The Committee will meet at 11.00 am in Committee Room 2

1. **Items in private:** The Committee will consider whether to take items 10 and 11 and future consideration of its report on the draft national plan for Gaelic in private.

2. **Draft National Plan for Gaelic:** The Committee will take evidence from—
   - Allan Campbell, Chief Executive, Bòrd na Gàidhlig
   - Peadar Morgan, Language Planning Manager, Bòrd na Gàidhlig

3. **Draft National Plan for Gaelic:** The Committee will consider whether to seek approval from the SPCB to publish its report in Gaelic.

4. **Petition PE853:** The Committee will consider the petition.

5. **Petition PE872:** The Committee will consider the petition.

6. **Petition PE892:** The Committee will consider the petition.

7. **Petition PE957:** The Committee will consider the petition.

8. **Subordinate Legislation:** The Committee will consider the following negative instrument—
   - the Regulation of Care (Social Service Workers) (Scotland) Amendment Order 2006 (SSI 2006/453)

9. **Adoption and Children (Scotland) Bill:** The Convener to move motion S2M-4844—
   That the Education Committee considers the Adoption and Children (Scotland) Bill at Stage 2 in the following order: Sections 1 to 8, sections 47 to 63, section 79, sections 9 to 46, sections 64 to 78, and sections 80 to 113 and, that each schedule is considered immediately after the section that introduces it.

10. **Proposed Protection of Vulnerable Groups (Scotland) Bill:** The Committee will consider its approach to Stage 1 scrutiny of the proposed bill.
11. Scottish Executive draft budget 2007-08: The Committee will consider its approach to scrutiny of the Scottish Executive’s draft budget for 2007-08.

The following papers are enclosed for the meeting:
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Introduction

1. Section 2(3)(a) of the Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act 2005 asp 7 requires Bòrd na Gàidhlig to consult the Parliament when preparing the national plan for Gaelic. Bòrd na Gàidhlig is conducting a public consultation on a draft national plan for Gaelic until 10 November 2006.

2. The Bureau referred consideration of the draft national plan for Gaelic to the Education Committee on Tuesday 29 August 2006 under rule 17.5.2 of Standing Orders. Once the Education Committee has reported, the Parliament shall consider the consultation document in the light of the lead Committee’s report (rule 17.5.3).

3. Copies of the draft national plan for Gaelic have previously been circulated to members and are available from Bòrd na Gàidhlig’s website at: http://www.bord-na-gaidhlig.org.uk/nationalplanforgaelic.html

4. At its meeting on 13 September 2006, the Committee agreed to take oral evidence from Bòrd na Gàidhlig on the draft national plan for Gaelic and to invite Highland Council, Comhairle nan Eilean Siar and Glasgow City Council to provide written submissions.

5. The following papers are attached:

   SPICe summary of the Education Committee’s Stage 1 Report on the Gaelic Language (Scotland) Bill  
   Annex A

   Written submission from Comhairle nan Eilean Siar (this is a draft response to Bòrd na Gàidhlig’s consultation)  
   Annex B

   Written submission from Glasgow City Council  
   Annex C

Eugene Windsor  
Clerk  
Education Committee
EDUCATION COMMITTEE

BRIEFING PAPER

Gaelic Bill stage 1 report: summary

Introduction

The Gaelic Language (Scotland) Act created Bòrd na Gàidhlig and required it to produce a national Gaelic language plan.

The Committee noted the fragile state of the language (para. 8) in its stage 1 report¹ and fully endorsed the view that Gaelic should have ‘parity of esteem’ with English (10). However, it recognised that progress would be incremental (11) and the language needed to be ‘developed’ rather than only ‘preserved’ (12).

Status

The Committee was of the view that Gaelic already had the status of an official language (22), that it should be considered ‘equally valid’ although this should not, at this stage, confer rights on individuals as opposed to duties on organisations (33).

Education

Rather than recommend a statutory right to Gaelic education (37), which was ‘an aspiration for the future’ (68), the Committee recognised the profound importance of education to the future of the language (14) and recommended a national Gaelic education strategy to be developed by the Scottish Executive (39). The strategy would address:

- early years education (41)
- the lack of secondary school Gaelic medium provision (47)
- the lack of Gaelic medium teachers (50)

The Committee considered that new technology such as video conferencing together with developing ‘centres of excellence’ provided opportunities for extending both Gaelic education and teacher training (60-64). It was also important to provide support for parents whose children were learning Gaelic (75).

¹ Available online at http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/business/committees/education/reports-05/edr05-02-02.htm
It noted that Gaelic education would remain within the core remits of bodies such as HM Inspectorate of Education, Learning and Teaching Scotland and the Scottish Executive rather than become solely the concern of Bòrd na Gàidhlig (59).

Reserved Issues and Private Sector

The Committee wished to see more clarity with regard to the role of Scottish Ministers and Bòrd na Gàidhlig on Gaelic broadcasting (79). It also asked that the Executive seek support for UK public bodies operating in Scotland to operate within the spirit of the Act (91). Similarly, the Committee recognised the involvement of the private sector in public service delivery and wished to see the use of service level agreements (93).

Bòrd na Gàidhlig

The Committee supported the independence of Bòrd na Gàidhlig (97) and agreed that its approach to public bodies should be facilitative rather than coercive (97 – 100). Complaints should go to the Scottish Public Services Ombudsman (103). The Committee heard views about the qualifications of board members and while it agreed that there should be educational expertise (106), it did not support a requirement that members be Gaelic speakers (108).

Language Plans

The Committee noted that the Scottish Courts service should draw up a Gaelic language plan (96). More generally, the Committee suggested that language plans be developed for those local authority areas where Gaelic is less widely spoken but where there is both demand and potential for development (112).

The Committee recommended that the national language plan be reviewed every five years and the Scottish Parliament be involved in approval of the Plan (118-119).

Camilla Kidner
SPICe Research
20 September 2006

Note: Committee briefing papers are provided by SPICe for the use of Scottish Parliament Committees and clerking staff. They provide focused information or respond to specific questions of interest to committees and are not intended to offer comprehensive coverage of a subject area.
Is the vision of the draft Plan one in which you can share?

In broad terms, Comhairle nan Eilean Siar welcomes the Draft Plan. The Plan highlights areas that are key concerns for Gaelic language campaigners in the Western Isles, particularly the association that must exist between efforts to revitalise Gaelic in the home and the status the language has at community and official levels.

In general, it is encouraging that the plan is based on what is currently available, in situations where organisations and local authorities are enthusiastic to develop Gaelic, and can therefore be used as examples of best practise for other areas or organisations. There may be criticism from some that the aims are not sufficiently ambitious, but it is better to have aims that are achievable instead of aspiring to the unattainable.

Comhairle nan Eilean Siar accept that it has an important part to play in the revitalisation of Gaelic, particularly in relation to the status of the language in official situations. There are opportunities in the Western Isles for Gaelic to be given a higher profile through its use in official documents and as the language of communication at meetings. In accepting that situation, it is essential that Bòrd na Gàidhlig lead by example through corresponding in a bilingual format to organisations such as Comhairle nan Eilean Siar.

Over the past number of years there have been many consultations on the way forward for Gaelic and this plan is the outcome of the many observations that have been received over the years and includes objectives that have been actively sought for by Comhairle nan Eilean Siar.

In the light of your response to the above question, are the proposed sectoral projects essential to the meeting of the action area aims for 2012? If not, why not?

If there were any criticisms that may be levelled at the Plan, it would be that the aims for 2012 are not sufficiently ambitious, but it is more important to be followed in the drafting of the authority’s language plan.

In terms of the area projects, Comhairle nan Eilean Siar’s view is that the National Plan represents a strong foundation, which will give the language the opportunity to grow. The aims of the National Plan are reflected in The Western Isles Gaelic Language Plan and the Comhairle confirms that these are the principles that will be followed in the drafting of the authority’s language plan.

Are the outcomes for the twenty themes and the proposed sectoral projects essential to the meeting of the action area aims for 2012? If not, why not?

If there were any criticisms that may be levelled at the Plan, it would be that the aims for 2012 are not sufficiently ambitious, but it is more important to be followed in the drafting of the authority’s language plan.

In general, it is encouraging that the plan is based on what is currently available, in situations where organisations and local authorities are enthusiastic to develop Gaelic, and can therefore be used as examples of best practise for other areas or organisations. There may be criticism from some that the aims are not sufficiently ambitious, but it is better to have aims that are achievable instead of aspiring to the unattainable.

Comhairle nan Eilean Siar accept that it has an important part to play in the revitalisation of Gaelic, particularly in relation to the status of the language in official situations. There are opportunities in the Western Isles for Gaelic to be given a higher profile through its use in official documents and as the language of communication at meetings. In accepting that situation, it is essential that Bòrd na Gàidhlig lead by example through corresponding in a bilingual format to organisations such as Comhairle nan Eilean Siar.

Over the past number of years there have been many consultations on the way forward for Gaelic and this plan is the outcome of the many observations that have been received over the years and includes objectives that have been actively sought for by Comhairle nan Eilean Siar.

In the light of your response to the above question, are the proposed sectoral projects essential to the meeting of the action area aims for 2012? If not, why not?

If there were any criticisms that may be levelled at the Plan, it would be that the aims for 2012 are not sufficiently ambitious, but it is more important to be followed in the drafting of the authority’s language plan.

Are the outcomes for the twenty themes and the proposed sectoral projects essential to the meeting of the action area aims for 2012? If not, why not?
priorities for tackling them correctly outlined and prioritised? If not, why not?

The Comhairle feel that that the twenty themes and the associated priorities provide a reasonable steer for the way forward.

It is good to note that it is recognised that Education alone does not bear the burden of saving Gaelic. It is clear from the plan that Education does not stand alone, but it would be useful to have stated that the action areas for education are linked to the action areas for culture, because that is a basic part of education delivery. Certainly, that is contained within the Strategy, unobtrusively, but it would be appropriate for it to appear in the action area.

In regard to any growth in the education sector, there has to be a national campaign to support promotion efforts. Although we are seeing slow progress with our own efforts in partnership with Comunn na Gàidhlig, there is also a fair amount of discouragement, whether it be through indifference or active hostility towards the language. There is ample evidence which indicates that children benefit from Gaelic Medium Education if it means that the school roll in their village school is compromised.

Pre-school education and school education are accustomed to receiving criticism and advice, but not much attention is paid to the third level, particularly university education. In discussing issues with university students, it becomes clear that there is no uniformity in structure, suitability or appeal among the universities. They all meet academic standards level but they should also encourage a zeal for the language. There should be a priority similar to the following:

- Development of Gaelic/Celtic courses with regard to suitability and appeal.

Surely, universities will also be under a duty to fulfil their obligations to advance the status of Gaelic.

National Strategy for Gaelic Education

It was useful to have this element to flesh-out the action areas, and it would be useful to have something similar for each action area, as organisations will require detailed guidance. There is one amendment to page 47, under Teacher Recruitment and Supply - the provision of distance learning to include secondary teachers in now in its second year. It is worth retaining as an essential provision for expansion.

One new post is mentioned – Teacher recruitment Officer – that is not the only post that could be useful, and it is not a post that we would see as a priority, as it is difficult to envisage this being a full-time post. Other

priomhachasan airson dàiligeadh leotha air am mineachadh gu ceart agus ann an órdan freagarrach? Mura h-eil, ciamar nach eil?

Tha a’ Chomhairle den bheachd gu bheil na fichead cuspair agus na priomhchasas an t–tòiridh stiùireadh iomchaidh air an t-slighe air adhart.

Tha e math faicinn gu bheil aideachadh ann nach ann air fhoghlam a-mhàin a tha an t-ualach airson a’ Ghàidhlig a shàbhhaladh. Tha e soilleir bhon phlanach nach eil foghlam a’ seasamh leis fhèin, ach bhiodh e feumail nam biodh e sgrìobhtè gu bheil an roinn gniomh foghlam ceangailte ri roinn gniomh cultar, oir tha sin na chuidhean bunaiteach de lìbhrideachd foghlam. Gun teagamh, tha sin san Ro-innleachd, cha mhòr air falach, ach bhiodh e iomchaidh nochdadh anns an roinn ghnìomha.

A thaobh fàs sam bith ann an saoghail foghlaim, feumaidh iomairt nàiseanta bhith ann airson taice chur ri oidhirpean brosnachaidh: ged a tha sinne a’ faicinn fàs sladach le na h-oidhirpean againgn fhèin is Comann na Gàidhlig, tha mòran dith-minseachad na lùib, eadar daoine bhith coma na guineach ma dheidhinn a’ chàinm. Tha fhios agus dearbhadh anagainne gu bheil foghlam Brochadh Mhheadhan na Gàidhlig na bhuanachd do chloinn, ach dh’fhùm air amson de dhàrr an uilleamachadh, a’ chàdhadh an t-àrd-sgoile a-dhiubh ann a dh’fheumas atharrachadh duilleag 47 – oir tha cuimhneachan airson cùrsaichean 47, a th’ann airson gu bheil an t-slighe air adhart.

Tha foghlam ro-sgoile agus sgòile cleachdhte ri bhithe a’ faighinn slaisean agus comhhairle, ach cha mhòr gu bheil aon bhithe air uair sam bith ann air threars eile, gu h-àrdaigh aig ire oilitigh. Ann a bhithe a’ còmhradh ri olleanaich, togaidh duine nach eil eil co-ionannachd ann an cruth, freagarrachd no tlachd eadar oilitheadhean. Tha iad uile a’ coleannadadh inbhe acadamaigeach, ach bu chóir thòil a bhithe a’ brosnachadh eud airson a’ chàinm cuideachd. Bu chóir priomhchasas mar seo a bhithe ann:

- Leasachadh air càrsaichean Ghàidhlig/Ceiltis a thaobh freagarrachd agus tarraineachd.

’S cìnteach gum bi oilitheadhean cuideachd fo fhìachaibh a bhith a’ coleannadadh an deasainn ann a bhith ag adhartachadh inbhe na Gàidhlig?

Ro-innleachd Nàiseanta Foghlam Gàidhlig

Bha e feumail seo a bhithe ann airson feoil a chur air chòrdain an roinn gniomha, agus bhiodh e feumail a leithid a bhithe ann airson gach roinn-gniomh, oir feumaidh buidhean stiùireadh mionaideachd. Ach tha aon nì a chòrdain ann a d’hfeumas atharrachadh duilleag 47 – oir tha an solair airson isgnasachadh thar astrar airson àrd-sgoile a-nis anns an dara bliadhna. ’S fhìach a fhàgail ann mar nì a tha rìteachd a chumail a’ dol.

Tha aon dreuchd ùr air ainmeachadh – Oifigear Trusaidh Thidéean – chan e sin an aon dreuchd a bhiodh feumail, agus chan e sin an aon dreuchd don toireamaid priomhchasas, oir tha e dìthlich seo fhìachinn mar obair làin-thide.
things such as continuous professional development would have to be included.

A key task under Ethos might be, “Awareness of the place Gaelic has in fulfilling the National Priorities for Gaelic.”

In regard to the Specific Grants it is unreasonable to write, “grant funding is available for new Gaelic education initiatives only.” This was quite appropriate when the scheme started, when there was not much happening on the ground, but it can be extremely discouraging when the demand started to grow, there was sustained stream of funding to help with the normalising of Gaelic into mainstream funding this would then be an appropriate aim.

In the light of your response to the above question, what projects do you view as being essential to implementing these priorities (some examples are offered in Appendix I)?

All the projects are equally valid, although there can be no doubt that now more than ever Gaelic in the home requires sustained support. At the same time people must come to realise the potential the language has in relation to economic development not just in the Western Isles but also throughout the whole of Scotland, so it is felt that it would be useful to have a marketing project at some stage.

And are the right organisations identified as being the primary players in implementing these priorities?

There can be no question that local authorities and other public bodies are central to the delivery of Gaelic development. These organisations are in an advantageous position in terms of giving Gaelic a high profile through its use in official business, thereby giving the language credibility as an effective working tool, adding to the achievements of the Gaelic Medium schools and ensuring that Gaelic is an accepted language for business and industry.

If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, how

Bho Spiord dh’haodadh cur ris mar prionmh ghnìomh, “Mothachadh air an àite tha’ig a’ Ghàidhlig ann a bhith a’ coleannadadh nam Prionmhchasain Nàiseanta airson Foghlaim.”

A thaobh nan Tabhartas Sònraichte, tha e mi-reusanta a bhith a’ cur slos “maoín thabhartasach ri fhathairt a’ airson iomairteachd uàr Ghàidhlig a-mhàn.” Bha seo iomchaidhs gu leòr nuair a thoiseachadh an sgeama, nuair nach robh mòran sam bith a’ dol, ach chan eil/domadh a’ bhàsachaidh a thogail le iomairteachd ùra, a bhios feumail ach a thèid a bith an ceann 3/5 bladhna. Ma tha seo gu bhith do-sheachainte do dh’ ughdarras, toigeadh buadhman ùra ceann, gu call nithean susbainteach. Feumair ghabhail ris nach eil iomhnaiche aig uighdarras airson a h-uile cosgais a tha an lùb a’adhachtadh na Ghàidhlig a thoirt as an iomhnaiche aithne aca, a dh’aideoin gach oirdhirp. Nam biodh sruth maoincheadh ùrachadh ann airson cuideachadh le nithean Ghàidhlig a chur don iomhnaiche aithne aca, bhiodh ann an amas seo freagarrach.

Bho Stòras bu chòir:

- A’ite thòirt don prionmhchasach a tha gu bhith aig SSDN (GLOW) anns na bliadhachan tha romhainn ann a bhith a leasachadh stuthan teagaisg air loidhne
- Impidh a chur air buidhnean crailaidh obair foillseachaidh agus margaidheachd a dhèanamh, le bhith a reic DTV no eile de prògraman Gàidhlig, chloinne agus inbhich, mar a tha a’ tachart le prògraman Beurla.

Ri linn freagairt na ceiste mu dhireachadh, dè na pròiseactan a tha, nur beachd-se, riotanach guus na prionmhchasain sin a choileannadh (tha eisimpleirean cheisteann ann an Eàrr-sgrìobhdadh I)?

Chan eil aon seach aon nach eil riotanach, ach guin teagamh sam bith tha Ghàidhlig san dachaigh feumach air taic, ach aig aon àm feumaidh daoin faicinn gu bheil luaich anns a chànan agus guin gabh Gàidhlig cleachdadh a chum buannachd eacnamaich chan a mhàn anns na h-Eileanan ach ann an Alba air fad, le sin bhiodh e air leith feumail nam biodh pròiseact margaidheachd a’ nochdadh aig ire air choireigin.

An iad na buidhnean freagarrach a tha air an comharrachadh mar prionmh bhuidhnean ann an coleannadadh nam prionmhchasain sin?

Chan eil teagamh sam bith nach fheum ughdarrasain ionadail agus buidhnean poblach eil airse bhò mhòr air cùl leasaichdhean ann an saoghal na Gàidhlig. Tha na buidhnean sin a’ toirt iomhaich don chànan tro bhith ga cleachdadh ann an suidhichdhean a’ fuigeil, agus tha sin a’ toirt creideis poblach don chànan, a cuir taic ri na thathar a déanamh anns na sgìoltan agus a’ taraing Gàidhlig a-steach gu bhith na cànán nàdharrair airson gnothachas agus gnìomhachas oifigeil.

Ma tha sibh a freagairt às leth beidhinn, ciamar a tha sibh
Do you see yourselves contributing to the success of the National Plan?

Comhairle nan Eilean Siar sees itself as a key player with responsibility for the promotion of Gaelic and plays a vital role in language development work in the Western Isles. The Comhairle is also keen to work at inter-authority level to ensure the most effective and widespread use is made of the available resources. Since its inception in 1975, the Comhairle has a long-established commitment to raise the profile of the language within the authority, which it does within the limited resources available. The Comhairle has had a Bilingual Policy since 1979, which was reviewed in 1986 and again in 2002, each time the will was to strengthen the policy.

Do you have any other comments on the draft National Plan which you would like to submit?

The format of the plan should be more user-friendly: there is a danger with such bulky documents that they will be cast aside, unread. As an example:

- It would be more useful to have the “plan” portion separate from the background/rationale; these could be added as an Appendix for people who are not familiar with the background.
- There could be a separate booklet about the action areas, with attached strategies.
- The small graphical representations do nothing to enhance the booklet. Does the one for education suggest, “What am I to do with you?”
- The way the sections are at the moment, it is unclear why there are different thicknesses of font for the priorities.

We have to maintain confidence, despite the challenging circumstances that face us, in the hope that the work done to bring the plan to this stage and this consultation, will give us a practical plan with firm responsibilities, including the Executive, local authorities and other appropriate organisations.

Ma tha sibh a freagairt às leth buidhinn, ciamar a tha sibh gur faicinn fhèin a’ cur ri soirbheachd a’ Phlana Nàiseanta?

Tha Comhairle nan Eilean Siar ga faicinn fhèin mar aon de na priomh bhuidhnean air a bheil uallach airson Gàidhlig a bhrosnachadh agus bhiodh a’ Chomhairle airson a bhith ag cridhe obair leasachaidh a’ chànan ann na h-Eileanan an Iar. Tha úidh mhòr aig a’ Chomhairle cuideachd ann a bhith ag obair aig ire eadar-úghdarrais gus na ghabhas de dh’eòifeachdhas fhaghinn bhon mhaoin a tha ri fhaoitain. Thairis na bliadhnaich tha a’ Chomhairle air daingneachadh gu bheil an cànan a’ faighinn àite sònraichte an taobh-staigh obair na buidhne, agus tha an obair ga choiliomh a-rèir an stòrais a thann. Bha Poileasaidh Dà-chànanach aig a’ Chomhairle bho 1979, air an deach ath-sgrùdadh ann an 1986 agus a-rithist ann an 2002, gach turas a’ déanamh am poileasaidh nas treise.

Feumaidh cruth a’ phlana a bhith nas frasa làimhseachadh. Tha cunnart ann le leabhran cho tomadach ’s a tha sa phhlan a an-dràsta gun tèid a thigil an dara taobh. Mar eisimpleir:

- Bhiodh e na b’fhéarr na pìosan “plana” a bhith air leth bhò na pìosan feallsanachd : dh’haodadh iad sin a bhith ann an Earr-radh (appendix), do dhuine nach biodh eòlarach air an fheallsanachd.
- Dh’haodadh leabhran tana a bhith ann mu gach roinn-gnìomha, le ro-innleachd nan caolais.
- Chan eil na dealbhan beaga a’ cur ris an leabhran ann an dòigh sam bith – a bheil an dealbh airson foghlaí ag rádh, “Dè as urrainn dhomh a dhèanamh leibh?”
- Mar a tha na h-earrannan an-dràsta, chan eil e soilleir carson a tha diofar tughadh clò air na prìomhachasan.

Feumaidh sinn ar misneachd a gheidheadh a dh’aideoin an t-suidheachaidh chugallach anns a bheil sinn gar faighinn fhèin, an dòchas gun toir an obair a rinneadh airson am plana thoir chun na h-ire seo agus an co-chonaraidh tha seo, duinn plana prataigeach le dieastanais teann, a’ bualadh air an riaghallas, uthgardair Ionadail agus buidhnean ionchaidh eile.
Dear Mr Windsor

DRAFT NATIONAL PLAN FOR GAELIC

Thank you for the invitation to comment on the National Plan for Gaelic, which in conjunction with the Guidance for Gaelic Language Plans, is now out for public consultation.

As you will be aware, Glasgow has a large number of Gaelic speaking residents. The City Council provides considerable support to Gaelic, especially through provision by its Education Services and Cultural and Leisure Services. Indeed, just last month, the Council opened a new £4m Gaelic School for children from pre-5 to secondary, the first Gaelic campus in Scotland for 3-18 year olds.

The National Plan for Gaelic, however, requires the Council to go well beyond its current level of provision. Individual service departments are currently considering the implications of the Plan for their services in terms of staffing and potential financial costs and their comments will be included in the Council’s formal response to Bord na Gaidhlig’s consultations.

Since the Council is working to the formal consultation deadline of 15 November 2006, I am afraid it is too early for the Council to provide any detailed comments on the draft National Plan.

Yours sincerely

DAWN CORBETT
HEAD OF CORPORATE POLICY
Introduction

1. This paper sets out some proposals for dealing with Petition PE 853.

2. The petition calls on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive to introduce legislation requiring all proposals which relate to the closure or alteration of facilities and services for children with special needs to be referred to it and, in the case of such proposals, requiring detailed consultation with parents of affected children and to implement a moratorium preventing the closure of special needs schools until such legislation is in place.

3. The Public Petitions Committee (PPC) considered the petition at its meeting on 22 June 2005. The PPC agreed to write to the Minister for Education and Young People and Aberdeenshire Council. At its meeting on 7 December 2005, the PPC agreed to refer the petition to the Education Committee.

4. The Education Committee considered the Petition at its meeting on 1 March 2006, and agreed to seek the views of the Petitioner on the Scottish Executive's response.

5. The Committee took evidence from the Petitioner at its meeting on 13 September 2006.

Consideration

6. As the Committee has acknowledged on a number of occasions in the past, its main role is scrutiny of the Scottish Executive’s policies and actions in the relevant policy area. Decisions on any school closures and the conduct of related consultations are matters for local authorities, and it is not for the Committee either to become involved in individual cases, or to seek to question the decisions of democratically elected local authorities, which are accountable to their electorate.

7. The Minister for Education and Young People, in his letter to the Committee regarding school closures indicated that COSLA is soon to issue a “Good Practice Guide” for authorities’ use, to be read alongside the Executive’s own guidance. The Minister further stated that when the COSLA guide is published he will write again to Council Conveners, highlighting the issues underpinning good practice and the need for Councils to explain very fully the rationale behind proposals consulted on. The letter went on to state that councils must be able to demonstrate a clear case for closure of a school, if that is the final decision.

Recommendation

8. In view of the above, members may wish to allow the petition to remain open until the Committee has had the opportunity to consider the forthcoming good practice guide from COSLA.
Introduction

1. This paper sets out some proposals for dealing with Petition PE 872.

2. The petition calls for the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive to introduce a legislative presumption against closure of rural schools unless there is an undeniable educational and social benefit to the children and communities affected.

