Dear Meilyr,

Thank you for attending Committee last week, along with your colleague Claire Morgan, to give evidence on behalf of Estyn on the general principles of the Curriculum and Assessment (Wales) Bill.

During the session there were some questions we were unable to cover. I attach these in the annex to this letter and would be grateful to receive a written response by 8 October 2020, to inform our scrutiny of the Minister later that month.

Yours sincerely,

Lynne Neagle MS
Chair

Croesewir gohebiaeth yn Gymraeg neu Saesneg | We welcome correspondence in Welsh or English.
ANNEX

CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT BILL: WELSH LANGUAGE

When asked during the Committee meeting on 17 September about the Bill’s provisions as they relate to immersion in Welsh, you stated:

“I think that most people agree that we do need the ability to have full immersion in the Welsh language, but we’ve said in our response to the consultation that it’s worth reconsidering whether there’s a better way of achieving that in legislation than the proposed opt-out. I mean, I’m not an expert in drafting legislation, but you could imagine that Welsh and English could be mandatory after the age of seven, and it could be for the school or the local authority then to choose which of the two languages was used before then.”

Are you able to share any further detail on your suggestion? For example, can you confirm whether you suggest that English not be a mandatory element before age 7 and that the school or the local authority be able to choose whether to teach it or not before this age? Would you suggest that Welsh be a mandatory element from age 3? Could there be any unintended consequences arising from this alternative solution?

CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT BILL: FUNDING

When asked during the Committee meeting on 17 September about the information provided by Estyn to inform the Bill’s Regulatory Impact Assessment, you stated:

“…I have to admit that these calculations, estimates, are incredibly difficult to undertake. It’s partly because it’s very difficult to distinguish between an activity that’s directly related to the curriculum, or to a particular set of legislation around the curriculum, and more general ones. […]

It’s also difficult to distinguish between what we are doing now, compared to what we would have done anyway, because, clearly, we always have done work on things related to curriculum and subjects and so forth. So, we found it difficult even to do it in retrospect; calculating it in future is really, really difficult. For example, I don’t know what my budget is for next April, and I don’t know what the remit letter is for next April. So, it’s quite difficult to calculate what proportion of that is going to go towards work related to the curriculum.”

Are you able to reassure the Committee that, in light of the above statement, you are confident that the Bill’s provisions are affordable from Estyn’s perspective?