

Addendum: Examples of issues raised during two preliminary REC consultation meetings (31.10.12 & 7.11.12)

1. Reference to core skills and understanding (eg Recommendation 2) should also include reference to skills.
2. An overarching statement of the purpose and aims of RE (see Recommendation 1) may be neither possible nor desirable. It may be best for the review to focus on aims and purposes for RE in non-denominational schools as a resource that might be accessed/useful for faith-based schools if they chose to draw upon it.
3. The term 'religion and belief', used in many recent RE documents, is more inclusive than reference to 'religion' alone. The subject area is Religion and Belief, RE being the mechanism through which these are studied.
4. Principle 3 assumes that the current system of local determination of RE will continue. Some believe that this is detrimental to RE and standards achieved by pupils.
5. More evidence needs to be included of current views and perceptions held within the faith-based sector of schooling
6. Too much emphasis has been placed on the 2004 *Non-Statutory Framework* for RE at the expense of later initiatives and documentation (eg relating to the new primary curriculum and secondary curriculum) which marked further development.
7. The report sometimes implies confusion over aims whereas the issue is really diversity.
8. Work on Recommendation 1 needs to identify the different groups with whom we are communicating (eg governors, teachers, parents, faith groups, business, the public). It might be useful to think about what makes a child religiously literate and its value for life and employment.
9. Recommendation 9 relates to what has been central in the work of the RE Council. But we also have to recognise that we are living in a changed environment and there are other routes which might become more urgent and effective.
10. The idea of 'entitlement' to RE is missing (eg in Principle 10).
11. In Principle 3, how does 'authoritative' sit with recognition of diversity?
12. Is RE a discipline? Engaging with the nature of the subject is what RE is about.
13. There does need to be some kind of document that acts as a central reference point, but the nature of this document will need careful consideration.
14. What about the significance of RE's contribution to pupils' spiritual, moral, social and cultural development (particularly as this remains a focus of Ofsted inspections)? Should there have been an additional recommendation linked to this?
15. In phase 2, the review needs to have one expert/writing group rather than separate task forces working in discrete ways to produce something coherent.
16. Recommendation 7 could be widened further to include actual and potential providers. The RE community could also forge links with those not currently offering qualifications – like universities – and also become involved in vocational qualifications.
17. The whole area of legislation relating to RE is missing from the report; should it be?