



Department  
for Education

**Consultation Response Form**

**Consultation closing date: 3 February 2014**  
**Your comments must reach us by that date**

# **National curriculum reform (England): KS4**

## **English and mathematics**

**If you would prefer to respond online to this consultation please use the following link: <https://www.education.gov.uk/consultations>**

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes, primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Data Protection Act 1998.

If you want all, or any part, of your response to be treated as confidential, please explain why you consider it to be confidential.

If a request for disclosure of the information you have provided is received, your explanation about why you consider it to be confidential will be taken into account, but no assurance can be given that confidentiality can be maintained. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The Department will process your personal data (name and address and any other identifying material) in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, and in the majority of circumstances, this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

<b>Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential.</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for confidentiality:	

Name: Professor Alice Rogers	
Please tick if you are responding on behalf of your organisation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Name of Organisation (if applicable): London Mathematical Society	
Address: 57-58 Russell Square London WC1B 4HS	

If your enquiry is related to the DfE e-consultation website or the consultation process in general, you can contact the Ministerial and Public Communications Division by e-mail: [consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:consultation.unit@education.gsi.gov.uk) or by telephone: 0370 000 2288 or via the Department's ['Contact Us'](#) page.

Please mark the box that best describes you as a respondent.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Primary school	<input type="checkbox"/>	Secondary school	<input type="checkbox"/>	Special school
<input type="checkbox"/>	Organisation representing school teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subject association	<input type="checkbox"/>	Parent
<input type="checkbox"/>	Young person	<input type="checkbox"/>	Higher education	<input type="checkbox"/>	Further education
<input type="checkbox"/>	Academy/Free school	<input type="checkbox"/>	Employer business sector	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local authority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other

Please Specify:  
Learned Society.

*1 Do you have any comments on the content set out in the draft programmes of study for English?*

Comments:

*2 Do you think the draft programme of study for English provides for appropriate progression from key stage 3?*

Comments:

*3 Do you have any comments on the content set out in the draft programmes of study for mathematics?*

Comments:

On the whole, we welcome the proposed key stage 4 programme of study. There are details with which one could quibble, but it is generally better formulated and more focused than the published programmes for earlier key stages - and the success of the key stage 4 programme may depend on finding a way to moderate some of the premature demands which were included in earlier key stages.

We particularly welcome the clear indication that the key stage 4 programme and the GCSE specification incorporate the programmes for both key stage 3 and key stage 4: we hope that schools will be actively encouraged to aim for mastery of the key stage 3 material (even if this spills over into key stage 4) before pupils are pushed on to the more formal aspects listed in the key stage 4 programme. (This expectation may need to be stated more clearly: we anticipate that you will receive some negative responses to the proposed key stage 4 programme because the key stage 3 content has here been suppressed - even though it mostly appears in the GCSE specification.)

This positive expectation is clearly hinted at in the "Introduction" to the key stage 4 programme. However, it could all too easily be swamped by the insistence in the same "Introduction" that all the material listed "in standard type [...] should be taught to all pupils" - a goal which seems likely to encourage teachers to cover inappropriate material prematurely and superficially. We suggest that Ofsted will need to actively encourage schools to exercise judgement in interpreting the final sentence in the "Introduction" that makes this expectation dependent on "Whenever it is appropriate, given pupils' security of understanding and readiness to progress".

*4 Do you think the draft programme of study for mathematics provides for appropriate progression from key stage 3?*

Yes

No

Not Sure

Comments:

We would like to have been able to answer "Yes". But we remain concerned.

The revised key stage 4 programme makes potentially greater demands - on teachers, on pupils, on the assessment system, on publishers, etc. But the initial signs indicate that the strengths of this programme are generally not understood by mathematics teachers and by the Awarding organisations - so that many of the proposed changes are being interpreted unimaginatively, and are seen as retrograde. If the new programme is to have a chance of leading to improved outcomes, then there is a profound need for a dissemination programme to make sure that the intended spirit is understood and implemented, and that suitable materials (e.g. textbooks) are forthcoming to support its intended goals.

