

House of Commons
All Party Parliamentary Group on Archives and History

History for all?

Report, together with oral evidence

The All Party Parliamentary Group on Archives and History

The purpose of the group is to consider and promote public policy issues and internal matters related to the archives and records sector and the study of history and associated business.

Officers

Dr Hywel Francis MP–Chair
Chris Skidmore MP – Vice Chair
Lord Clark of Windermere – Vice Chair
Lord Boswell of Aynho – Vice Chair
Tristram Hunt MP– Vice Chair
Paul Murphy MP– Vice Chair
Lord Bew – Secretary

Qualifying Members

Baroness Falkner of Margravine
Baroness Henig
Baroness Young of Hornsey
Chris Skidmore MP
Conor Burns MP
Damian Collins MP
Dr Hywel Francis MP
Lord Bew
Lord Boswell of Aynho
Lord Brooke of Sutton Mandeville
Lord Cope of Berkeley
Lord Howarth of Newport
Lord Luke
Lord Morgan
Lord Smith of Clifton
Lord Smith of Finsbury
Lord Trimble
Paul Murphy MP
Sharon Hodgson MP
Tristram Hunt MP

The group would also like to thank Andrew Goodfellow and Luke Hall for their assistance with research and preparation of material.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

p4 – Introduction and Summary

p7-- Oral Evidence, 22nd May 2012 First Session

p32 -- Oral Evidence 22nd May 2012 Second Session

p52 -- Oral Evidence 22nd May 2012 Third Session

p64 –Oral Evidence 21st June 2012 Fourth Session

INTRODUCTION

The report's conclusions are based on the results of four separate evidence sessions, taken by the All Party Parliamentary Group on History and Archives. A wide range of history teachers and representatives from the historical community were consulted, as well as representatives from various exam boards.

The terms of reference for the inquiry were to examine the current state of History provision in schools, and to ask the question of whether History should be made compulsory for all pupils, up to the age of 16.

SUMMARY

1. In general, *History for All?* finds that there is a great deal to be positive about in the way History is currently taught in schools. There was unanimous agreement that universities are seeing highly enthusiastic students arriving, who are passionate about their subject. We also found that in the schools specifically investigated, Pimlico Academy and Dartford Grammar School, that there is a great deal of innovative History teaching taking place.
2. However, we are concerned about the wide educational divide in this country when it comes to studying History, which is that in affluent areas History is studied well and widely, whereas in many more deprived areas it has been neglected and ignored. It is important that the Department for Education does not allow perverse incentives to develop, which might suppress the take-up of History in poorer areas.
3. The report highlights concerns in the historical community at schools reducing the history offer at Key Stage 3 down to two years. There are also widespread concerns with the curriculum- not only its content but also over the pace at which history is taught. The amount of time given to history in the curriculum is also a worry, with the average thirteen year old only spending one hour a week on the subject. It is very difficult to generate understanding and a sense of chronology in such abbreviated time periods.
4. The Historical Association expressed concerns over how a 'pluralist' history can be taught, now that it is possible for over 50% of schools – as academies – to opt-out of the National Curriculum.

5. With the influence of the National Curriculum waning, assessment is now becoming the main driver of improving standards. We believe that every pupil should have the opportunity to study History, should they choose to, no school should discourage this simply because of its potential effect on league tables. Schools should not use the English Baccalaureate as an excuse to divert pupils away from entering GCSE History.
6. There is also an issue in some schools of head teachers trimming the study of History to the absolute minimum, through poor understanding of how it differs from a core subject like Mathematics, in terms of National Curriculum levels. This can lead to an excessive focus on content, inhibiting understanding and maturity of thought.
7. We recommend investigating the development of a British history qualification at 16 that is based on a broad chronological framework across all periods, which could encompass local, national and international perspectives on British history. There is also a need to develop new research into the teaching of local history, as a way of approaching new interpretations of British and international history.
8. This qualification should be taught over Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4 if possible, so that pupils are given a greater time span in which to develop understanding of chronology, narrative, critical thinking and analysis. It was also mentioned that teaching history as a five year course would allow for a much more coherent course structure. The qualification should also mark the return of longer, essay-based answers, allowing for the development of reasoned arguments.
9. In terms of whether or not History should be taught chronologically, there was some debate. Concerns were raised about the present system; that pupils could demonstrate strong knowledge of some area in great depth, but lacked a consistent knowledge of the broad chronology of narrative history. Again, this seems to be a consequence of the limited hours available for studying the subject.
10. There is also real concern within schools and universities about repetition of topics; that many students end up studying the same topic at Key Stage 3, Key Stage 4 and at A-level. This is usually stereotyped as 'Hitler and the Henrys'. We advise that firebreaks are built into the syllabus to ensure a broad range of topics.
11. History to 16 for all seems an unlikely prospect at present, unless more resources are diverted into the training of specialist history teachers. However, the offer could gradually be introduced by schools who are willing to do so- the government should allow all schools the freedom to replace citizenship lessons with History.

12. On the question of supply and training of teachers, The Historical Association noted that good Continuing Professional Development was vital, particularly for primary school teachers. *“The majority of young people get most of their History in primary schools, and the majority of teachers for very good reasons, are not specialist historians, they have to teach 41 subjects, and they get very little training in History”*. We acknowledge that many pupils will not opt to take History beyond the point at which it is compulsory; it is therefore vital to ensure that what they do experience is taught with some level of expertise.
13. There are also concerns about the move towards Schools Direct training, where potential history teachers are being removed from a university training structure. This means that they often lack up to date understanding of historical interpretation and teaching methods. If we are to improve the overall standard of history teaching in schools, it must continue to evolve alongside modern historical scholarship.
14. The APPG also recommends a connected academic reform, that the writing of school textbooks should be included in University REF submissions. At present, examiners are writing school history textbooks with little appreciation of current scholarship. This means that there is also currently no incentive for university academics to engage with school education.

recent events have shaped the world. That is the fairly classic set of capitulations of the Schools History Project, and that should give you a sense of where we are coming from.

Sean Lang: I am Sean Lang, Senior Lecturer in History at Anglia Ruskin University, and I am here representing the Better History Forum. This is a sort of research and development group based in Ruskin involving teachers and the University, and I think it is fair to say that we are much more critical of the current setup and of the current History arrangements at GCSE and at A-level, and we have put ideas together into the National Curriculum review, and current we are in the early stages of preparing quite a radical proposal, for a very different type of approach to History at GCSE and we had a big conference in January with another group and met again in June where we began to put ideas out among teachers. Essentially, I think it is fair to say that we challenge the consensus that has surrounded History that has surrounded teaching for the last 40 years or so, dating back to the early seventies, and the early date of the then schools council project, in terms of content, in terms of assessment, both the objectives and the form of assessment. So we are really developing I think a radically different method and which if comes to pass would provide a very different sort of experience. I think very briefly, to bounce off, we would much rather see a genuine baccalaureate approach at sixteen, the English baccalaureate is not a bad thing, but it not a baccalaureate, so we will be looking at a much more radical redrafting and rethinking of the curriculum.

Rebecca Sullivan: Rebecca Sullivan, I am the CEO of the Historical Association, the Historical Association represents about five and a half thousand to six thousand individuals, and schools and the vast majority of our members are secondary schools, our key concerns are History five to sixteen, we would like to see History to sixteen, but with the caveat that there must be a meaningful qualification for all young people. We are also very concerned about the issue of coherence across the curriculum, particularly in the primary years and from primary into secondary education, we don't think that the current Key Stage 3 curriculum is a problem, but we would like to see that structure extended, and one of the problems in the lack of progression from Key Stage 3 into Key Stage 4. I think that probably, with Sean we would not be against a proper baccalaureate, because the unintended consequences of the Ebac is something I will bring up later, and I think Simon will refer to later, it can skew the national picture Chris, and I think this fits in very well with the research that you have done in the growing socio-economic divide, in which young people have access to History, and I think that the HA would say that that is key and important issue in the understanding of our History.

Andrew Smith: I am Andrew Smith, I am the honorary secretary of the Royal Historical, but Colin do you want to?

Colin Jones: Yes if I kick off about the Royal Historical Society, we are the oldest and largest learned society for the promotion and defence of History in Britain. I say in Britain, we have members from Great Britain and many overseas members as well, and as a

learned society our focus is on research, we hold seminars, conferences, publish scholarly publications, support early day scholars, writers, scholarships, and engage with and involve the public. The focus of our membership is defiantly within higher education, I think there is about two thousand practicing research historians working within the higher education section and the majority of them are fellows or members of our society. Our membership is three thousand and upwards, university teachers past and present, but also good representations from museums, archives, heritage sector, early career scholars, independent scholars, and members of these houses as well. But I think that our approach to this is always where we are as a group, which is very much within higher education. We have a sense that we have a representative function for the health of the discipline more generally, but obviously knowledge of, and involvement in affairs to do with education, pre-higher education, is sort of a receding telescope in some ways. We are very interested and very concerned with A-level, because obviously A-level students will be coming onto higher education. That is something that we have always kept an eye on. We were quite involved in the National Curriculum debate two decades ago for example. We are interested in History in schools as well, because clearly kids coming through that system go into A-level, and some of them come onto us, but we do not claim to have detailed knowledge of the lower groups and we tend to work well with and co-operatively with the Historical Association, the big representative of schools and school teachers, and take a very interested engagement in the sort of debates over schooling, which other

groups such as Sean and others have mentioned. The health of the discipline most generally we agree with what Jamie was saying, diversity is the key where the larger range, the bigger, broader theme, but also the in-depth study, defiantly pre-modern as well as late modern, defiantly global, by which we mean not just European and American but genuinely global, in its own terms preferably, rather than a sort of access of British History, different types of History, intellectual history, political or social, we like the fact that these things are taught in schools. One of the things that I do for example is History of Medicine, and there is a very nice A-level for example in the History of Medicine, and that is something that we regard as important. We like the mixed forms of assessment, including coursework; we stress probably more than other groups the importance of the essay as a crucial form of development. If we have an overview position as regards to the debates that are going on this afternoon and in other places, we do not want to particularly get involved in the detail, because we do not think that we are qualified to, but we do have a sense that there are three functions that I have outlined in the, Peter Mandler and myself and Adam have outlined in the paper that has gone round, which we regard as very important, we think that any reform of the school system or curriculum should not lose form place or view. The citizenship function generally, the humanities function and the skills and analytical function as well, I can and I am sure that we will talk about that later.

Q2 Chair: Thank you very much. I should say welcome to Tristram Hunt, the co-Vice Chairman of the All Party

Group, thank you for coming along. I have set questions, going from looking at the current situation to then moving onto looking at exams, assessment, onto the timetable, international evidence, and then ending with the idea of compulsory History to sixteen, and then what that might involve. Rather than ask each question specifically, what I would like to do is read out all of the current questions on the current situation, and if we wanted to have a bit of a discussion on that issue and then move into the curriculum afterwards and exams assessment, so we can get through everything in time. Tristram if there is anything that you want to ask just chip in and everyone feel free if there is an issue, but if we can avoid cutting across each other too much and get into an argument that would be great. This is all being recorded, so I will produce a transcript of the meeting, that I will send you. What do you think the current state of History of schools is and what concerns if any do you have? Why is History declined in certain schools? And what evidence do you have of the situation? Is the current situation acceptable? And do you believe that it needs to be changed? We may bring in the Ebac here, and at the same time the quality of History of students seems to have risen overall, how do we balance the concept of History for all, with the necessity for universities to have the best trained pupils? There may be additional questions that you think I should have asked there, but are there any comments that you would like to make that the report should reflect, about History teaching, History in schools as it stands? We have got the simple numbers, but it obviously does not reflect everything that takes place.

Simon Harrison: We have the latest Historical Association survey, which I think will be very informative, we are just working our way through the numbers at the moment, so it's probably fair to say that it is not quite ready to go public yet, but that is certainly something that we could introduce as well, which hopefully you will find quite useful. There are some quite telling bits of data in it, particularly about the Ebac, I don't know if that's something that you want to cover now or something you want to come back to in the structure of the questioning.

Chair: We could have it now, yes.

Simon Harrison: One of the things I think the Historical Association is particularly concerned about is the unintended consequences of some of the changes that are going on at the moment, which we fully accept are very well meaning, and in many cases are fully intended to improve the status of History within the curriculum, may not be having that affect. If I give you one example from the survey data that we are looking at the moment; It seems to be telling us that probably about 50% of schools are either experiencing no change as a result of the Ebac, or indeed in the small number of cases that are actually experiencing a negative change in terms of the number of pupils that are taking up History. The obvious question that lies behind that is one that you raise yourself Chris in your research, which is about the where, and that is the key thing that concerns us in particular, is the geographical and socio-economic divide in terms of what is happening with History. The simple fact appears to be that there are many schools that are not being influenced by the English

baccalaureate in the way that it was intended. I think that in some cases there is a negative consequence in that many schools are moving towards a two year Key Stage 3 structure, and whilst that may be beneficial to those that are studying it to GCSE in terms of an extra year for enrichment or further study. Of course the simple fact of the matter is that for the majority of pupils, their History ends at the end of Year 8.

Jamie Byrom: How old are they at the end of Year 8?

Simon Harrison: Thirteen years old.

Q 3 Chair: This is something that several History teachers have brought up with me, I was wondering if everyone could develop on this point as a specific concern, because I don't think that it is a problem with it being raised, and this leads to points on the curriculum which we can move into.

Simon Harrison: If I could develop perhaps one point related to that, which is not Ebac, but I think is very closely related to that. The situation with Ebac is that there is a finite supply of History teachers at the moment, and the supply coming into the system is gradually being eroded as well, which means that one effect is if you are deploying your best teachers as you would at Key Stage 4 in terms of GCSE, it means that there is an increase in non specialist teaching, which is backed up again by the HA survey evidence at Key Stage 3. So not only are you having pupils that are having less History, they are having less History with actual specialist History teachers in front of them. Also, in terms of the emphasis in schools the question arises 'why aren't more schools jumping

to the tune of the Ebac?' One of the reasons is that it is not an accountability measure, Ofsted coming into schools are not necessarily looking at Ebac, what they are looking at is the expected progress measure from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4 in English and Maths, and that takes precedence in most schools at the moment, it is the key measure that appears to be driving Ofsted inspections and therefore not surprisingly Heads and Deputy Heads such as myself are really driven by that. And of course what that means is therefore you are looking at extending the time at Key Stage 4 in order to make sure that you can reach that progress measure, because the progress measure is not at the end of the Key Stage 3, it is at the end of Key Stage 4, so that is the little number that goes into the system that defines how that figure is judged, and therefore what you are inevitably going to do is push all of your resources into making sure that that figure is the one that's right because that is the key accountability measure for Ofsted. And of course that does not feature History, so you have a situation at the moment where you have a lever there that could make a big difference to History, but because it is not an accountability measure it is very easily ignored by schools in favour of other measures that clearly they are being held to account for.

Q4 Chair: So just to clarify, in practice, what is happening on the ground is that where as Key Stage 3 students are continuing into Year 9, all History is ending in some schools in Year 8?

Simon Harrison: Yes, increasingly so, and if anything I think what we are feeling is that Ebac is starting to drive

that approach more, which is not intended I know.

Q5 Chair: You mean under the current framework of the Key Stage 3 National Curriculum you are still allowed to remove History in Year 9?

Mel Jones: That is very much the case, and not only that but they also do integrated humanities in Key Stage 3, which is another matter altogether.

Sean Lang: Anecdotally, but I think highly individually, I have worked recently in a school where they were giving pupils a choice between continuing their History work at end of Year 7, a choice between History and Geography, and trying to make sure that in that Year 7, they notionally claimed that it was fulfilling the National Curriculum orders, so the squeeze is going back even further. That has now I am pleased to say been addressed though an Ofsted special visit, but schools are unclear about what they can and should do with these competing pressures, and History, through the accountability measures that you talked about finds itself often compromised.

Colin Jones: This is why, as we put in our update, there are fundamental questions which underline everything that we talk about here and everything that we talk about in all gatherings and all History gatherings and meetings that we ever go to. The first is what is going on in the minds of heads when they decide to take History and squeeze it or marginalise it, and although there may be some particular reasons that we can identify, we don't really know, and I am not aware of any real attempt to find out, and it would be a very difficult thing to

undertake as well. So why do we do this? We see exactly the sort of people who never come to a meeting, people that even when they are History graduates themselves, so there is something going on as it were there, where there is a different outlook between their outlook and our own in this room, we, I would imagine, can all agree on the importance of the subject that we are talking about, but there are people who are in charge of schools out there who don't share that. The second very fundamental issue that follows on from that is the role of government, which is how prescriptive are we prepared to be, if we believe in the subject. To give an analogy, if we are talking about something very different, if we were talking about a concept such as toilets, and you came across a situation where people didn't think they were very important, and wanted to marginalise them, and not study them beyond 13, we would say absolute nonsense, and force you to, because we have no worries about it, we believe in it. And that is why I found the question whether History should be compulsory until 16, although things like international comparisons play their part, there is a fundamental question which is if you believe that a subject matters in the real sense of the word matters, then prescription is not really an issue, because it matters.

Jamie Byrom: It can be very hard to judge at what level it gets to detailed to a deterrent, but one of the reasons, certainly in the situations that I have lived in is head teachers have believed that it is acceptable or okay to squeeze down to two years let's say, is a misunderstanding of the nature of getting better of History, and progression within History. Often because they work so

much with the core subjects, where crudely, and I stand to be corrected, in Mathematics, the movement through the levels of the National Curriculum is tied very closely to the content that is taken on. If you can do a quadrilateral equation, you are broadly speaking at 'this' level. Now in History it is not the case that if you have done the Romans you are at 'this' level, and if you have done the Victorians you are at 'that' level. In head teachers minds when they make the decisions, they tend to be drawn to the content side of things, so surely if you trim a bit off here, trim a bit off there, you will 'cover', a dangerous word, the content in two years, therefore you have 'met' the National Curriculum, but in terms of the maturity of thinking and the development of understanding, knowledge with understanding, then those things are severely curtailed and damaged by that squeeze.

Q5 Chair: Graham, thank you for coming, Graham Stuart is the Chairman of the Education Select Committee. Graham we are just talking about the current situation in History and in particular how History is being squeezed down at Key Stage 3 into the first two years and pupils giving it up at the end of Year 8. Please chip in with any questions that you have. So that brings us onto the wider issue of the curriculum, that you have Key Stage 3 in its current form, yet there are loopholes by which schools are managing to get around teaching it across the entirety of Key Stage 3, then there is a clear problem and issue that needs to change, we are not debating what should be in the curriculum, but if you can simply abandon the curriculum altogether, two thirds of the way through, that is

something that we would have to look closely at changing.

Rebecca Sullivan: Well a problem is that so many schools are becoming academies as well, which is going to exacerbate this issue, because they don't have to follow the National Curriculum, so it leaves you with a question of 'why do we have a National Curriculum?' if we are not going to have any prescription, no need to follow it, no Ofsted checking it, what is the point of a National Curriculum?

Jamie Byrom: Sorry, but as things stand, the statutory requirement is History until the end of Key Stage 3.

Rebecca Sullivan: It is, but some years ago, there was a pilot to loosen up Key Stage 3, so some schools were trialling the two year Key Stage 3, and then some schools started a skills based opening minds type curriculum, or cross curricular and I looked it up and there has been no attempt to enforce the National Curriculum until the end of Key Stage 3.

Simon Harrison: I think actually, the point is that History is in Key Stage 3, rather than through to the end of it, in other words, if you can do it in two years, legally you are allowed to do so.

Rebecca Sullivan: I think it is supposed to be 3 years though; I had a chat with Mike Maddison on the actualities of it.

Simon Harrison: Well then that's something we should find out. Do we have any hard data of the effects on pupils studying History as part of a combined humanities programme?

Jamie Byrom: There was some Ofsted explanations of that in the early stages of doing it, and it has appeared in Ofsted subject specific 3 yearly report, and I think in the last two they have been able to take a take on it, and the view is not healthy at the moment, certainly the very early findings were very critical of some of the practice, where babies went out with bathwater and became very ‘skill-sy’ in the loosest of senses, I think the recent Ofsted would provide a healthy take on that.

Simon Harrison: The Ofsted History for all report in particular is very, very clear on that, and interestingly enough is mirrored in the Geography equivalent as well.

Q6 Chair: I wonder if it would be helpful if I just read out some of the suggested questions that I have in the curriculum and then as a whole you can pick and choose which ones you think are relevant, it is over a huge period, in particular the Historical Associations mention the 5 to 16, conscious that’s a problem and they must have an odd primary school, more than an odd primary school History that that should mean. But we have already discussed the issues. What are the current strengths of the National Curriculum? Should it be changed? If so what changes need to take place? I think that was actually a line taken from the curriculum review. What are the issues of primary curriculum Key Stage 1 and 2? How should the transition between primary and secondary school be managed with History? What framework should be in place to teach British History? And as it currently stands does Key Stage 3 work effectively at doing so? How can an appropriate balance of local and national

History be applied? What is your view of project work within the curriculum? What is your view regarding the traditional argument of knowledge verses skills in History teaching? And if History was made compulsory until 16 how might or should this affect the curriculum, and in what ways could the curriculum be adapted to reflect the change in propulsion?

Simon Harrison: Can I press you on this, because I have been saying because I probably think it is true, that the actual and what is in Key Stage 3 as a History curriculum, is not a bad package in terms of teaching young people about the past, both local, national and international, but the capacity within the timetable makes it very hard to deliver that. Some of Chris and Graham’s colleagues are very worried about the sort of no Churchill, but it doesn’t seem to me that that is the case in terms of Key Stage 3.

Jamie Byrom: Well it depends, it is not beyond criticism, and one of these points does mention British, and this has been against for years now, it is not a British History that they are teaching in school, and there is almost no coverage of major issues from Welsh, Irish or Scottish History. And something like, for example the Act of Union, for obvious reasons nowadays I would have thought an absolutely crucial thing for the population to know about.

Rebecca Sullivan: I don’t think that the content in the Key Stage 3 curriculum, its broad outlines are very good, it is an excellent model, time in school to teach it is a big issue. Especially these History teachers who can translate those broad outlines into good History, and that is something that is non specialist will on

the whole not look at History in the same way, and I think Mel, Simon and Jamie will have a better grip on this working within schools more, about what this actually looks like.

Jamie Byrom: I would like to pick up on this point about time, I see it as not just minutes or hours that are given to History teaching in the week, but here we have the question of Key Stage 3, Key Stage 4 and whether it goes through to 16 or not, because the model that we are working with, where History ends at the end of Key Stage 3, wherever a school chooses to draw that, that is where it may well end for a large number of pupils, that was quite a late flip in the original National Curriculum, the original thinking was that History would be through to 16, and the late flip meant that the content that there would have been able to grow through and meet later on in their school years, had to be shoehorned back into a programme that had been planned already. Hence the overload that people have been trying to sort out since. But it also leads to another of the classic problems which helpfully in the sense of the phrase is powerful, Hitler and the Henrys, but unhelpful in the sense that it is not terribly accurate. That problem kicks in then, because we have an option system at the end of Key Stage 3, where there is a choice to be made, some of the material that has crept back into Key Stage 3 because really everybody ought to have some experience and understanding of these things, reappears at Key Stage 4 in an options based subject, and then reappears post 16, and you tend to get the market forces at work and you tend to get Hitler and Henrys.

Graham Stuart MP: We had an earlier question about ‘what is the point in a National Curriculum when more and more schools don’t have to follow it; the best response that you can get at the moment is that most of them do, these flexibilities are created and then the fact they don’t use it is apparently a virtue, but leaving that aside, if they are mostly following it then that’s the point of a National Curriculum, because it will have an influence. The expert panel report that came out in December last year suggested that Key Stage 4, in addition to the existing subjects, Geography, History, Modern Foreign Languages, Design and Technology and the arts should all be made compulsory until Key Stage 4. What feedback have you had from government on this? Because it was rather odd that report came out, and the educational establishment gets upset about everything and talks about everything in great intensity, and I keep saying to union leaders ‘why are your conferences being dominated by talk of this curriculum?’ It seems quiet and if Michael Gove is going to out of clear blue sky made some announcement which is the suggestion, that there is work going on, it will feel like it has come out of clear blue sky, and yet in a sense it shouldn’t, there is a National Curriculum review, the expert panel has reported, it made specific recommendations, and where is the debate? And surely you should be here solidifying saying they are right, mentioning them relentlessly, and saying get it compulsory through, and then ensure that we have a coherent system because again they specifically mention in their report the danger that you get Hitler again and again because the whole

thing is so incoherent, and doesn't flow though.

Rebecca Sullivan: We have supported largely the recommendations of the expert team on that board curriculum, the same recommendations in the Norse report that we supported, and I think that one of the problems you have got looking in terms of where is the debate in schools is that there is so much uncertainty, people don't know what to do, what is going to happen, there are these different performance measures that Simon referred to. So there is a lot of uncertainty in the system, and a lot of concern and a lot of contraction, so a lot of the subjects associations who might have otherwise got together, are very concerned about their own subject communities, so some of the great debate that you might like, the big society, is not happening, and I think that is a concern.

Simon Harrison: I think that you have got two fundamental problems with the framework though; first of all, I don't think anyone is quite clear on exactly what the status of this document is. There was a very clear, timescale that was put in place for the National Curriculum review that has clearly now slipped and continues to slip, without any clear, unequivocal response to the document, and I think that puts schools in a very difficult position of being unsure whether they should just be putting this to one side as a very interesting aside to the debate, or whether it is driving the debate. It is very unclear what that would be, but of course again there is that fundamental point that we come back to about academies, and in any case that to an academy this could be seen as an

irrelevance because they don't have to follow it, and if the direction of policy is very much that the default position is that schools will move towards academies if they are not already, then there is a question mark over what this really means in terms of what is going on in schools anyway. I think the fundamental issue is actually the uncertainty about what status of the document actually is. From our point of view we welcome it in the sense that we support the idea of History to 16. It is fantastic to actually see that in print, and in this document, but without really understanding where things go next it is difficult to know quite how to respond to it other than to say, well yes but what is the future direction now.

Mel Jones: I think there is also an element of contradiction going on as well, because the report recommends History to 16, but then Michael Gove on April 24th was questioning whether that would actually be the case, so I think people don't know quite where they stand.

Graham Stuart MP: That right, what I mean about the debate, but there is a review, it has been delayed by a year, I don't know whether it has slipped further than that, they are certainly taking their time, the Education Committee, which I chair, the criticism of the Ebac, was about the way it was introduced, rather than the principle, it was about consulting with people, bring them with you, nearly half a million teachers, you might want to make sure that they are part of that conversation first if you want it to succeed, whether you are right or you are wrong. As I say it was as much about the way that it was done. The National Curriculum is

grinding along, and has been extended by a year there is the opportunity precisely to engage in this, and it seems like you're going on 'well it's not going to be obligatory', well, the Ebac isn't obligatory, and that had a massive impact, according to teachers that I have talked to, and still does, which surprises me.

Sean Lang: I think we would probably dispute that, we did talk about that a little bit earlier on in terms of what the effect of the Ebac actually is and whether it has been entirely positive and whether there has been some unintended consequences that go with that.

Graham Stuart MP: It wasn't whether it was positive necessarily, but it had an impact, and point being it is not obligatory, it's not an accountability mechanism as ministers repeatedly kept repeatedly saying before us, it's a performance information amongst a plethora of performance information there, and it still had an impact, so anyway my point being the National Curriculum will be very influential, and need to argue strongly in favour of compulsory History to 16 and have a debate with those who are going to feel squeezed out as a result, that is what we need, because in a big system like this we need to understand what good provision, no excellent provision, which doesn't fit this model is going to be lost, if this becomes the new model.

Adam Smith: This is why in actual fact this debate about History until 16 is more important through that, because the 16 GCSE point is crucial, it is the key, but as an analogy, when you said how many people are doing the Ebac. If you compare it to when the National

Curriculum came in, exactly the same thing applied to independent schools, they didn't have to follow the National Curriculum, they could do whatever they liked, but I remember very clearly at the time most of them saying that they would follow the National Curriculum, because it would lead into GCSE, and GCSE wasn't going to change based on the same GCSE as everyone else. And that is basically the situation, and in actual fact still pertains for academies and selected independent schools to this day. Now there is only one exam at 16, and if you therefore make things compulsory until 16, that's when you begin to have the impact lower down, because it all leads into the same point, but if you don't make it compulsory to 16, if you hold back from it, then your backing will be sort of vague, airy, and heads or MDs may decide they don't want to do that subject, and our wings are clipped, so this is the crucial debate, this is actually in many ways more important than what they are doing.

Jamie Byrom: Another dimension to that which is sort of hovering over all of this is as you have rightly pointed out is where schools are accountable, now I should be very careful what I wish for here, because you don't want a tight narrow form of accountability, a model at what 'getting better' at History looks like, to be imposed purely to allow History to have some credibility, I think whatever form of a assessment we arrive at, needs to reflect the answer to the question, not just why have a National Curriculum, but why have History within the National Curriculum? Depending on our view on that, our model of assessment needs to follow.

Q7 Chair: In terms of Ofsted criteria, if you have compulsory subjects, we talked about progression from Key Stage 2 to Key Stage 4 as a key monitoring process that drives along our problems with History, but once a subject becomes a core subject, does that change Ofsted's own criteria? So if History became a core subject, wouldn't by default Ofsted have to change their own inspection criteria? How History was then taught?

Jamie Byrom: That is an interesting way round of putting at it. My take on it is more the effect that it would have on the senior management and leadership in schools, in that the knowledge that this is going to be held to account by an externally review measure, whether by Ofsted or by parents, immediately these things happen, that I am sure is the case, but don't press that line too far because what we want, the people sat in this room genuinely feel that there is intrinsic merit to the study of History, and we don't want the nature of that study to be warped in any way, so we have to hold those intentions, we would love to see History taught through to 16, with the right model of assessment, that feeds and supports and nourishes the right form of learning, that reflects what the subject can do for the individual in society. We have got to crack that, and you asked, I think almost top of your list was what do you see as being the state of play at the moment. I for one feel that there is a template of assessment for History teaching that happens at GCSE at the moment, which I am afraid is leading to pressures on teachers to a sort of template form of teaching, the question is 'this' shape, therefore the answer required must be 'this shape' therefore the teaching assumes 'this' shape. We are not getting the flexible critical

thinking, thoughtful analysis that I think we all want from as many as can possibly achieve it. And everything should be designed to tune that end, but if at the end, the form of assessment has that warping effect, for reasons I should say in terms of exam groups, an attempt at fairness, that's what largely drives that. And that attempt at fairness, that narrowness and everything that feeds back, now it would be even worse if the accountability measures affected everybody, and took away some of the freedoms and some of the more creative approaches to teaching. So it is a real tension for us here; History through to 16, yes, but as Becky said in your very first sentence, with the caveat that the assessment has to be changed.

Rebecca Sullivan: It really does, we have to reflect the majority of children, who are not going to go on and be academic historians, we also need to not just look at History in the backroom, there is the big curriculum issue, I think that is quite an important part of life in schools, and I think that goes back to Sean's suggestion that some sort of baccalaureate style, and it is the same in the Alice Norse report, and the curriculum review doesn't suggest that is how much it recommends GCSEs, but across that broad range of subjects, though GCSE as they stand would not be suitable.

Jamie Byrom: One other thing, which is of course the expert group report, which is that the list you read out is a helpful reminder that it wasn't just taking this subject and saying let's take it through to 16, that's a serious shift in the nature of the balance of our education through to the age of 16, affecting the whole curriculum, and all the healthier for it I

think, if we were narrowly here sitting arguing the case for History, it would be a different discussion.

Simon Harrison: To be narrow for a minute, and I totally take your point that this is about the vast majority of students who will not become academic historians, but if as it were the creativity is being limited, through the teaching process at the moment, do we have any data, or is there any data about applicants to History departments from independent schools? I know that there is the data there for universities as a whole, is it departmentally done? Can one show that the applicants for and indeed those that get in to History departments are now 70% or 60% from the independent sector? Does anyone know?