3. The Public Petitions Committee (PPC) considered the petition at its meeting on 28 June 2005. The PPC agreed to write to the Minister for Education and Young People. At its meeting on 9 November 2005, the PPC agreed to refer the petition to the Education Committee.

4. The Education Committee considered the petition at its meeting on 14 December 2005, and agreed to continue the petition.

5. The Committee took evidence from the petitioner at its meeting on 13 September 2006.

Consideration

6. As the Committee has acknowledged on a number of occasions in the past, its main role is scrutiny of the Scottish Executive’s policies and actions in the relevant policy area. Decisions on school closures are matters for local authorities, and it is not for the Committee either to become involved in individual cases, or to seek to question the decisions of democratically elected local authorities, which are accountable to their electorate.

7. The Minister for Education and Young People, in his letter to the Committee indicated that COSLA is soon to issue a “Good Practice Guide” for authorities’ use, to be read alongside the Executive’s own guidance. The Minister further stated that when the COSLA guide is published he will write again to Council Conveners, highlighting the issues underpinning good practice and the need for Councils to explain very fully the rationale behind proposals consulted on. The letter went on to state that councils must be able to demonstrate a clear case for closure of a school, if that is the final decision.

Recommendation

8. In view of the above, members may wish to allow the petition to remain open until the Committee has had the opportunity to consider the forthcoming good practice guide from COSLA.
Introduction

1. This paper sets out proposals for handling petition PE 892.

2. Petition PE 892, by Ronnie Beaty, calls for the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive to amend the Education (Scotland) Act 1980 to set down minimum safety standards for school bus provision including the provision of certain safety signs and to make regulations, under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, requiring the use of certain safety signs and lights on school buses and to make failure to comply with such signs an offence and to seek the necessary powers to require bus operators to remove such safety signs from school buses when they are not in school use.

3. The Public Petitions Committee (PPC) considered the petition at its meeting on 26 October 2005. The PPC agreed to write to the Minister for Education and Young People, Scottish Accident Prevention Council, the Parent Teachers Association, the Educational Institute of Scotland (EIS), Transport 2000, the Confederation of Passenger Transport and the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA). At its meeting on 3 May 2006, the PPC agreed to refer the petition to the Education Committee.

4. The Education Committee considered the petition at its meeting on 7 June 2006, and agreed to invite the petitioner to give evidence. The Committee also agreed to invite the Scottish Parliament Information Centre (SPICe) to prepare a briefing to support consideration of the petition.

5. The Committee took evidence from the petitioner at its meeting on 13 September 2006.

Consideration

6. The Committee has a long-standing interest in school transport policy, and has a commitment to review annually the progress of the Scottish Executive’s policies in the area. During 2005, it conducted a survey of local authority policies on school transport, which drew a total of 11 responses from councils. A summary of the key points from the survey was sent to the Minister for Education and Young People, and the Committee considered his reply and questioned the Minister on it at its meeting on 26 October 2005.

7. The Committee continues to require an annual update from the Minister for Education and Young People in respect of the Scottish Executive’s progress in this area. The
most recent consideration of the annual update was at the Committee’s meeting on 13 September 2006, the same meeting at which the petitioner gave evidence.

8. The evidence given by the petitioner at the Committee’s last meeting was harrowing and members would, no doubt, share the desire of the petitioner to try to ensure that the number of accidents involving children during their travel to and from school is as low as possible.

9. Local authorities are responsible for drawing up the contracts with bus and coach operators for school transport, and may specify vehicle types and standards and set out operational practices which they would wish the operator to follow. There is no statutory requirement to remove school bus signs when the vehicles are not being used to transport children, or to deploy hazard warning lights when the vehicle is stationary and children are boarding or alighting. However, Scottish Executive guidance on school transport states “Scottish Ministers invite education authorities to stipulate in their contracts that the signs should only be displayed when children are being transported and that hazard warning lights should be used when children are getting on or off vehicles.” It is not known the extent to which this is, in fact, stipulated by education authorities. However, it is not for the Education Committee to advise local authorities in relation to what is stipulated on specific school transport contracts.

10. The Minister’s letter, considered by the Committee at its last meeting, provides details of work presently being tendered by the Scottish Executive. This work will address three main aspects: it will identify good practice with a view to improving the quality and consistency of service and practice across Scotland; highlight ways in which parents’ and pupils’ safety concerns have been allayed and consider good examples of ways in which health and environmental issues have been addressed. It is expected to be completed in time to allow local authorities to consider it before the start of the new school session in August 2007.

11. Most of the areas on which the petition seeks action are, in fact, reserved and therefore matters for the United Kingdom parliament. The scope for action by the Scottish Parliament is, in these circumstances, very limited.

12. Nevertheless, the Committee could invite the Minister to make representations to his colleagues in the UK government. However, if this option were to carry any weight, it would be necessary for the Committee to hold its own inquiry and take evidence in order to inform its findings. As members will be aware, such an inquiry is not currently part of the Education Committee’s work-plan and would have to be considered alongside previous uncompleted commitments, such as the proposed inquiries into the teachers agreement (McCrone) and looked after children. Such an inquiry may also raise issues in relation to remit and competence, as it is likely to be centrally concerned with road safety matters, the majority of which are reserved to the UK Parliament.

13. It may also be appropriate to wait until the work currently being carried out on this issue on behalf of the Scottish Executive has fed into the practices of local authorities and has had time to ‘bed in.’

14. It may therefore be more appropriate to recommend in the Committee’s legacy paper to its successor committee
i. that annual scrutiny of Scottish Executive progress in relation to school transport is continued by the successor committee; and

ii. that the successor committee considers whether to hold an inquiry into school transport during the course of the next Parliamentary session, once the outputs from the current initiatives have been fully embedded in practice by local authorities.

Recommendation

15. On the basis of the above, it is recommended that this petition is closed.

Iain Smith
Convener
Education Committee
Introduction

1. This paper sets out proposals for handling petition PE 957.

2. The petition, by Phyllis French, calls on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Executive to review its strategy Building Our Future: Scotland's School Estate to ensure that new schools are built in a safe and secure environment and not, for example, on functional flood plains.

3. The Public Petitions Committee (PPC) considered the petition at its meeting on 3 May 2006. The Public Petitions Committee agreed to forward a copy of the petition to the Minister for Communities for information only and to refer the petition to the Communities Committee as part of its ongoing scrutiny of planning issues including the Planning etc. (Scotland) Bill.

4. The Communities Committee considered the petition at its meeting on 24 May 2006. It agreed that the planning related issues raised in the petition should be taken into account in its consideration of the Planning etc. (Scotland) Bill at Stage 2, and that the petition should be referred to the Education Committee for consideration of the issues in relation to the Building Our Future: Scotland’s School Estate strategy.

5. The petitioner gave evidence to the Education Committee at its meeting on 13 September 2006.

Consideration

6. Members will be aware that the PPC originally referred the petition to the Communities Committee in the expectation that any relevant matters contained in the petition would be considered by the Communities Committee during its scrutiny of the Planning etc. (Scotland) Bill. The PPC did not refer the petition to the Education Committee. However, after consideration of the petition, and agreement that it would consider relevant issues within its scrutiny of the Planning etc. (Scotland) Bill, the Communities Committee decided to refer it to the Education Committee.

7. The evidence given to the Education Committee at its meeting on 13 September appeared to arise mainly out of the petitioner’s concerns over South Lanarkshire Council’s plans for the replacement of Uddingston Grammar School. It is understood that full planning permission has now been granted for the school and that SEPA is content with the revised scheme. Construction work on the project was due to begin in August 2006.
8. Although there may be potential for future investigation of the links between school estate renewal within local authorities (whether funded under PPP or other means of capital investment), the Scottish Executive’s school estate strategy and the local planning system, the petition itself raises no matters which are within the remit of the Education Committee. Moreover, the issues it does raise are clearly planning ones.

Recommendation

9. In view of the above, it is recommended that no further action is taken by the Committee and the petition is closed.

10. As an alternative to the recommendation above, the Committee could agree to close the petition, but to include in the legacy paper to the successor committee a recommendation that it considers whether to hold an inquiry into school estate renewal issues.

Iain Smith
Convener
Education Committee
1. The purpose of this instrument is to amend the Regulation of Care (Social Service Workers) (Scotland) Order 2005 by inserting three additional descriptions of social service workers to be added to the register of social services.

2. The Education Committee is the lead committee for this instrument and should report to the Parliament by 23 October. The Minister responsible is Robert Brown, Deputy Minister for Education and Young People.

3. A copy of the SSI, an explanatory note which is not part of the Regulations, and the Executive Note are attached.

4. A note on procedure for considering SSIs is attached overleaf. This is a negative instrument.

5. The Subordinate Legislation Committee considered the SSI at its meeting on 12 September and no points of concern were raised.

6. The Committee is invited to consider whether it wishes to make any recommendation in relation to the instrument. The instrument is not subject to amendment.

Eugene Windsor
Clerk
Education Committee
Procedural Note

Standing Orders

1. The procedures for dealing with Scottish Statutory Instruments (SSIs) are covered by Chapter 10 of Standing Orders. SSIs are laid by being lodged with the chamber clerks, and are published in the Business Bulletin. They are referred to the Subordinate Legislation Committee, the appropriate subject committee (the ‘lead committee’), and, where relevant, any other committee.

SSIs subject to annulment: ‘negative instruments’

2. Where an SSI is subject to annulment, it comes into force on a specified date and then remains in force unless it annulled by the Parliament. Any MSP may by motion propose to the lead committee that the committee recommend that nothing further is to be done under the instrument. Such motions are lodged with the chamber clerks.

3. The lead committee debates such a motion for no more than 90 minutes.

4. The lead committee reports to the Parliament, setting out its recommendations. If it recommends annulment, the Bureau will propose to the Parliament a motion that nothing further is to be done under the instrument.

5. All the above must take place within 40 days of the instrument being laid, excluding recesses of more than 4 days.

6. To date, no motion to annul SSI 2006/453 has been lodged with the chamber clerks.
Finance Committee

Budget Process 2007 – 08 - Draft Budget Guidance to Subject Committees: Paper by the Budget Adviser

1. The budget process this year is again a short one, because of the postponement of the Spending Review until 2007, there has been no Stage One.

2. Members will also be aware from the figures that this is the tightest budgetary context in this Parliament with spending growing by 2.4% in real terms over 2006-7.

3. Therefore, there is no need for Committees to make recommendations for additional spending, but proposals to reorder priorities within portfolios would be considered.

4. The document also highlights changes in plans since last year, and Committee comments on these would be helpful.

5. This is the last budget in the current Parliament. The Finance Committee has put considerable effort into improving the quality of financial information in the document. Concerns remain over the Executive's 'objectives and targets' approach. It would be helpful if Committees could reflect on the usefulness of the financial and performance information to them, and suggest ways of improving the presentation of the budget in the next Parliament.

6. In addition, Committees may also feel able to reflect on spending priorities within their portfolios and recommend any programmes they feel need to be prioritised for the next Parliament.

7. Last year, Committees were asked for views on the Executive's Efficient Government Initiative. The Executive has recently published an Outturn Report for 2005-06 and the Finance Committee would be interested in any observations that subject committees may have on Efficient Government within their remit.

8. With these comments in mind, the Finance Committee would welcome responses on the undernoted key topics:

   a) Is the Committee satisfied with the responses from Ministers to its recommendations for the 2006-7 budget?
   b) Does the Committee wish to make any comments on the budgetary changes reported in the “New Resources” section?
   c) Does the Committee wish to recommend any transfers of funding between programmes within its portfolio, with an explanation for the proposal?
d) Does the Committee have any proposals for improving the quality and relevance of financial and performance information in the Draft Budget which could be considered after the 2007 election?

e) Does the Committee wish to make any recommendations in budget proposals to its successors in 200x7? Is there any programme with a clear need for additional expenditure, or which members think is overfunded?

Professor Arthur Midwinter
September 2006
The Committee reports to the Finance Committee as follows—

**Introduction**

1. The Committee took evidence on 26 October 2005 from Peter Peacock MSP, Minister for Education and Young People, Philip Rycroft, Head of Schools Division, Colin MacLean, Head of Children, Young People and Social Care and Joe Brown, Head of Policy Support Unit, Education Department, Scottish Executive.

2. This report is based on the evidence provided to the Education Committee by the Minister and officials and is structured according to the questions posed to subject committees by the Finance Committee on the Scottish Executive’s draft 2006-07 budget.

**Is the Committee satisfied with the responses from Ministers to its recommendations for the 2005-06 draft budget?**

3. The Committee is concerned that a number of points made in last year’s budget report have not been fully addressed, and is disappointed that despite comments made last year, the budget has been presented in the same format. This report therefore reiterates a number of points made by the Committee in its report on the 2005-06 budget.