If progression from primary school to key stage 3 is to be effective, then some of the excessively ambitious demands in the key stage 1 and key stage 2 programmes will need to be given (sooner rather than later) some "lighter official interpretation" - so that pupils enter key stage 3 with both confidence and competence. And progression through key stage 3, and from key stage 3 to key stage 4 will only prove effective if significant investment is made in supporting key stage 3 teachers. We know, from the last two Ofsted triennial reports in 2008 and 2012, that mathematics teaching is weakest at key stage 3, yet the published programmes at secondary level currently lack any supporting "Notes and guidance".

*5. Do any of the proposals have potential to have a disproportionate impact, positive or negative, on specific pupil groups, in particular the 'protected characteristic' groups? (the relevant protected characteristics are disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation); if they have potential for an adverse impact, how can this be reduced?*

## General comments on Q5

The on-line response form does not allow responses to Q5 other than for specified pupil groups (disability, gender, etc.), so we include our concerns for a rather different group within our response to Q4. Circumstances have combined to threaten the interests of a highly significant group of pupils - namely those who may continue their studies to A level mathematics. The proposed KS4 programme of study includes a significant amount of "harder" material that is either underlined or in bold type. DfE intentions that this additional material implied that GCSE Higher tier would require more assessment time than for Foundation tier have been overruled by Ofqual's decision that both tiers should involve the same amount of assessment time (4.5 hours). This seems likely to make it difficult to give due weight to the material that is needed for progression to A level mathematics. This is unfortunate.

A compromise might be for the Department to find ways of "actively encouraging" the development of a Level 2 "Extension paper" - as intimated in the original consultation: that is, a Year 11 assessment which is not a GCSE, which avoids additional content, but which instead assesses key stage 4 curriculum material in greater depth."

5 a) Disability- If they have potential for adverse impact how can this be reduced?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Positive impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not sure
--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	----------

Comments:

See Q5 above.

5 b) Gender reassignment- If they have potential for adverse impact how can this be reduced?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Positive impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not sure
--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	----------

Comments:

5 c) Pregnancy and maternity- If they have potential for adverse impact how can this be reduced?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Positive impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Negative impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not sure
--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	----------

Comments:

5 d) Race- If they have potential for adverse impact how can this be reduced?



<input type="checkbox"/> Positive impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Negative impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
--	--	-----------------------------------

Comments:

5 e) Religion or belief- If they have potential for adverse impact how can this be reduced?

<input type="checkbox"/> Positive impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Negative impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
--	--	-----------------------------------

Comments:

5 f) Sex and sexual orientation- If they have potential for adverse impact how can this be reduced?

<input type="checkbox"/> Positive impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Negative impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Not sure
--	--	-----------------------------------

Comments:

Thank you for taking the time to let us have your views. We do not intend to acknowledge individual responses unless you place an 'X' in the box below.

<b>Please acknowledge this reply.</b>	✓
E-mail address for acknowledgement: <a href="mailto:education@lms.ac.uk">education@lms.ac.uk</a>	

Here at the Department for Education we carry out our research on many different topics and consultations. As your views are valuable to us, please confirm below if you would be willing to be contacted again from time to time either for research or to send through consultation documents?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
---	-----------------------------

All DfE public consultations are required to meet the Cabinet Office [Principles on Consultation](#)

The key Consultation Principles are:

- departments will follow a range of timescales rather than defaulting to a 12-week period, particularly where extensive engagement has occurred before
- departments will need to give more thought to how they engage with and consult with those who are affected

- consultation should be 'digital by default', but other forms should be used where these are needed to reach the groups affected by a policy; and
- the principles of the Compact between government and the voluntary and community sector will continue to be respected.

Responses should be completed on-line or emailed to the relevant consultation email box. However, if you have any comments on how DfE consultations are conducted, please contact Carole Edge, DfE Consultation Coordinator, tel: 0370 000 2288 / email: [carole.edge@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:carole.edge@education.gsi.gov.uk)

**Thank you for taking time to respond to this consultation.**

Completed responses should be sent to the address shown below by 3 February 2014

Send by post to: Ministerial and Public Communication Division, Level 2, Department for Education, Mowden Hall, Staindrop Road, DARLINGTON DL3 9BG

Send by e-mail to: [KS4EnglishmathsPoS.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:KS4EnglishmathsPoS.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk)