



**COMHAIRLE NAN EILEAN
SIAR**

POLICY DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY AND TIMELINE

FEEDBACK ON CONSULTATION

January 2004

POLICY DEVELOPMENT : CURRICULUM STRATEGY AND TIMELINE

The document was welcomed and positive comments were made about it. Specific issues were raised as indicated.

Consultation Response	Comment
Change in summary and action record, to be sent in draft to HT for signature and amendment. One signed copy returned. This would allow input from HT.	This was the procedure initially, and was considered to be cumbersome. The current proposal allows the Head teacher to suggest amendments, which can be done electronically. Acceptance of the document, either first copy or an amended one, constitutes agreement to content.
Standard policy folder and policy index to be compiled.	This accords with the plans of the policy development working group and is agreed. Link Officers could conduct checks as part of QA arrangements.
Policy development could be delegated to sub-groups of HTs. Co-ordination with authorities of a similar profile suggested, through Heads Together or other network.	Although policy development has not been delegated wholly to HTs and other senior school staff, participation by school staff in policy development sub-groups is catered for in the document. As part of forward planning, school staff could be asked to indicate expertise/interest in terms of the future programme of policy development. This idea is accepted and could be pursued.
Schools having the option of accepting a CNES sponsored policy or replacing a standard policy with its own.	School policy would need to incorporate key requirements of Education Department Policy.
Lead Officers should be experts in the curricular field.	This is accepted, but may not always be feasible. Working groups would always include appropriate expertise.
Concern over the large number of areas being developed over the one session.	It is accepted that the burden is heavy, but the department is aiming to address as many development needs as possible.
The timeline may be overly ambitious. Better to focus on fewer areas per session, to ensure each is firmly embedded before moving on to the next. A particular problem for primary schools in implementing a series of policies per session.	Although it is accepted that monitoring, implementation and evaluation periods are somewhat tight, it is nevertheless imperative that the authority and schools implement a comprehensive policy framework. Review of the timeline has however, decided on an overarching policy on Learning and teaching instead of specific subject statements. This is in recognition of the detailed subject guidance available nationally.
School staff on working groups – would this be during school day or after hours?	Either option may be feasible, having taken all factors into consideration.
Commissioning of practitioners to draft initial documents: finding cover more of a problem than cost. Potential clash with commitment of school staff to development plan projects in their own school.	The problem of finding supply cover continues to cause difficulties. All the factors mentioned will need to be considered, and care taken in planning and organisation of groups to take these factors into consideration.
As much advance warning as possible would be essential to allow schools to plan incorporation in development plans.	Agreed. The timeline will be available to head teachers.

