have regard to the desirability of promoting good relations between persons of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group.

While reading this report it should be noted that, under current legislation, schools are not designated public authorities and therefore are not subject to Section 75 legislation.

The Equality Commission for Northern Ireland approved CCEA's Equality Scheme in June 2001. The Scheme outlines how the Council proposes to fulfil its statutory duties under Section 75. Following approval of the Scheme, existing policies were screened to assess impact on the promotion of equality of opportunity or the duty to promote good relations using the following criteria:

- is there any evidence of higher or lower participation or uptake by different groups?
- is there any evidence that different groups have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to the particular policy issue?
- is there an opportunity to promote equality of opportunity between the relevant different groups, either by altering the policy, or by working with others in government or in the larger community, in the context of the policy?
- have consultations with relevant groups, organisations or individuals indicated that policies of that type create problems specific to any relevant group?

A report describing the results of the screening process is available on the Council's website ([www.ccea.org.uk](http://www.ccea.org.uk)).

This report represents the final stage of CCEA's Equality Impact Assessment of the Review of Northern Ireland Curriculum and its Assessment.

## **THE COUNCIL**

CCEA is the Northern Ireland Council for the Curriculum, Examinations and Assessment. It was set up by government to provide advice on, and support for, what is taught in schools and colleges in Northern Ireland and how it is assessed. CCEA is responsible for the assessment of pupils at Key Stages 1, 2 and 3 and accreditation of Records of Achievement. CCEA conducts public examinations such as GCSE, GCE, Certificate of Education Achievement (CoEA) and Graded Objectives in Modern Languages (GOML) for students aged 16 to 19 and beyond, and administers the Transfer Test on behalf of the Department of Education. CCEA is also responsible for the regulation of GNVQs in Northern Ireland.

CCEA's remit is set out in The Education (Northern Ireland) Order 1998. CCEA has a statutory responsibility to:

- keep under review all aspects of the curriculum, examinations and assessment;
- give advice to the Department of Education about the statutory curriculum, assessment, examinations and external qualifications;
- publish and distribute information about the statutory curriculum, assessment and examinations;
- carry out consultation with the educational community in Northern Ireland about proposed changes to legislation governing the statutory curriculum, examinations and assessment;
- conduct and moderate examinations and assessment, ensuring that standards are equivalent in these areas to other parts of the United Kingdom.

In addition to the above, CCEA has a remit for the development of educational technology and the production of multi-media resources.

### **The Council's mission statement is:**

*"to enable the full potential of all learners to be achieved and recognized".*

CCEA would like to thank all respondents for their help in carrying out this Equality Impact Assessment exercise. Particular thanks is extended to those organisations which submitted detailed responses to consultation in relation to equality issues and to those individuals from Equality groups who gave of their time and expertise to attend focus group discussions.

## 2: DEFINING THE AIMS OF THE POLICY

The main reason for reviewing the curriculum was to ensure that the curriculum and assessment framework can meet the changing needs of pupils, society and the economy and environment in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The proposals for the revised Northern Ireland Curriculum and its Assessment aim to empower young people to achieve their potential and to make informed and responsible choices and decisions throughout their lives as individuals, contributors to society, the economy and the environment.

The revised curriculum proposals also seek:

- to ensure our young people are prepared for the demands of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, particularly in relation to the way they live in our society and the work they will do;
- to place greater emphasis on the development of skills and capabilities;
- to provide greater flexibility than at present for schools to adapt the curriculum to meet the needs of all of their pupils.

CCEA's objective is that these Proposals should have the confidence of teachers, parents, employers and the wider public and should meet the requirements of Section 75 and Schedule 9 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998. Accordingly, significant effort was put into disseminating and consulting on the proposals and ensuring that the proposals themselves sought to address equality issues in particular by proposing that:

- the statutory curriculum legislation is preceded by an 'access' statement which will allow schools to adapt the curriculum to meet the needs of all pupils including those with disabilities and special educational needs;
- all young people aged 4 –16 should have access to discrete strands relating to Learning for Life and Work, including:
  - personal, social and health education which addresses issues of relationships and sexuality; and
  - local and global citizenship which addresses issues of diversity and inclusion, equality and justice, human rights and social responsibilities and democracy and active participation.

In addition to these proposed new discrete strands within the curriculum, the proposals require that each subject strand within the curriculum also addresses the following key elements:

- under the objective of developing individuals the key elements of *personal understanding; mutual understanding; personal health; moral character; and spiritual awareness;*
- under the objective of developing contributors to society the key elements of *citizenship, cultural understanding; media awareness and ethical understanding;*
- under the objective of developing contributors to the economy and environment the key elements of *employability; economic awareness and sustainable development.*

It is through these discrete strands of the curriculum and through the key elements that CCEA proposes that the issues of equality are addressed fully as part of the education of all young people in Northern Ireland. The proposals suggest real life scenarios through which these key elements might be addressed.

In addition to the statutory proposals, CCEA is committed to providing guidance and support material, for example:

- guidance on adapting the curriculum for pupils with Special Educational Needs in mainstream and special schools and for pupils with profound and multiple learning difficulties (PMLD) in special schools;
- guidance on adapting the curriculum for Irish-medium schools;
- sample teaching plans and detailed teacher guidance and resources for the Foundation Stage and Key Stages 1, 2 and 3 which will help teachers to address these issues in more detail in the classroom; and
- resources to support the teaching of relationships and sexuality and local and global citizenship.

In addition, CCEA is working closely with its educational partners, in particular the Curriculum and Advisory Support Service (CASS) of the Education and Library Boards, to ensure that appropriate training is provided to support teachers in implementing the revised curriculum. The continuous professional development of teachers will be an on-going programme for the next 5 to 10 years.

It is at this more detailed level of guidance, in-service training and resources that the nuances of equality issues raised in the consultation will be addressed. CCEA has been able to demonstrate some of these resources to equality focus groups.

CCEA has conducted wide-ranging consultations on the proposals emerging from different phases of the curriculum review as follows:

**Phase 1** of the Review of Curriculum and Assessment took place from September 1999 to March 2000. It focused on whole curriculum issues and on establishing the nature of the statutory curriculum entitlement for all pupils. The Proposals from Phase 1 were issued for consultation in April 2000. This included a revised curriculum framework comprising the aim, objectives, skills and values underpinning the curriculum as well as proposals for expanding pupil entitlement into areas relating to Personal Development, Citizenship and Employability.

The Phase 1 consultation was designed to gather and analyse the views of teachers and other interested individuals and organisations in Northern Ireland. The process involved:

- written questionnaires distributed to all schools and key stakeholders;
- 20 consultation seminars for school representatives; and
- 50 meetings organised with key stakeholders.

As a result of the Phase 1 consultation, it was agreed that the overall aim and objectives of the revised Northern Ireland statutory curriculum should be: *to empower young people to achieve their potential and to make informed and responsible decisions throughout their lives as individuals, contributors to society and to the economy and the environment.*

It was also widely accepted that the three new strands of Personal Development, Local and Global Citizenship and Education for Employability should form part of the statutory curriculum for all young people.

**Phase 2** of the Review began in October 2000 and took into account the feedback received from the consultation on Phase 1. The aims of Phase 2 were:

- to develop detailed proposals for the statutory curriculum in Primary schools and its assessment at Key Stages 1 and 2 (including a new Foundation Stage);
- to develop outline curriculum and assessment proposals for Key Stage 3 (for age 11-14 year old pupils);
- to produce a more flexible curriculum framework for Key Stage 4, (for age 14-16 year old pupils) taking into account developments in relation to qualifications;
- to place a much greater emphasis on the development of skills and capabilities;
- to explore the potential use of ICT in assessment; and
- to assess the potential impact of the proposals on Equality groups as defined in Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998. (See EQIA on

Phase 2 of the Review of Curriculum and Assessment, available at [www.ccea.org.uk](http://www.ccea.org.uk)).

**Phase 3** of the Review took place from January to September 2003 and took account of feedback on the outline proposals that had been consulted on in Phase 2.

The purpose of Phase 3 consultation from September to November 2003 was to seek views on the detailed learning opportunities that young people, aged 11-14, should have as part of their minimum statutory curriculum.

At Key Stage 3 the consultation focussed on:

- a more flexible curriculum, while providing a minimum entitlement for all young people;
- the organisation of the curriculum into Learning Areas and subject strands and the detailed proposals within each strand;
- the detailed proposals for the development of skills and capabilities;
- the detailed proposals for assessment; and
- to assess the potential impact of the proposals on Equality groups as defined in Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998.

In each of these consultations, CCEA sought to ensure that information was readily accessible to all interested parties and considered all requests for the provision of materials in alternative forms. CCEA set up a dedicated website and made available a CD ROM containing all the consultation proposals.

### 3: CONSIDERATION OF AVAILABLE DATA AND RESEARCH

This Equality Impact Assessment on the Review of the Curriculum and Assessment at Key Stage 3 draws upon the following sources of information.