**Does the Committee wish to raise any matter regarding the changes to spending plans referred in the ‘New Resources’ section?**

4. During its work on the Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Act 2004 and its subsequent implementation, the Committee has monitored the Scottish Executive’s progress within this critical area of its remit. The Committee notes that in its report on the 2005-06 draft budget, it expressed concern over the lack of clarity in tracking investment in additional support needs. During its scrutiny of the draft 2006-07 budget, the Committee was again unable to track overall expenditure on additional support needs across all departments as the New Resources and Transfers section of the document refers to transfers into the Health Department and the National Priorities Action Fund (see below). In

---

1 FI/S2/05/20/3. Considered by the Finance Committee on 20 September 2005.
evidence, the Minister for Education and Young People reassured the Committee that the overall budget for additional support needs was increasing. In order to aid transparency, the Committee believes that where there are interdepartmental transfers of funds, the net impact on expenditure across the entirety of the Scottish Executive’s budget should be clearly stated. The Committee thanked the Minister for Education and Young People for agreeing to provide more detailed information to it on the Scottish Executive’s total expenditure on additional support needs and how it was split between administration and delivery services.

Does the Committee wish to recommend any specific changes to programme budgets within the portfolio? If so, which programmes should be increased and why, and which programmes should be reduced to fund such changes?

5. The Committee notes that total expenditure on Scottish preschool and school education amounts to over £4 billion. The Scottish Executive’s Education Department’s Total Managed Expenditure in its proposed budget for 2006-07 is £597.9 million. This represents less that 15% of the total Scottish expenditure with the remaining 85% coming from local authority grant aided expenditure. 30% (£176.3 million) of the central Scottish Executive budget is contained within one individual budget line: the National Priorities Action Fund. However, there is no explicit information provided on what this budget line contains. Transparency over the contents of this budget line is vital because, as the Minister for Education and Young People said, the National Priorities Action Fund: “… is an important part of how we drive and incentivise change in certain areas …”²

6. Therefore, in order for the Committee to assess how the Scottish Executive is funding activities to drive its changes or emphases in its education policies, explanation of the detailed content of the National Priorities Action Fund below Level 3 would be valuable to improve the Committee’s understanding and scrutiny of the Scottish Executive’s future policy directions.

7. The Committee again thanks the Minister for his commitment to provide additional detail on the content of the National Priorities Action Fund. However, the Committee notes that precisely the same concern was raised in last year’s Stage 2 budget report and recommends that, irrespective of whether it complies with the agreed pan-departmental approach to the presentation of the budget, details of the National Priorities Action Fund below Level 3 are made explicit in the Education and Young People section of the draft budget as they are critical tool for driving policy changes.

8. The Committee notes that for the other 85% of expenditure on preschool and school education, the Scottish Executive has not indicated any plans to specify what performance information would be required to track future performance.

Is the Committee content with the Statement of Priorities set out in its portfolio chapter?

9. The Committee shares the Scottish Executive’s priorities for education and young people. However, it remains uncertain as to how the Scottish Executive reassures itself that its extensive suite of objectives, targets and priorities will be delivered when there is no direct alignment with local authorities’ objectives, targets and priorities. The Minister for Education and Young People referred to a “fundamental tension”\(^3\) in the relationship between central and local government and noted the development of outcome agreements on teacher numbers, that will enable local authorities to provide locally appropriate solutions which collectively satisfy the Scottish Executive’s national requirements. The Committee recognises the challenge of allowing local authorities the flexibility to develop and implement local solutions while ensuring that national priorities are delivered and looks forward to receiving feedback from the Minister on the results of the outcome agreements during next year’s budget process and what performance information on the total £4 billion expenditure should ideally be publicly available to all interested parties.

10. The Committee also notes the ongoing study by Audit Scotland of the implementation of the McCrone recommendations and use of the additional McCrone funding by local authorities.

Does the Committee have any comments to make regarding the cross-cutting issues set out in its portfolio?

11. The Committee did not specifically discuss this issue with the Minister for Education and Young People but encourages the Finance Committee to explore how the Scottish Executive monitors performance in the three cross cutting issues areas across departments.

Is the Committee content with the efficiency proposals identified for its portfolio? Are there projects to promote efficiency that the Committee would like to see considered by the Executive?

12. The Committee noted that the degree of devolved school management varied between local authorities. Clearly, some of this variability may be accounted for by differences in definition and accounting practice. However, differences in the degree of devolved school management could impact on the potential scale of efficiency savings between local authorities. Local authorities with higher levels of devolution will have less scope for central efficiency savings than those where more funding is held centrally.

13. The Committee asked the Minister for Education and Young People and officials for reassurance that pressure to achieve efficiency savings would not compromise the Education Department’s performance in delivering its commitments. The Minister replied that, although the efficiency targets would necessitate a decrease in the degree of spending discretion, there would be no reduction in performance. The Committee believes that there is a case for the

---

\(^3\) Peacock, Official Report, Education Committee, 26 October 2005, column 2721.
Finance Committee to conduct *post hoc* scrutiny of the Scottish Executive’s efficiency saving programme.

14. The Committee was pleased that local authorities had been asked by the Minister for Education and Young to exempt education from efficiency savings but noted that this places greater pressure on other aspects of local authorities’ portfolio of services, especially given the large percentage of local authority expenditure that education represents. The Committee was reassured that there was no intention to pass efficiency targets down to individual schools. Nevertheless, the Committee questions how the Scottish Executive can be certain that education budgets will be exempt from the requirement to find efficiency savings, when these budgets are set locally by individual local authorities.
DRAFT BUDGET 2007-08

As you know, the Draft Budget 2007-08 was published on 08 September. I thought it would perhaps be helpful, ahead of our meeting on 24th October, to provide an update on issues we discussed last year. As you know, the format of the Draft Budget is agreed by the Finance Committee and the Executive, and there is no scope to adapt individual portfolio chapters to provide additional material.

Particular themes from last year were:

- the provision of more detailed information on ASN and NPAF - Annexes A and B provide data which we could not incorporate in the budget document

- work with local authorities to focus more on agreed outcomes - Annex C outlines this ongoing process

- Efficient Government where the Committee recommended that “the Executive clarify its position with respect to efficiency savings in education budgets and the Minister’s advice on education exemptions from the Efficient Government plan”. Last year I said that the Executive exempted education from efficiency gains specifically because we seek to grow teacher numbers. The Efficient Government Plan states that “pay provision for education, police and fire was excluded from Efficiency Gains”. I trust that it is clear that pay provision, which is a substantial element of education expenditure was excluded from efficiency savings,

- The Audit Scotland study of McCrone spending which has of course been published.
I do of course welcome the Committee’s vigorous scrutiny of the Draft Budget and recognise the importance of access to detailed information. I remain committed to openness and accountability and will strive to respond fully to any specific issues prioritised by the Committee. Can I therefore suggest that we invite the Clerk to the Committee and Joe Brown, the Education Department’s Business Manager to work together to prepare for a constructive dialogue.

PETER PEACOCK
TRACKING OF ADDITIONAL SUPPORT NEEDS EXPENDITURE ACROSS DEPARTMENTS

In reviewing the 2006-07 Draft Budget, the Committee reiterated a wish to track overall expenditure on additional support needs across portfolios. I agreed to provide the Committee with more detailed information. However, it has not been possible to accommodate that information within the agreed structure of the Draft Budget document.

As such, the following table sets out funding which will provide directly for children with additional support needs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£m</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASL Act</td>
<td>To support the education of pupils with additional support needs.</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>To support the inclusion of pupils in the widest sense – covers all pupils with additional support needs.</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Strategies</td>
<td>To improve physical accessibility and curricular accessibility for disabled pupils.</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Training</td>
<td>For staff development for all staff (teachers, auxiliaries, and psychologists) working with pupils with additional support needs. This provision can also be used by multi-disciplinary training involving eg health service therapists</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline/behaviour, alternatives to exclusion</td>
<td>Funding made available through the Discipline Task Group recommendations, Better Behaviour – Better Learning, and, to support initiatives relating to alternatives to exclusion.</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings of the Beattie Committee Report *Implementing Inclusiveness: Realising Potential* into improving post-school transitions were the catalyst for additional funding from the Executive in April 2001. This funding was used to develop an inclusiveness and key worker service for young people with additional support needs which is now delivered as part of Careers Scotland's suite of services; to improve access to and inclusiveness within the Further Education sector for young people with additional support needs; and to pilot the development of post-school psychological services (12 local authority Pathfinders) building on the current local authority educational psychological services. Additional developments aimed at further improving support for young people with additional support needs are currently under consideration in the NEET (Not in Education, Employment or Training) Strategy to be published shortly.

In addition, there is also funding available which will impact on the education of children with additional support needs.

The following table shows some examples of funding which supports all children, including those with additional support needs.

...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Buildings Improvement Fund</td>
<td>For capital work on school buildings. Ministers have approved revenue support for School PPP projects worth an indicative capital amount of nearly £2 billion.</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>101.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Children’s Services Fund</td>
<td>To support better integration of services for children and young people, in particular for those with additional support needs.</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and Communications Technology</td>
<td>Staff development, support for a range of online communities, and provision of online educational resources. Digital content conforms to accepted accessibility standards. (Spend via SE and LTS)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Infrastructure NGFL / GLOW</td>
<td>Used by education authorities to support ICT infrastructure in schools. Can be used for a variety of ICT equipment and services. (Spend via LA’s)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified Voluntary Sector Fund</td>
<td>Direct grant funding for national voluntary organisations working with children’ young people and families.</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sure Start Scotland</td>
<td>Sure Start Scotland provides support for vulnerable families with very young children (0-3 years), which can include children with disabilities or special needs</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>271.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>268.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NATIONAL PRIORITIES ACTION FUND - SPENDING BELOW LEVEL 3

The Committee wanted to assess how the Executive is funding activities to drive its changes or emphases in its education policies and asked for explanation of the content of the National Priorities Action Fund below Level 3 which would be valuable to improve the Committee’s scrutiny of the Executive’s future policy directions.

I agreed to provide additional detail on the content of the NPAF below level 3. It should be noted that authorities have flexibility in how they deploy these resources but the notional breakdowns for 2006-07 and 2007-08 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>£m</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration in School Education</strong></td>
<td>25.816</td>
<td>25.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusion</strong></td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support for Teachers</strong></td>
<td>9.600</td>
<td>9.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out of School Hours Learning/ Study Support</strong></td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>12.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASL Support</strong></td>
<td>12.500</td>
<td>12.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASL INSET</strong></td>
<td>7.186</td>
<td>7.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPD</strong></td>
<td>13.500</td>
<td>13.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternatives to Exclusion</strong></td>
<td>11.000</td>
<td>11.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support for Parents</strong></td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline - (DTG recommendations)</strong></td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staged Intervention</strong></td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Staff</strong></td>
<td>10.800</td>
<td>16.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICT Infrastructure – Glow (SSDN)</strong></td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>20.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nutrition</strong></td>
<td>26.762</td>
<td>26.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Un-attributed ***</td>
<td>2.432</td>
<td>6.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (as per budget document)</strong></td>
<td>195.076</td>
<td>204.776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planned additions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>£m</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53,000 teachers commitment</td>
<td>18.000</td>
<td>44.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated 53,000 teachers commitment</td>
<td>12.070</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff – additional element</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum for Excellence</td>
<td>2.798</td>
<td>tbc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Involvement</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>tbc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Sizing (McCrone)</td>
<td>7.471</td>
<td>tbc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for primary teacher PE training</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total additions</strong></td>
<td>41.912</td>
<td>44.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NPAF (including additions)</strong></td>
<td>236.988</td>
<td>249.276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 2006-07, this element has been consolidated with £12.070m and provided to authorities as ‘Accelerated 53,000 teachers commitment’ allowing them to increase the number of teachers they employ prior to the 2007 deadline for the 53,000 fte teacher commitment. I have yet to decide how to deploy the £6.3m element in 2007-08.
OUTCOME AGREEMENTS:

Teachers

As a follow-up to the Statement of Priorities set out in the portfolio chapter, the Committee sought feedback on the results of the outcome agreements during the budget process and what performance information on the total £4 billion expenditure should be publicly available.

The main focus on outcome agreements in education this year has been in relation to teacher numbers within local authority schools.

As the Committee will be aware, funding was secured in the last SR for the additional teachers required, over and above the numbers employed by education authorities at the time of SR2002. The total additional sums involved are £18m in 2006-07 and £44m in 2007-08. This is alongside the significant increases of probationers coming onto the Induction Scheme (some of whom will be fully funded by the Executive, as in previous years), will allow authorities to reduce class contact time and:

- reduce classes in P1 and S1/S2;
- provide 400 PE specialists and 600 visiting specialists in the expressive arts and learning support working across the Primary/Secondary boundary;

which, taken together, will meet the commitment that there should be 53,000 fte teachers by 2007.

The release of funding for 2007/08 would only follow after each local authority confirmed that they were committed to the objective of increasing teacher numbers, as set out in the Partnership Agreement. Additionally, authorities need to show that they are working towards 2007 teacher employment being in line with agreed expectations.

National Priorities Action Fund – NPAF

The Committee may wish to know that more generally, we will reflect on the learning from the outcome agreements on teachers as we develop an outcome agreement approach for the NPAF. This will allow us to:

- deliver a clear understanding throughout the system of the purposes of the National Priorities in Education and their fit with policy initiatives;
- develop dynamic short-term national objectives for improvement linked to robust outcomes;
- support a more intelligent approach to delivery and measurement of school improvement based on local priorities;
- mainstream support and encourage more joint-working and sharing of effective practice between local authorities.