- The Northern Ireland Curriculum Cohort Study conducted for CCEA and the Department of Education by the National Foundation for Educational Research. As part of this longitudinal study more than 2,700 pupils and their teachers in 51 schools within Northern Ireland gave their views on the current statutory curriculum (see *Harland, J. et al, 'Is the Curriculum Working?' A Summary of the Key Stage 3 Phase of the Northern Ireland Curriculum Cohort Study, Belfast: CCEA*).
- The CCEA Curriculum Monitoring Programme involving detailed face to face feedback from 100 teachers about their experience of teaching the Northern Ireland Curriculum and their recommendations for change (see *CCEA (1999), Key Messages from the Curriculum 21 Conferences and the Curriculum Monitoring Programme, Belfast: CCEA*).
- Detailed insights from the CCEA *Curriculum 21* Conferences, which sought input from experts around the world and facilitated discussion with wide-ranging audiences (see *CCEA (1999), Key Messages from the Curriculum 21 Conferences and the Curriculum Monitoring Programme, Belfast: CCEA*).
- Advice to the Northern Ireland Minister of Education on the nature and scope of the review of the Northern Ireland Curriculum, (see *CCEA (1999): Developing the Northern Ireland Curriculum to meet the needs of Young People, Society and the Economy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*).
- Feedback from the Phase 1, Phase 2 and Phase 3 consultation exercises, through which educational partners, other interested organisations and the general public were invited to make a response to the consultation Proposals (see *CCEA (2001 and 2002): Reports on the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Consultations*).
- Detailed work with educational partners, in particular officers from the Curriculum and Advisory Support Service (CASS) of the Education and Library Boards, and a wide ranging number of organisations with an interest in education.

## **4: ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATION OF MEASURES TO MITIGATE ANY ADVERSE IMPACT**

For previous findings at Phases 1 and 2, please refer to the Equality Impact Assessment carried out on Phase 2 of the Review of the Curriculum and Assessment, available at [www.ccea.org.uk](http://www.ccea.org.uk)

## 5: DETAILS OF THE PHASE 3 CONSULTATION PROCESS

In order to mainstream equality issues, consultation on equality issues was made an integral part of the wider consultation exercise. All respondents were invited to identify any adverse impact on equality of opportunity arising from the proposals.

All consultees were invited to respond via an on-line questionnaire or in writing. CCEA also offered to make available, on request, all documentations and correspondence in alternative formats, including large print, on computer disc, in Braille, on audio-cassette, on video presented in British and Irish sign language with accompanying subtitles and voiceover and in minority languages to meet the needs of those people who are not fluent in English.

Feedback to consultation was sought in the following ways:

- A summary Information Leaflet was circulated to groups with an interest in equality and also to the general public through the Belfast Telegraph (23,000 leaflets were distributed).
- 111 groups and organisations with an expressed interest in equality issues were specifically targeted (*see List of Equality Consultees outlined in Appendix 3*).
- 18 general focus groups were set up comprising representatives from:
  - post primary schools;
  - organisations with an interest in education; and
  - equality groups as listed at Appendix 3.
- 3 specific focus group meetings were held following direct invitations to equality umbrella groups (*see Equality Focus Group Attendees at Appendix 1*).

Key issues emerging from these meetings and on-line questionnaire are set out as follows:

- At Appendix 1: a summary of the feedback from Equality Focus Groups, including CCEA's responses to the issues raised.
- At Appendix 2: the equality-related feedback drawn from the main consultation questionnaire, including CCEA's responses to the issues raised.

## **6: DECISION BY PUBLIC AUTHORITY**

**The main equality issues identified through this consultation and the mitigating measures proposed are set out in Appendices 1 and 2 under the nine Section 75 category headings.**

Readers are asked to bear in mind that this EQIA exercise applies to the proposed statutory curriculum only and not to issues relating to its implementation.

The data set out in Appendices 1 and 2 is a presentation of the diverse nature and type of feedback in the form of comments received from our consultees. CCEA has faithfully reproduced the comments provided by consultees and has not sought in any way to exercise editorial control over consultee comments which may not directly relate to the proposed statutory curriculum. Where the comments provided by consultees are related to specific elements of the proposed statutory curriculum, CCEA has endeavoured to provide a response.

CCEA has identified that a very significant number of comments provided by consultees are related to the implementation of the proposed statutory curriculum. CCEA has indicated in section 2 above the ways in which implementation will be supported by teacher guidance, resources and training. Whilst issues relating to implantation of the Proposals are matters for other agencies including schools, CCEA, in partnership with other educational partners, is committed to doing all in its power to ensure that adequate support and training are provided to mitigate the issues raised.

CCEA's proposals for a new statutory curriculum in Northern Ireland are the end result of a comprehensive five year programme of monitoring, research and consultation. The analysis by CCEA of the data set out in Appendices 1 and 2 does not identify any potential adverse impact from the Proposals themselves on any of the nine equality dimensions. CCEA will therefore bring forward its Proposals for the revised N.I. Curriculum to the Department of Education, amended to respond to curricular matters raised in consultation.

CCEA believes that these measures, when implemented, should further equality of opportunity generally, in compliance with the organisation's obligations through its Equality Scheme and with its obligations under Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998.

## **7: MONITORING FOR ADVERSE IMPACT IN THE FUTURE**

In discussion with the Department of Education, it was agreed that CCEA would take the lead in the assessment of impact on the proposals stage of the revised curriculum. It was decided subsequently that the Department of Education will lead the equality impact assessment as part of the consultation on the statutory curriculum legislation.

## Summary of Feedback from Equality Focus Groups and Response from CCEA

Equality umbrella groups were invited to focus group meetings as follows:

5 <sup>th</sup> November 2003	British Deaf Association Coalition On Sexual Orientation (COSO) Rainbow
7 <sup>th</sup> November 2003	Disability Action Mencap Royal National Institute for the Blind
10 <sup>th</sup> November 2003	Coalition On Sexual Orientation (COSO) Rainbow

A summary of the equality issues raised by these focus groups and CCEA's response is set out below.

### **Equality Category: DISABILITY**

#### **1. Disability Action, The Royal National Institute for the Blind, British Deaf Association and Mencap**

Generally the group received the proposals very positively. Overall it was felt that the revised curriculum proposals offer great potential to address equality issues and the skills and the capabilities approach was welcomed. The inclusion of the new area of Learning for Life and Work was specifically welcomed as a very positive approach that will maximise young people's chances.

It was stressed that issues of identity are important for disabled children as is the area of Personal, Social and Health Education. It was highlighted that the difficulty often lies in building the confidence of disabled children in relation to future life and work opportunities and also training teachers on how to manage sensitive situations.

Making aspects of Home Economics statutory was also welcomed to increase the status of the subject. It was thought schools could work within local colleges if they did not have the equipment needed.

A suggestion was put forward to use speakers with disabilities to supplement certain parts of the curriculum e.g. citizenship.

While not on the KS3 agenda, the group asked that consideration be given to the introduction of a GCSE Sign Language for the following reasons:

- The European Charter of Languages has a charter specifically for sign language. It was officially recognised as a language in March 2003.
- Currently deaf children are integrated into schools. It is therefore essential that hearing pupils be offered sign language in order to effectively communicate with their peers.
- There is a shortage of sign language interpreters. Qualifications in this area would offer career opportunities.

**Equality Category: DISABILITY (continued)**

Comment/Issue Raised	Response from CCEA
<p><b>Access</b> Concern was expressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that children with disabilities and special educational needs were not specifically highlighted within the proposals;</li> <li>• that transition planning for special educational needs children or children with a disability are not mentioned specifically within the proposals documents;</li> <li>• that some deaf pupils are not being given access to the full range of curriculum subjects;</li> <li>• regarding the use of the word <i>'Independent'</i>; this could be changed to <i>'Should allow to demonstrate ability by part means'</i>;</li> <li>• a history of disabled and visually impaired children being excluded from PE because of Health and Safety issues; there was support for the minimum requirement in this area, which will ease the case for disabled pupils and could stimulate schools to make alternative arrangements.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assessment</b> Children with a disability may take longer to achieve set targets therefore there may be a danger that these children would be segregated throughout the curriculum. It is important that a restrictive timeframe for attainment is not set for those with special educational needs.</p>	<p>CCEA acknowledges the absence of specific reference to Special Educational Needs comment and will ensure that in all its implementation arrangements pupils with SENs be taken full account of.</p> <p>The statutory curriculum will be preceded by an 'access' statement which will allow schools to adapt the curriculum to meet the needs of all pupils including those with disabilities and special educational needs.</p> <p>Guidance on adapting the curriculum for pupils Special Educational Needs for pupils in mainstream and special schools and for pupils with profound and multiple learning difficulties (PMLD) in special schools will also be provided along with sample teaching plans and detailed teacher guidance and resources for the Foundation Stage and Key Stages 1, 2 and 3 which will help teachers to address these issues in more detail in the classroom.</p> <p>The special arrangements for the assessment of pupils with special educational needs or disabilities will continue. The purpose of the revised assessment arrangements is to set realistic targets for progression. This would apply equally to all pupils including those with SEN.</p>

**Equality Category: DISABILITY (continued)**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p><b>Support Materials</b> Concerns were expressed that materials for children with special needs are often received late putting them at a disadvantage.</p> <p><b>Inclusion</b> It was felt that the teaching of pupils with disabilities should be the responsibility of all teachers, as opposed to a separate group. There is a need for teachers to be equality aware, for example, teachers may not raise the issue of disability, as they do not have any disabled pupils in their class.</p> <p><b>Use of IT</b> It was stressed that access to IT is important for all groups of children with disabilities. RNIB would be interested in speaking to CCEA directly regarding the piloting of (DAISY) software for visually impaired and dyslexic pupils.</p>	<p>Every effort will be made to ensure that materials are adapted as quickly as possible.</p> <p>Legislation is being put in place by the government to promote the inclusion of children with special needs into mainstream schools, which would enable full integration to take place. Awareness of disability will be addressed in training, particularly in relation to Citizenship.</p> <p>ICT is promoted throughout the curriculum and Northern Ireland has a well funded e-learning strategy which is supported on an on-going basis through the CASS service of the ELBs.</p>

## 2. The Coalition On Sexual Orientation and the Rainbow Project

### Equality Category: SEXUAL ORIENTATION

Comment/Issue Raised	Response from CCEA
<p>There was positive feedback on the broad key concepts of Personal Development with consideration given to including balanced examples and clearer learning outcomes.</p>	
<p>Representatives relayed the importance of training for teachers delivering the Area of Learning for Life and Work. Particular concerns were expressed that these topics should not be delivered through RE.</p>	<p>Extensive training, guidance and support will be provided for teachers.</p>
<p>Positive feedback was given regarding vocational training for 13-14 year olds.</p>	
<p>Concerns were raised regarding how the curriculum will be updated with changing technology.</p>	<p>ICT is promoted throughout the curriculum and Northern Ireland has a well funded e-learning strategy.</p>
<p><b>Personal Development Strand</b> Concern was expressed that too much flexibility is offered in the new curriculum and that schools may not cover all equality issues.</p>	<p>Pilot training materials were presented to the group and it was agreed that the detailed materials addressed the above issues. It was agreed that a slight change in wording would be made to the proposals.</p>
<p><b>Suggested additions to material:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sexual orientation should be cited as an example under 'Relationships';</li> <li>• 'contraception' should be changed to Safer Sex and reference to HIV;</li> <li>• same sex parents should be cited as an example under Family Life;</li> <li>• the focus within Sexual maturation should not just be on conception but also on other issues, for example, different sexual orientations, IVF;</li> <li>• within parenting responsibilities, consideration to be given to broader issues and a change of</li> </ul>	

title e.g. relationship/caring responsibilities.

**Consultation with Young People**  
Concern was expressed as to the number of young people being consulted.

The Northern Ireland Cohort Study, involved longitudinal feedback from up to 3000 young people. Consultation responses from young people on Key Stage 3 were invited through schools and representative groups including Youthnet.

## Summary of Feedback from the Consultation Questionnaire and Response from CCEA

The table below represents the statistical data drawn from the on-line questionnaire in relation to question 11 under the nine equality categories.

### Question 11: Can you identify any adverse impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations arising from the proposals?

Category	Yes %	No %	Unsure %	Total
Age	7.3	64.4	28.3	100%
Marital Status	2.5	67.2	30.3	100%
Dependants	2.4	64.1	33.5	100%
Racial Group	4.3	64.1	31.6	100%
Sexual Orientation	3.5	63.1	33.4	100%
Gender	11.4	58.2	30.4	100%
Disability	8.0	59.3	32.7	100%
Political Opinion	8.5	57.2	34.3	100%
Religious Belief	10.5	54.7	34.8	100%

The consultation process raised the following issues, particularly with regard to equality issues. In presenting the comments below, CCEA has endeavoured to faithfully reproduce the issues raised by respondents during consultation. These comments, which are presented as direct quotes from respondents, do not indicate endorsement by CCEA.

In considering the Proposals, and their impact, readers should bear in mind that this exercise applies to the proposed statutory curriculum only and not to issues relating to its implementation, which are matters for schools and other agencies. All of the mitigating measures relate to implementation including, in particular, training for teachers. On analysis of the responses, the Council has found that there is no need to alter the curriculum proposals to address the issues raised.

CCEA would like to thank all respondents for their help in carrying out this Equality Impact Assessment exercise. Particular thanks is extended to those organisations which submitted detailed responses to consultation in relation to equality issues, to those individuals from Equality groups who gave of their time and expertise to attend focus group discussions and to those who sent free responses by letter.

**Question 11: Can you identify any adverse impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations arising from the proposals?**

**Equality Category: AGE - YES Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>We feel that older teachers may need to retrain. However, they may not get the opportunity to do so.</p> <p>Difficulties envisaged for older people with regard to retraining.</p> <p>We suspect that implementing these proposals will be extremely stressful for the older teachers.</p> <p>Many older teachers are considering early retirement rather than cope with the impact of these changes.</p> <p>Older staff may be viewed as being 'old hat' and their views dated.</p> <p>I can see this having possible implications for the older members of staff.</p> <p>The changes will require a lot of extra work (again) so older staff may be demotivated; young staff may not be confident enough to work with other staff.</p> <p>Younger members of staff may not be at ease with some of the emotional/social educational content of the course. Some new aspects of the curriculum may prove difficult for some members of staff.</p>	<p>Significant training will be put in place for all teachers.</p>
<p>Outside agencies may be the best place to go for handling some areas rather than depending on a fair non-judgemental delivery of some subjects.</p>	<p>Schools are encouraged to create mutually beneficial partnerships with outside agencies.</p>
<p>Learning for Life and Work is directed at those going into employment at 16 and ignores the needs of future university students, who will take up</p>	<p>Promoting Life-long Learning is not age or class related.</p>

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
employment at 22+.	
Have we considered the equality of opportunity between pre-proposal pupils and post-proposals pupils?	We are confident these new proposals further equality of opportunity for all young people. A phased approach should mitigate against very different experiences.
Abstract concepts are included in the Science requirements when many children are still at a concrete operational stage of cognitive development.	It is envisaged that teachers will teach the underlying science concepts in order to help young people grasp their impact on issues.
Depending on the assessment used e.g. if the 4 band system was used, would pupils at the lower levels of the current KS3 make a grade?	This problem will not arise as we are using an 8 level scale. All abilities will register on the scale.
In light of the fact that examinations at age 11 are weighted in terms of age, we must recognise that with a year group there will be a diversity at level of personal development – will this be taken into account in assessment e.g. communication?	
Children are developing at different ages.	
Limits choices from age eleven.	
Limiting their choices from age 11 – not as now 14 years of age.	
Schools need to consider at what age it is appropriate to cover some topics.	

### **Equality Category: AGE - UNSURE Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
Unsure because the end result is not predictable. Do employers want people with knowledge-based or skill-based?	The proposals aim to develop both knowledge and skills.
There may be resentment towards	A phased approach should mitigate

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>pupils, parents etc. of those pupils who have not benefited from this new proposed curriculum, e.g. those who come before or after the new curriculum. Also, if it proves unsuccessful, some parents may feel their child is being used as a guinea pig.</p>	<p>against very different experiences. Training will be ongoing and sustained. Monitoring and Evaluating will be closely linked to the school's own development planning.</p>

**Question 11: Can you identify any adverse impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations arising from the proposals?**

**Equality Category: MARITAL STATUS - YES Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
Since there is no time to work on the proposals in school, married staff with children will be disadvantaged.	As part of the consultation process, an exceptional closure day was granted to all schools and consultation seminars were held across the five ELBs. Exceptional closure days will continue to be provided for training and staff planning.
Many children have only one parent.	Explicit reference is made to a variety of family structures.

**Equality Category: MARITAL STATUS - NO Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
A married female taking a career break would be daunted by yet another change pushed through in her absence. How much change is necessary in education? Is this change the last?	Change is an on-going issue in society and it is the duty of schools and education systems to respond to these changes.
Children from single parent families or from a home of conflict could be disadvantaged.	Explicit reference is made to a variety of family structures.
Marital status single parent families, this could cause friction between members of a class.	

**Equality Category: MARITAL STATUS - UNSURE Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
Moral issues – single parents etc. covered within subjects – more awareness through Citizenship etc.	Explicit reference is made to a variety of family structures.

**Question 11: Can you identify any adverse impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations arising from the proposals?**

**Equality Category: DEPENDANTS - YES Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
We are unsure that the heavy workload allocated with implementing these proposals will effect the worklife balance of staff, particularly those with young children.	Exceptional closure days will continue to be provided for training and staff planning.

**Equality Category: DEPENDANTS - NO Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
What does 'dependants' mean?	This phrase is defined by Section 75.
Again dependants will have to put up with the stress of all the changes.	Exceptional closure days will continue to be provided for training and staff planning.

**Question 11: Can you identify any adverse impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations arising from the proposals?**

**Equality Category: RACIAL GROUPS - YES Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>English as a second language could lead to disparity in the acquisition of personal and interpersonal skills.</p> <p>Given the fact that our 3<sup>rd</sup> biggest ethnic group is Chinese and that many of them may speak English as a second language, would there be an element of discrimination?</p>	<p>Support for pupils with English as a second language is a resource issue which will be addressed through additional support.</p>
<p>Racial issues taught in schools don't always necessarily promote positive relations between pupils.</p>	<p>Up to 5 teachers in each school will receive training on addressing issues of citizenship. While the point is accepted, awareness-raising about the legal consequences of discriminating action can ensure that all children understand the consequences of discriminatory action.</p>

**Equality Category: RACIAL GROUPS - NO Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>How are Travellers going to be served by the new curriculum?</p>	<p>The curriculum proposals are applicable to all school-age children. The minimum entitlement aims to provide equality for all pupils while allowing schools considerable flexibility to adapt the curriculum to the needs of individuals and groups.</p>
<p>There is no provision made to introduce Ulster Scots as a subject and virtually no provision to express oneself through an Ulster Scots Medium.</p>	<p>As part of the minimum entitlements the curriculum does not promote one language above another. Culture and diversity, including diversity of languages, is encouraged.</p>
<p>My identify – Who am I – Physical and Human characteristics of origins of different minority ethnic groups – this could present problems and</p>	<p>Opportunities are presented through the key elements of personal, mutual and cultural understanding for pupils to explore and to express their</p>

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
could be open to abuse.	identity and diversity e.g. dress code, language. Teachers will receive guidance, training and materials to assist them to address these issues in an appropriate way.
May be disadvantaged if English is not fluent.	Support for pupils with English as a second language is a resource issue which will be addressed through additional support.
One of the learning areas has a comment on who is the weakest link as a global citizen! This could cause great offence in a multi racial school.	No area of the world or culture is identified in this example.
In modern languages, ERNIO requires schools to offer one of French, German, Spanish or Italian before they can offer Irish. This discriminatory legislation has no place in the new curriculum. This restriction could seriously affect Irish further under the new proposals where dual linguists will become rarer in schools and Boards of Governors will be working at the staffing implications of the new curriculum. If budgets allow for one language only, Irish will be excluded.	It is proposed that this restriction be removed.
Multi-cultural and multi-ethnic education is no longer an optional choice for us here in Northern Ireland. Our European cousins are now equally entitled to the full pedagogic expertise of our system. The global; positional identify and team plans as outlined in your proposals (Objective 1, 2 and 3) do not take away from the message of equality and integration.	It is proposed that the strand of Local and Global Citizenship will be statutory for all young people and will address these concerns.
Minority disabled and ethnic groups children are always at risk.	
Ulster Scots identified not addressed. Minimum requirement does not necessarily cater for multi-cultural	The Cultural Understanding is a key element within every subject strand.

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
elements such as the Chinese.	
It would appear that no Irish Medium school was represented in the research.	An Irish Medium focus group took place on 12 November 2003.

**Equality Category: RACIAL GROUPS - UNSURE Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
The nature of KS3 assessment for communication will negatively affect students from ethnic minority groups. This skill should be assessed in the students first language. It would be useful to refer to the recent QCA directives on the matter.	Support for pupils with English as a second language is a resource issue which will be addressed through additional support.
Children whose home language is not English or Irish are disadvantaged.	

**Question 11: Can you identify any adverse impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations arising from the proposals?**

**Equality Category: SEXUAL ORIENTATION - NO Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>We avoid discussing sexual orientation in this society – it’s about time we faced up to different lifestyle choices explicitly.</p>	<p>Both PSHE and Local and Global Citizenship provide opportunities to consider sexual orientation.</p>
<p>Some reference should be made to varying sexual orientation.</p>	<p>Local and Global Citizenship will include reference to groups who may be discriminated against including Section 75 groups. Citizenship works through developing understanding about concepts of prejudice, stereotyping, discrimination, which can be transferred to a range of situations. Through resources, schools will be strongly encouraged to explore issues appropriate to the needs and interests of their particular students.</p>
<p>Sexual Orientation has already been completely omitted in any of the Local and Global Citizenship material I have so far seen (3 days training). RSE specially allows schools to avoid this issue (or at least to teach their religious ethos which is usually hostile to gay people being encouraged to be true to themselves). The overall result is that any young person who is beginning to identify as gay and who is in a school which does not want to address this issue will continue to be isolated and discriminated against. Also there is absolutely no compulsion for such a school to address the prevalent nature of homophobic prejudice in all young people.</p>	<p>CCEA has no responsibility for Religious Education, which is a matter for the Department of Education and the 4 Main Christian Churches.</p>
<p>Greater flexibility may allow greater opportunity to create bias.</p>	<p>Teachers will receive guidance, training and materials to assist them to address these issues in an appropriate way and to avoid bias at all cost.</p>

**Question 11: Can you identify any adverse impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations arising from the proposals?**

**Equality Category: GENDER - YES Responses**

Comment/Issue Raised	Response from CCEA
<p>There are currently many issues surrounding the inequality of provision for Home Economics in all boys' schools. These proposals make no attempt to address these as implementation is being left to Principals to find 'creative ways to timetable'.</p> <p>For full equality of provision, there needs to be adequate funding to establish and equip more Economics rooms. Will this be provided to ensure, regardless of gender, that all pupils will have the opportunity to take this subject?</p>	<p>Aspects of Home Economics will be statutory for all pupils.</p> <p>The Department of Education will work with schools regarding the interpretation of the curriculum.</p>
<p>Gender learning differences would be highlighted positively or negatively.</p> <p>Girls like structure - clearly defined work.</p> <p>Experience shows that girls spent too long on project work – disadvantaged.</p> <p>Changes will suit girls more than boys.</p> <p>Boys and girls develop at different stages.</p> <p>Boys may develop later so left in limited choice area.</p> <p>Difference in boys and girls development could mean that girls could be at an advantage when it comes to groupwork and coursework.</p> <p>Boys proven to be weaker at coursework/project approach.</p> <p>Research in the past has shown girls</p>	<p>The proposals are free from gender bias. Teachers are encouraged to use approaches that encourage all intelligences and learning styles. CCEA has published guidance entitled 'Focus on Boys' with recommended teaching strategies that also benefit girls.</p> <p>One of the major issues of the review was to improve the relevance of the curriculum to both genders and to address issues raised as important by pupils aged 11-14.</p>

to be superior genetically in some of the skills shown in 'As a contributor to Society'.

Girls develop physically and emotionally earlier.

The first age group will suffer, as they will be the experiment Gender issue about male and female abilities.

Single sex schools/staff/pupils?

### **Equality Category: GENDER - NO Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>A married female taking a career family break would be daunted by yet another change pushed through in her absence. How much change is necessary in education? Is this change the last – of course not!</p>	<p>Responding to changes in society, the economy and environment is a duty of schools and of education systems.</p>
<p>The proposals appear to focus on the way boys learn. Is this because of the current hype surrounding boys and underachievement? This will all change if girls begin to underachieve.</p>	<p>The proposals are free from gender bias. Teachers are encouraged to use approaches that encourage all intelligences and learning styles. CCEA has published guidance entitled 'Focus on Boys' with recommended teaching strategies that also benefit girls. One of the major aims of the review was to improve the relevance of the curriculum to both genders and to address issues raised as important by pupils aged 11-14.</p>
<p>Boys need structure and directions where girls will thrive on the new proposed curriculum.</p>	<p>The purpose of the review is to make the curriculum more relevant to all pupils with the aim of motivating boys and girls.</p>
<p>All pupils should be treated the same irrespective of gender etc.</p>	
<p>In mixed girls schools, girls could be at a disadvantage due to social roles or traditional social roles.</p>	
<p>Since the proposed format is still very academic, it is likely that the performance of girls will continue to outshine that of boys.</p>	
<p>This is a period when pupils are undergoing adolescence and consideration must be given to the significant differences in gender development, particularly to ensure that the new curriculum meets the</p>	

Comment/Issue Raised	Response from CCEA
<p>needs of boys.</p> <p>Boys work better individually and therefore would find some of the proposals quite difficult.</p> <p>Skills element may encourage the unmotivated boys more so than the girls.</p> <p>Skills element may improve these attainment levels for boys as they tend to underachieve.</p> <p>New Curriculum may encourage boys more due to the advanced use of skills.</p> <p>Will boys be disadvantaged?</p> <p>With the findings about boys being more 'compliant without engaging', some schools might tend to do only the minimum and nothing more. We feel girls who are generally more motivated will be disadvantaged in co-ed schools. Interested, highly motivated boys in single-sexed schools might also be disadvantaged.</p>	
<p>There is a danger that, because of the non-statutory obligation to deliver against a precise programme, there will be a gradual return to gender stereotyping in the choice between Home Economics and Science/Technology. This must not be allowed to be possible.</p>	<p>Both Home Economics and Science and Technology will be statutory for all pupils.</p> <p>The Department of Education will work with schools realising the implementation of the curriculum.</p>
<p>All pupils have equal access to the curriculum. Boys only schools need to enact existing equality legislation. Funding is required to support what is proper.</p> <p>The concern would be in all boys schools, particularly Grammar where they may not be prepared to invest in a new HE department (if they don't</p>	<p>These are implementation matters to be addressed by the Department of Education.</p>

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>already have one) they may only pay lip service to the subject of HE. This would further undermine the status of our subject.</p> <p>Home Economics is Personal Development if the facilities are not available in boys' school's.</p> <p>Lack of facilities in all boys' schools for the provision of Home Economics.</p> <p>HE departments will have to be developed in boys' schools to ensure equality of opportunity. Will money be available to develop new HE departments?</p> <p>Will boys, for example, have access to Home Economics or will capital funding be available?</p> <p>There may be the possibility of single sex schools (boys) being exempt from the implementation of these proposals immediately due to the fact that they have no facilities. Would money be made available to these schools to provide facilities and teachers so as to implement this aspect of the curriculum.</p> <p>Implications for boys schools with emphasis on Home Economics and PSHE. Will resources be made available?</p>	

**Equality Category: GENDER - UNSURE Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>Girls can complete project work to a higher standard so boys may be disadvantaged.</p> <p>The proposals may favour girls, as</p>	<p>The proposals advocate that Assessment for Learning is used to plan future learning. Coursework will form only part of the whole assessment framework. The Learning Outcomes suggest opportunities for a wide variety of learning styles.</p>

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>they involve continuous assessment.</p> <p>Girls may be discriminated by having less access to T&amp;D.</p> <p>More awareness of most issues as a result of covering such issues as gender etc. – so more equal opportunity as a result.</p> <p>It was left that, like many of the recent changes in curriculum and assessment, the proposals would favour girls at the expense of boys.</p>	
<p>The status of Home Economics is suffering due to lack of respect for this subject and its perceived gender specific location.</p> <p>Concerned that all boys schools do not offer Home Economics to their pupils. Some girls' schools do not offer Technology to all their pupils.</p> <p>Boys only schools do not offer, or have the facilities for Home Economics.</p> <p>Home Economics seems to be a gender subject.</p> <p>We are concerned about all boys schools in relation to Home Economics given that they do not have the facilities.</p>	<p>Home Economics will be statutory for all pupils.</p> <p>The Department of Education will advise and monitor the implementation of the curriculum.</p>

**Question 11: Can you identify any adverse impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations arising from the proposals?**

**Equality Category: DISABILITY - YES Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
Pupils with disabilities may find the cross-curricular nature inappropriate.	Pupils with disabilities may find that enhanced connections across the curriculum may benefit their learning. Schools are encouraged to work in ways that meet the needs of their particular pupils.
Some pupils at KS3 may not be able to cope with the proposals as set out due to their disability and total dependency on others for all their everyday and general needs.	The 'access' statement will allow schools to adapt the curriculum to meet the needs of individual pupils.

**Equality Category: DISABILITY - NO Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
Will depend on the resources and materials used. That has to be done to provide furniture suitable for disabled pupils at present.	The statutory curriculum will be preceded by an 'access' statement which will allow schools to adapt the curriculum to meet the needs of all pupils including those with disabilities and special educational needs.
Could pupils with a disability be limited in a skill-based education system?	Guidance on adapting the curriculum for pupils Special Educational Needs for pupils in mainstream and special schools and for pupils with profound and multiple learning difficulties (PMLD) in special schools will also be provided along with sample teaching plans and detailed teacher guidance and resources for the Foundation Stage and Key Stages 1, 2 and 3 which will help teachers to address these issues in more detail in the classroom.
No mention of pupils with Special Needs.	
Could cause concern.	
Disabled people may not have equal opportunities with these proposals but probably don't have them at the moment anyway.	
Does 'everyone' have the potential to be 'enterprising'? Might this assumption be inappropriate for children with severe disabilities?	
Could be limited in relation to the skills.	
Proposals may have adverse impact	

<p>on statemented pupils who require careful structured routine with a greater degree of individual targets/work than a non-statemented pupil.</p> <p>Learning difficulties – realistic school need to tailor work to suit/structure applicable.</p> <p>No reference to access for disabled students.</p> <p>Minority ethnic groups and disabled children are always at risk.</p>	
---	--

**Equality Category: DISABILITY - UNSURE Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>Physically challenged pupils may be further disadvantaged by skills challenged curriculum.</p> <p>Depends on type or degree of disability.</p>	<p>Guidance for Special Needs has been developed for primary proposals and will shortly be developed for KS3.</p>
<p>Will there be extra funding/support etc to help pupils to train for their employability.</p>	<p>Extensive training is planned for teachers so that all pupils will have a minimum entitlement to the employability strand.</p>
<p>We would be concerned that children with Special Needs have pronounced difficulties in literacy who still arrive in large numbers to secondary schools unable to access the curriculum in its totality.</p>	<p>There is a Literacy strategy in place which aims to address this issue. In addition, the proposed new Foundation Stage aims to ensure that young children get a developmentally appropriate start.</p>
<p>Area of disability must be considered for all pupils. Special education is not dealt with in any detail – must be made clear how specific needs will be incorporated.</p>	<p>Local and Global Citizenship will include reference to who may be discriminated against, including Section 75 groups. Citizenship works through developing understanding about concepts at prejudice, stereotyping, discrimination which can be transferred to a range of situations.</p>

**Question 11: Can you identify any adverse impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations arising from the proposals?**

**Equality Category: POLITICAL OPINION - YES Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
Political issues taught in schools don't always necessarily promote positive relations between pupils.	Local and Global Citizenship will include reference to groups who may be discriminated against including Section 75 groups. Citizenship works through developing understanding about concepts of prejudice, stereotyping, discrimination, which can be transferred to a range of situations. Through resources, schools will be strongly encouraged to explore issues appropriate to the needs and interests of their particular students.
We have to be careful about political issues in citizenship in a volatile political situation.	Extensive training will be provided to teachers on handling sensitive/controversial issues.
Political backgrounds have produced traditional career paths.	The proposals suggest a minimum entitlement for all students.

**Equality Category: POLITICAL OPINION - NO Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
A number of issues are politically dangerous and open to exploitation.	No programmes advocate 'party politics' but rather encourage investigation and understanding about the workings of society at an age appropriate level.
At Key Stage 3, politics and religions should be kept out of school. KS3 pupils do not have the experience or maturity to discuss these ideas and it will merely reinforce prejudices.	Local and Global Citizenship will not teach what to think but how to think.
Some parents might object to what is taught in certain areas of Citizenship/History.	This is an enquiry led curriculum that encourages investigation and questioning as opposed to delivering a set body of information from specific viewpoint. At the same time it encourages thinking which will help pupils develop the key elements including moral character, spiritual awareness, mutual understanding
In areas where opinions are extreme, we believe that trying to teach tolerance frequently hardens opinions and creates a 'them and us' scenario. Also, parental opinion and local	

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>political influences will be far more important than anything we can deliver.</p> <p>Political opinion – is there a danger that teaching history may become selective?</p> <p>Political and cultural assumptions behind the proposed emphases on Citizenship and Employability may be inadvertently dominated by a Western capitalist beliefs-system that may not be appropriate for all! Citizenship could lead itself towards Political indoctrination.</p> <p>Citizenship could lead itself – political indoctrination.</p>	<p>etc. Schools are strongly encouraged to explore issues, appropriate to the needs and interests of their particular students.</p> <p>Citizenship seeks to develop understanding about concepts of prejudice, stereotyping, discrimination, which can be transferred to a range of situations.</p>

**Question 11: Can you identify any adverse impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations arising from the proposals?**

**Equality Category: RELIGIOUS BELIEF - YES Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
Religious backgrounds have produced traditional career paths.	The proposals suggest a minimum entitlement for all pupils.
Only the four main Christian churches represented in the RE provision. This does not enrich understanding of diversity.	CCEA does not have a remit for RE, which is the responsibility of the Department of Education and the four main Christian Churches.
If teachers are to lead discussions, how do we ensure their subjectively on religious grounds – this aspect would need to be addressed officially rather than leaving it to chance that they will be professional.	This is an enquiry led curriculum that encourages investigation and questioning as opposed to delivering a set body of information from specific viewpoint. At the same time it encourages thinking which will help pupils develop the key elements including moral character, spiritual awareness, mutual understanding etc. Guidance and training will be provided for teachers in addressing these issues.

**Equality Category: RELIGIOUS BELIEF - NO Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
A major flaw is that CCEA has not acknowledged that at least 50% of schools have Religious Education at their core.	The proposals recognise the place of RE in the curriculum and sample Teaching Plans will seek to make sufficient links to RE.
Would some people object to some of the topics, like Relationships and Sexuality Education, in the Personal Development Section?	As part of each school's policy regarding the teaching of Relationships and Sexuality, schools are encouraged to consult parents.
Indoctrination can happen in church schools etc.	All schools are encouraged to promote equality and diversity.
We should get global and stop focussing on religious beliefs!	Section 75 legislation requires that this question be asked. The focus within Citizenship promotes

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>Focusing on religious and cultural issues (Citizenship etc.) may only serve to encourage tribalism.</p>	<p>consideration of global, as well as local, issues.</p>
<p>The impact on certain areas may have an adverse impact, depending on how materials are expected to be delivered. Those with strong religious beliefs may find themselves sidelined in an atmosphere of ‘blandness’ or ‘political correctness’. Are we moving away from any adherence to moral absolutes.</p>	<p>This is an enquiry led curriculum that encourages investigation and questioning as opposed to delivering a set body of information from specific viewpoint. At the same time it encourages thinking which will help pupils develop the key elements including moral character, spiritual awareness, mutual understanding etc.</p>
<p>I am sorely disappointed, though scarcely surprised, that we will not be teaching all children the same RE syllabus. Surely we can devise a programme that encourages children to have a sound understanding for and tolerance of all religions. RE should not be about telling children what to believe, after all – it ought to inform them about the whole spectrum of religious belief and unbelief. A child’s religious belief is his own business.</p> <p>Content of RE still uncertain.</p>	<p>CCEA does not have a remit for Religious Education which is the responsibility of the Department of Education and the four main Churches.</p>
<p>Consideration must be given to religions which fall outside Christian belief and represent part of the NI community.</p> <p>No reference to faith other than Christian.</p> <p>Reference should be made to groups such as Muslim, non believers. Is there evidence in the proposals that religious belief will be respected?</p> <p>Without looking at the RE area, the rest of the proposals have very little mention of Christianity.</p>	<p>CCEA does not have a remit for Religious Education which is the responsibility of the Department of Education and the four main Churches.</p>

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>Strong feelings generated by the RE department. Staff, as a whole, felt that it is down to the professionalism of individual teachers to ensure all facts are presented in caring, neutral and safe environments so that none of the above groups is disadvantaged at school level.</p> <p>Could lead to school area – religion base cause difficulty.</p> <p>The role that religious belief plays in the shaping of values and in relations between sections of the community is essential to a rounded understanding of the society in which pupils live and to which we wish them to contribute as fully as possible.</p> <p>Are there still religious groups who are not permitted to use a computer? How big an impediment would this be?</p>	

**Equality Category: RELIGIOUS BELIEF - UNSURE Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>Some tasks set in ICT KS3 scheme have a religious emphasis eg 'Twelve Days of Christmas'. This may cause problems for children and parents with no religious affiliation or of a non-Christian affiliation.</p> <p>Certain sects do not participate in Christian festivals e.g. Christmas, Easter.</p> <p>Spiritual awareness may be a problem for pupils of different faiths.</p>	<p>Schools have a choice of ICT tasks and have the freedom to develop school-based tasks. Schools should choose tasks with sensitivity to ethnic groups.</p>
<p>Teachers may have differing views. They may also have great difficulty in suppressing their own views on sex, religion etc. Some may not wish to disclose their views/beliefs.</p>	<p>This is an enquiry led curriculum that encourages investigation and questioning as opposed to delivering a set body of information from specific viewpoint. At the same time it</p>

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>Concerns over the erosion of the Catholic Ethos in the curriculum of Catholic schools.</p>	<p>encourages thinking which will help pupils develop the key elements including moral character, spiritual awareness, mutual understanding etc.</p>
<p>Equal opportunity of teacher teaching RE? Parent's religious views? Flexibility will allow unequal opportunity.</p>	<p>Guidance and training will be provided for teachers in addressing these issues.</p>
<p>There may be an adverse impact on current good relations when such topics are brought to the fore – taking our own school as an example. Teachers are being asked to deliver such areas in PSHE as 'parenting responsibilities, challenging family scenarios', which really ought to be delivered by specially trained individuals.</p>	<p>Training will be offered to teachers. Schools are encouraged to create mutually beneficial partnership with outside agencies to assist delivery of part of the curriculum where appropriate.</p>
<p>I have responded to the RE Consultation and I believe there should be one person for a group of schools that focuses on this important subject. Pure Biblical Christianity was the foundation stone for academia years ago. Geography, History, Tolerance, Citizenship, Sciences etc. is so cross curricular and vital. From where I have observed it has been pushed aside – again, starting in Primary flowing through to Post Primary has got to be attainable.</p> <p>In relation to religious belief, we are unsure because the statutory provision for RE is separate from this document and therefore has not been considered in the context of this response.</p>	<p>CCEA does not have a remit for Religious Education which is the responsibility of the Department of Education and the four main Churches. The proposals recognise the place of RE in the curriculum and sample teaching plans seek to make sufficient links to RE.</p>

**Question 11: Can you identify any adverse impact on equality of opportunity and/or good relations arising from the proposals?**

**GENERAL COMMENTS: YES Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>Flexibility could be an issue – if schools decide to offer areas of the curriculum in a modular system, or specific topics to certain year groups then pupils could miss out.</p>	<p>All schools will be required to provide the minimum entitlement to all pupils which can then be amplified and modified to meet the needs of individuals and groups.</p>
<p>We would have some reservations that the children in school during the transition might be disadvantaged. Teachers will be put under pressure by the increase in school based assessment. This could cause conflict with parents.</p>	<p>CCEA will monitor the transition phase carefully and through moderation and quality assurance ensure that no pupil is disadvantaged.</p>
<p>The idea of ‘Learning for Life and Work’ is very susceptible to fixed ideas of futures appropriate to particular groups of students.</p> <p>It all depends on the course content devised by the individual school.</p>	<p>The examples given can be adapted to current and future needs.</p>
<p>There would be a lot of impact on staff who have to teach certain issues that they wouldn’t have in the past.</p>	<p>Guidance and training will be provided for teachers.</p>
<p>The decrease of HE from subject to part of a strand is unequal treatment of the subject and gives the impression that it is lesser value. This will have an impact on how it is implemented,</p>	<p>HE has become a full strand with Learning for Life and Work and a statutory entitlement which should increase its value in the curriculum.</p>
<p>The open nature of content could be slanted in any direction depending on the point of view of the school, or the teachers in the school.</p>	<p>The minimum entitlement will ensure that all schools provide a statutory entitlement, with the flexibility to adapt the curriculum for individuals or groups of pupils.</p>
<p>Diluted Maths will adversely affect the</p>	<p>The Key Stage 3 proposals outline a</p>

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>choices being made at 14 (too little experience of what the subject has to offer).</p> <p>Young people, people from minority ethnic groups and people with disabilities are under represented in the volunteering population. While these proposals should begin to address this, there may be special support needs for some groups.</p> <p>There would appear to be some issues that would arise because of the changes being made. It is hard to be too specific as these are totally new proposals.</p> <p>Any changes are bound to raise equality issues.</p> <p>All NI KS3 pupils will be disadvantaged – curriculum needs to be on a par with the rest of the UK.</p>	<p>minimum requirement, which embraces the numeracy strategy.</p> <p>These are matters relating to implementation.</p>
<p>Teachers are already dealing with and catering for the above in their everyday teaching. Any proposals will have an impact on the above.</p> <p>If it increases the burden on teachers, something will give e.g. health, willingness to embrace change or worse. Still provide the facade of change without real innovation.</p>	<p>Significant training will be put in place for all teachers.</p>
<p>Many of the above because of the open nature of content could be slanted in any direction depending on the point of view of the school and the teachers in the school.</p>	<p>Teachers will receive guidance, training and materials to help them address issues in an appropriate way and to avoid bias.</p>
<p>The open nature of content could be slanted in any direction depending on the point of view of the school, or the teachers in the school.</p>	<p>The minimum entitlement will ensure that all schools provide a statutory entitlement, with the flexibility to adapt the curriculum for individuals or groups of pupils. Teachers will receive guidance, training and</p>

Comment/Issue Raised	Response from CCEA
	materials to help them address issues in an appropriate way and to avoid bias.
Doesn't serve better pupils/more academic pupils well.	All schools will be required to provide the minimum entitlement to all pupils which can then be amplified and modified to meet the needs of individuals and groups.
<p>CCEA should carry out an EQIA, including widespread consultation and discussion with relevant groups to inform the decision-making, as part of the assessment of differential and adverse Impacts.</p> <p>We support the emphasis on skills, active learning and relevance, the explicit connections between different parts of the curriculum, the confidence in the professional judgement of the teaching profession and greater flexibility to tailor the curriculum to suit the needs of individual children.</p> <p>We understand the rationale of the new proposals to ease the progression from Primary School to Secondary School and as an introduction to proposed reforms at KS4.</p> <p>We welcome the idea of replacing the 'tyranny' of the traditional timetable with block timetabling to allow for the development of a collaborative curriculum and more meaningful learning for students.</p> <p>We agree with underpinning values eg spiritual, moral, equality, justice and human rights.</p> <p>We support the introduction of new developments including Learning for Life and Work containing citizenship, personal development and education</p>	<p>CCEA carried out an EQIA alongside the KS3 Curriculum Review and consulted with umbrella groups (see appendix 1) as well as advertising in the Belfast Telegraph.</p>

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>for employability.</p> <p>We welcome the proposal that all teachers should help pupils to develop these skills.</p> <p>Applauds the emphasis on assessment for learning, or formative assessment, to encourage more personalised and meaningful learning. We also agree with the advice to give more attention to methods of questioning and to peer and self-assessment,</p> <p>We support the provision of holistic assessments of pupils' achievements, attainments, aptitudes and interests with pupil input and parental feedback.</p>	

**GENERAL COMMENTS: NO Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>I am unsure about gender, political opinion and religious belief, this will very much depend on the choice of topic and content. There may be a danger that the new freedom in content will allow schools and/or teachers to avoid contentious areas or to approach topics in a one-sided way.</p>	<p>Aspects of the curriculum that are designated in bold type in each strand will ensure that contentious issues are addressed. Training will seek to ensure that teachers approach contentious issues in a balanced way.</p>
<p>Cultural awareness can raise issues of 'rights'. Minority groups may wish to have input into the proposals given the increase in immigrant workers and families coming to live in NI. Guidance may be needed for teaching staff regarding discussions on personal development and relationships.</p>	<p>Guidance and training will be provided for teachers in addressing these issues.</p>
<p>We feel that again the less able pupils and those who are interested in getting a good grasp of basic skills for</p>	<p>The issues raised here are addressed through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the skills and capabilities</li> </ul>

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>employment in manual and services jobs have again been left high and dry. The pupil who aspires to being a mechanic or cook is being overloaded with irrelevant and frustrating philosophical and intellectual pursuits.</p>	<p>requirements;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the education for employability proposals; and</li> <li>• the proposals for greater flexibility and a wider range of courses at Key Stage 4.</li> </ul>
<p>There is no adverse impact on these but is there sufficient positive impacts for equality in these areas? No negatives but are there any positives.</p>	<p>CCEA believes that the proposals for Learning for Life and Work, in particular those for PSHE and Local and Global Citizenship, provide a range of positive impacts in terms of ensuring equality.</p>
<p>We feel there will be no adverse effects as long as staff are well trained to deal with sensitive issues.</p>	<p>Training and guidance will be provided.</p>
<p>We believe that these proposals are political driven and this is both unacceptable and dangerous. By way of example, it is now clear that Citizenship is being interpreted by one community in terms of rights and by another in terms of responsibilities.</p>	<p>The proposals seek to highlight the issues of equality, diversity, rights and responsibilities for all communities.</p>
<p>Would this increased flexibility lead to some parents/community groups putting pressure on History Departments to cover (or not to cover) particular topics/issues? Would such pressure lead to parents/community groups creating issues between local schools? 'My identity' – I could not begin to outline the issues, which could arise here! What about Child Protection, not to mention Social services involvement with families?</p>	<p>Schools have a responsibility to address, in a balanced way, issues which face students in society. Training and guidance will be provided.</p>
<p>No obvious adverse impact.</p> <p>Good to see Home Economics making a comeback.</p> <p>I am pleased to see HE is being revisited.</p>	<p>These are matters to do with the Costello recommendations on post-primary review.</p>

Comment/Issue Raised	Response from CCEA
<p>This should be about teaching, learning and achievement.</p> <p>Providing Grammar Schools are not allowed to continue with their own set curriculum and a two tier system must not be the result of these changes.</p> <p>For as long as Grammar/Secondary Schools system exists these proposals have the potential to increase inequality of opportunity as well as increase public perception that a Grammar School equals an enriched curriculum, while a Secondary School provides a 'dimmed down' curriculum.</p> <p>Continuation of the grammar/secondary school divide could raise equality issues if the changes are embraced more enthusiastically by one type of school. A core entitlement which includes the how of learning rather than a minimum entitlement could address this issue.</p> <p>Nothing in the proposals appears to impact on any of the above.</p>	
<p>It will affect the 'guinea pigs' those pupils involved in the first few years of the change from a good workable system to an unknown unproven one.</p>	<p>A phased approach should mitigate against very different experiences.</p>
<p>Equality of opportunity will be the responsibility of each school. Greater flexibility in the curriculum could facilitate greater equality of opportunity but it is dependant on the individual schools and its local environment.</p>	
<p>Schools chosen interpretation of curriculum requirements could have substantial effect or abuse. The</p>	<p>Teachers will receive guidance, training and material to assist them address issues in an appropriate way</p>

**Comment/Issue Raised**

**Response from CCEA**

phrase 'entitlement' could make it difficult for a school to keep its ethos and identity. Many controversial issues are put up front perhaps making it difficult for a teacher to deliver the areas of entitlement. It may be difficult to teach/give guidance on moral issues given the very complex nature of society today and hence our staff and pupils.

and to avoid bias.

Would be slightly concerned that 'material' would not be too open ended.

There is scope to cater for a wide range of backgrounds set out in the curriculum.

The proposed curriculum should encourage pupils to create informed and reasonable views on such issues.

There will be a distinct disadvantage to the more able pupil. We note your failure to list ability in the above list. These proposals represent clear discrimination against the academically able.

All schools will be required to provide the minimum entitlement to all pupils which can then be amplified and modified to meet the needs of individuals and groups.

None of the above was seen as an issue. However, sensitivity is always required when trying to meet the needs of every child.

Alien games may be seen as a threat.

No real adverse impact but the delivery in certain schools could be problematic.

We do not believe that these proposals will have any adverse impact on equality.

We do not see anything that we would regard as having a negative effect in any of the above.

Comment/Issue Raised	Response from CCEA
<p>Until one would work through the proposals, it is impossible to imagine issues which could be generated.</p> <p>Golden ration – now we can prove you are ugly. Is this really what we want to be teaching pupils the notion that they are not, and can never be, perfectly proportioned?</p> <p>In reality, home influences will always outweigh what teachers teach pupils about equality. The home environment and politicians are more important to pupils than teachers; pupils with extreme views see teachers as occupying a different world from the one they live in and perhaps in this they are right.</p> <p>Equality of delivery may be standardised but learning outcomes and progress by each child may be inequitable.</p>	
<p>This will depend on what the teacher teaches. The teacher should not put his/her opinion in such a way as would influence the above issue.</p>	<p>This is an enquiry-led curriculum that encourages investigation and questioning as opposed to delivering a set body of information from a specific viewpoint.</p>
<p>We feel that there will be no adverse effects as long as staff are well trained to deal with sensitive issues.</p>	<p>Guidance and training will be provided for teachers in addressing these issues.</p>
<p>Content sufficiently vague to eliminate bias.</p> <p>Under citizenship there should not be any obvious problems.</p> <p>All of the above is concerned by local and global citizenship.</p> <p>Problems could arise with local and global citizenship (symbols impact).</p> <p>Citizenship could cause conflict in</p>	

**Comment/Issue Raised****Response from CCEA**

mixed schools.

Indoctrination views in Citizenship and Environment and Society.

If delivered properly, the ideals of citizenship and RE etc. should ensure that equality is catered for. However, in individual classrooms teachers would be free for to form their own interpretations/views.

In theory, the proposed citizenship etc. should create a more developed, stable society.

As a school which welcomes staff and pupils of all denominations and race and yet is not officially an INTEGRATED SCHOOL, we find that major differences in culture and religion are not an issue. Our approach is a discreet one which allows staff and children to socialise, collaborate and co-operate in an environment which promotes mutual respect – focusing on religion and cultural issues (Citizenship etc.) may only serve to encourage tribalism.

Some of the citizenship elements might be contentious for some people.

If anything, the whole structure caters far better for all these groups.

We could not see any limits/bias in the proposals as they stand.

So long as schools become integrated and co-ed.

Depending on the make-up of the school population, local area and experiences of students.

As teachers we would support discussion on these issues, in their appropriate setting/situation.

Comment/Issue Raised	Response from CCEA
<p>With so much flexibility you cannot be sure of the outcomes.</p> <p>Flexibility is there for each school so that does happen.</p> <p>Proposals were obviously developed in the best interests of children.</p> <p>There is an issue of inequality in relation to the structuring of the questionnaire. HE specialists are not invited to comment on: the helpfulness of additional guidance and examples; the appropriateness of identified learning outcomes; the suitability of the proposals as foundations for school-based courses; the adequacy of such courses as foundations for progression to KS4 and GCSE.</p> <p>Lack of clarity may lead to ambivalence.</p> <p>No significant impact because of type of school and area.</p> <p>The only concern is regarding ability issues over equality.</p> <p>Cannot identify any equality areas.</p> <p>Proposals are geared towards equality and tolerance.</p> <p>As we could adapt and draw up the SoW so that they do not have any adverse impact on equality of opportunity.</p> <p>No adverse impact on equality of opportunity.</p> <p>There appears to be no obvious areas of equality or opportunity issues. If only comprehensive and secondary schools become committed to these proposals then there may be a stigma attached to the students of these schools i.e. 'special schools'.</p>	

Comment/Issue Raised	Response from CCEA
<p>If CCEA is seriously concerned about issues of equality, it needs to consider its position in relation to the Transfer Test and selective education. This is the most decisive element of the education system and breaks all the requirements for equality of opportunity.</p>	
<p>CCEA would appear to have an unfair monopoly here. Proposals will disadvantage academic pupils.</p>	<p>The proposals allow schools considerable freedom to adapt the curriculum to the needs of the academically able.</p>
<p>Opportunities will arise for all.</p> <p>The requirements are vague and do not state that these really need to be covered. Schools will probably teach their own values which is not their job.</p> <p>Proposals are definitely politically correct and well worded to cause least offence to everyone – although so watered down they are meaningless.</p> <p>I can see no adverse impact because the proposals are so ‘politically correct’ and watered down that they lack substance.</p> <p>The proposals are so politically correct that we cannot find any adverse impact.</p> <p>Discussing certain issues may have an adverse effect even if taught by experienced + specialised teachers. It is often impossible for a teacher to know the ‘undercurrents’, the family ethos + personal situations.</p> <p>Economic status is missing.</p> <p>‘High flyers’ and less able pupils could be disadvantaged learning wise. ‘Minimum entitlement’ and ‘flexibility’</p>	

**Comment/Issue Raised****Response from CCEA**

may impact on resources of the school. It is extremely difficult to review the proposals because of their lack of detail and clarity. Need to visualise how a non-detailed curriculum entitlement could respond to the need of those groups stated above. Proposals do not appear to have an adverse effect on equality of opportunity or good relations in any of the areas identified.

Concerned at the idea of teaching KS3 students to be 'entrepreneurs'.

I am sure CCEA shall abide by current legislation.

Concerns about the implications for their implementations of the proposals and the outcomes.

Only with the development of shared post primary schools can we promote equity, good relations and social inclusion.

Duplication of education provision along sectarian lines and separate teacher training do not represent an acceptable use of public resources and must be urgently addressed.

Accommodating differences within one school would have a positive effect on the future self-esteem of the child.

Falling school rolls could be used to lobby for reduced class sizes.

The option of social studies including family studies, world religions, philosophy and sociology could be a more appropriate preparation for students in a pluralist society.

A clear message about the benefits of the proposals for empowering all children and use of the statutory duty to further the case for promoting

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>equality of opportunity should be publicised.</p> <p>The inspectorate should take on an enhanced improvement role to provide schools with feedback and follow-up support.</p>	

### **GENERAL COMMENTS - UNSURE Responses**

<b>Comment/Issue Raised</b>	<b>Response from CCEA</b>
<p>Some aspects of the Learning for Life and Work Area are susceptible to a prejudiced, and prejudicial and prejudicial interpretation.</p> <hr/> <p>Academically able pupils may not be stretched to reach their full potential.</p> <hr/> <p>Concerns re: parents attitudes/beliefs on what should be taught regarding sexual orientation, political opinion and religious beliefs</p> <hr/> <p>Reads well.</p> <p>Untried – unable to predict the future.</p> <p>It seems in theory that all the above groups will be treated equally especially in the module on 'Local and Global Citizenship' which encourages good relationship with everyone.</p> <p>If there is too much disapplication, some pupils may be forced out of subjects that they currently study and like, just for the sake of school convenience.</p> <p>Will really only know when this info from pilot schemes comes in.</p>	<p>Schools have a responsibility to address, in a balanced way, issues which face students in society.</p> <hr/> <p>The proposals allow schools considerable freedom to adapt the curriculum to the needs of the academically able.</p> <hr/> <p>As part of each school's policy regarding the teaching of Relationships and Sexuality, schools are encouraged to consult parents. Through training, schools will be strongly encouraged to explore issues appropriate to the needs of their particular students.</p> <hr/>

---

Good relations – possibility of grievance between teachers about teaching themes, time allocated to each area etc.

Most would like to see what the final proposals are before commenting.

---

Children from troubled or broken families, or who do not live in families, may be affected by the introduction of advanced work on family relationship at too early a level of maturity.

---

Because of the flexible structure of the proposed curriculum, it is difficult to imagine how it will be delivered in schools, and it is possible that practices leading to inequality of opportunities or adverse impact on relations may arise from individual school practices e.g. how will sexual orientation or the structure of the family be examined in the personal development programme? Will the flexibility left to schools impact on equality of opportunities on a gender or disability basis? Will the delivery of science offend some religious groups? Let's remind ourselves that schools are not bound by any equality scheme. It would therefore be useful if clear guidance was issued to develop a curriculum in school that would actively promote the positive contribution made by all the groups to the society.

---

Unfortunately this idea will have to be in operation before one can account for the damage it will do.

---

Differences between schools may create prejudice and unequal opportunities for pupils and staff particularly when moving between schools.

---

Explicit reference is made to a variety of family structures.

---

CCEA will monitor the transition phase carefully and through moderation and quality assurance ensure that no pupil is disadvantaged.

---

Learning for life assumes students are entering employment immediately after KS3 – what about those who stay on at school?

Teachers may have widely differing views. They may also have great difficulty in suppressing their own views on sex, religion etc. Some may not wish to disclose their views/beliefs.

Ability needs to be taken account of.

Many of the skills and capabilities prescribed will be difficult for less able pupils to develop and sustain.

It is much too early to make a value judgement here though we fear that more able pupils may not get a fair deal and that an already overworked teacher workforce will be sorely stretched to meet the requirements.

Would need to see change in practice to assess any adverse impact on equality.

We find it very difficult to answer this question. The problems that may arise due to the above topics will only become apparent through the teaching. We are concerned that there is no mention of differential educational requirements.

Can only be answered empirically.

We would hope that the proposals would have a positive outcome for the above groups.

We are worried that inconsistencies could arise if different schools are placing varying emphases on the key concepts.

We fear that it may disadvantage the more able pupil. The acquisition of knowledge which has been the

Teachers will receive guidance, training and materials to assist them to address issues in an appropriate way.

---

hallmark of grammar schools education has been devalued. Portfolios and coursework will favour pupils.

No facility in these proposals for the very able student. Needs to be acknowledgement of their existence.

Are High Schools going to be reassured the same as Grammar Schools?

Unsure because all of the above issues is dependant on the delivery by each individual teacher. This could raise issues of monitoring.

There was concern about the strong emphasis on promoting the social norm. It was felt that this may disadvantage those who are individualists or who do not conform. It was pointed out some of the greatest geniuses in the past have also been social misfits. Would they survive the new curriculum as proposed?

More awareness of most issues above as a result of covering such issues gender etc. – so more equal opportunity as a result.

The equality of opportunity is more about High School pupils v Grammar Schools pupils. Proposals allow for a 2 tier system.

Equality is not an issue presently in this school. It is addressed at every level and is second nature here to both staff and students.

Time will be the judge of this question.

This is difficult to answer – needs time.

There could be problems but it is difficult to foresee them until we know

---

what each school will be doing.

Because we don't know what we are delivering yet – depends on this.

Difficult to predict this until you know exactly what you have to deliver.

The entire proposals are so politically correct that we cannot find any adverse impact.

Would expect teachers to be sensitive in the delivery of it. Careful planning.

Given the shout on ethical/moral/spiritual and some of the staff who may be teaching this, of course there is room for adverse impact. Staff only have to say that they are following the curriculum for NI.

Impact depends very much on nature of individual schools – what type of area they are situated in – religious/political tensions – that area etc. Difficult to assess.

### List of Equality Consultees

Action Mental Health  
Action MS  
Age Concern  
Age Positive  
AIAC  
Alzheimer's Society  
Amnesty International  
Blind Centre for NI  
British Deaf Association  
British Institute of Learning Disabilities  
British Irish Rights Watch  
British Psychological Society  
CACDP  
CAIN  
Cara-Friend  
CARE for Northern Ireland  
Cedar Foundation  
Citizens' Advice Bureau  
City Partnership Board  
Coalition on Sexual Orientation  
Commission for Racial Equality  
Committee on the Administration of Justice  
Community Relations Council  
Community Work Education & Training Network  
Co-operation Ireland  
Criminal Cases Review Commission  
Deafblind UK  
Democratic Dialogue  
Department for Social Development  
Disability Action  
Disability Rights Commission  
Disability Unit of the Equality Commission  
Down Syndrome Association  
East Belfast Partnership  
Employers' Forum on Disability  
Equality Authority Dublin  
Equality Challenge Unit  
Equality Commission  
Equality Rights and Social Inclusion  
European Court of Human Rights  
Family & Schools Development Worker  
Forster Green Hospital  
Foyle Friend  
Gay Lesbian Youth Northern Ireland  
Greater Shankill Partnership  
Groundwork NI  
Guide Dogs for the Blind Association

Hands that Talk  
Hearing Dogs for Deaf People  
Help the Aged  
Human Rights Consortium  
Human Rights Watch Association for Spina Bifida and Hydrocephalus  
INCORE  
Independent Panel for Special Education Advice  
JEDI  
Justice London  
Labour Relations Agency  
Law Centre NI  
Law Society of NI  
Legal Island  
Londonderry Deaf Youth Service  
ME Association  
Mediation Network NI  
Mencap NI  
Meningitis Research Foundation  
Multiple Sclerosis Society NI  
Muscular Dystrophy Campaign  
National Autistic Society Services for Children  
National Schizophrenia Fellowship  
Newtownards Road Women's Centre  
NI Association for Mental Health  
NI Deaf Youth Association  
NI Gay Rights Association  
NI Human Rights Commission  
NI Womens' European Platform  
NIACRO  
NICVA  
NISCC  
North Belfast Partnership  
Northern Ireland Dyslexia Association  
Northern Ireland Policing Board  
NOU (Northern Ireland)  
ODEI  
Office of Law Reform (OLR)  
Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister  
Ombudsman  
Opportunity Now  
Orchardville Society  
PAPA Resource Centre  
Parkinson's Disease Society  
PHAB Northern Ireland  
Pobal  
Police Ombudsman for Northern Ireland  
Praxis Care Group  
Probation Board NI  
QueerSpace  
Rainbow Project  
RNID Northern Ireland  
Sense Northern Ireland

Sisters of Mercy Education & Justice  
Skill NI  
South Belfast Partnership  
Standing Advisory Commission on Human Rights  
Transferors' Representative Council  
Victims Groups  
Volunteer Development Agency  
West Belfast Economic Forum  
West Belfast Partnership Board  
Women's Aid Federation  
Women's Forum for NI  
Women's Support Network

**Focus Groups at Key Stage 3**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Date</b>
Assessment	Wednesday 1 October 2003
	Monday 13 October 2003
Mathematics	Friday 3 October 2003
English	Monday 6 October 2003
Arts	Wednesday 8 October 2003
Physical Education	Friday 10 October 2003
Science and Technology	Wednesday 15 October 2003
Life and Work	Friday 17 October 2003
	Monday 27 October 2003
Languages	Monday 20 October 2003
Implementation	Wednesday 22 October 2003
	Wednesday 5 November 2003
General	Friday 24 October 2003
	Wednesday 29 October 2003
Environment and Society	Monday 3 November 2003
Special Needs	Friday 7 November 2003
Parents	Monday 10 November 2003
Irish Medium	Wednesday 12 November 2003