Colin Jones: We do have that data, and we monitor that in our education committee in the Royal Historical Society, and our anxiety is that the indications seem to be that the proportion of independent school people educated coming into History is gradually rising. That is certainly out experience at UCL, and it is a similar story at Oxford and Cambridge, even though Cambridge have made great strides in their History faculty in increasing the number of state educated pupils, they work very hard to do that, and applications from independent schools are steadily increasing. So that is data that reinforces some indications that we have had from A-level, which goes beyond this discussion, but which I suspect is connected to the point that you have discovered from your survey, which is we are very concerned about this social bias that appears to be going on, that while Ebac seems to have had a

positive effect in some schools and in some places, it doesn't surprise me at all to hear that it will have had a negative effect in other schools in other places.

Adam Smith: Because what we are dealing with now in terms of people applying for History degrees and all the rest of it is a ten year process, so Ebac, if it does achieve anything is not going to filter through for another decade, so it is going to keep spiking or keep rising.

Rebecca Sullivan: I think that it is increasing as Chris' report showed and that a lot of our work has shown is that we need to do something about this socio-economic divide that is going on, those kids that are in schools that are quite capable of doing well, but for one reason or another, and it may be for external accountabilities or all sorts of social reasons that means that these schools have taken themselves on halfway A, which might not be quite so much towards a traditional GCSE approach as school B, which might be in a leafy suburb, and we need to actually do something about that as a society.

Jamie Byrom: I just want to loop back if I may quickly on the point about assessment and exam boards and so on, I should also add that they would reasonably and rightly say one of the reasons they stay in fairly narrow approaches is because schools don't like it when I suddenly start asking questions in a different way. So anything mending the assessment will have to be done in a very carefully thought through way. So schools and exam groups and then what happens in the class room with the children has all got to be considered.

Graham Stuart MP: Have we discussed the changes? There was the Ofqual review that brought in the changes immediately for Geography, and I had contact from Geography teachers saying it was a bit too quick on top of a lot of other changes but History was also affected, the idea that the way through the syllabus, the way the exams were, the GCSEs were set up that allowed you to not teach the whole syllabus, or as much off the syllabus as one would expect to be taught because of the way it was constructed, and there are changes coming in History's case in 2013, does anybody know anything about that?

Jamie Byrom: I'm thinking that it may be that at the moment something happens at GCSE, and I am speaking as an individual rather than somebody representing SHP, that I have concerns about the increasing modularity of assessment, though this is very much for me as an individual. Where a student will study a chunk of the course and be assessed on that chunk, and then another chunk and so on. And it seems to me a bit like; how fast can you run the 100 metres Jamie? Well I can run it extremely fast if you let me do it 10 yards at a time over a period of three weeks, rather than taking on a full event. That maybe part of it that people can weave a path through it, but it just reinforces how important assessment is in everything that we talk about. What we are interested in of course is how the subject is in the classroom and the experience of the students. That tail wags this dog quite a lot actually.

Chair: We should move actually onto exams and assessments, we have been talking through the curriculum. I just wanted to quickly get through that and

talk about primary schools, before carrying onto GCSE and what might be an ideal examination assessment.

Rebecca Sullivan: When looking at this whole question we must remember that certainly the existing setup, the majority of young people get most of their History in primary schools, and the majority of teachers for very good reasons, are not specialist historians, and they have to teach 41 subjects, and they get very little training in History, they may have given up History themselves at age 14, so actually getting some good CPD into primary schools, is vital. Getting good CPD into initial teacher training in primary in History and Geography and Languages is vital. And one of the other things that I think we would say it that very much we support the Alexander's suggestions, subject specialist teaching from year 5 and transition from primary to secondary, and that coherence across. They are quite simple issues; I can go into further depth about how young people learn, starting from the here and now, there is lots of issues around it, but by and large we have got to be based around primary, the Ofsted report has shown how popular it is, kids like it, so we are onto a winning streak, so we just need to build on it and making sure we get some training.

Q8 Chair: So there is no informal assessment? For History at Key Stage 2? It's just Key Stage 3 where there is informal assessment?

Rebecca Sullivan: Just at Key Stage 3.

Q9 Chair: Without piling pressure on kids do you think there should be some form of informal assessment to see what sort of level at History someone has

reached, even if it was a teacher assessed examination?

Rebecca Sullivan: Mel has just been analysing some of the research from our primary survey, and assessment came up there didn't it?

Mel Jones: Yes, assessment is particularly piecemeal in primary schools, you do find, from our survey data at least, there were a minority of schools that assess, but generally speaking there is no formal assessment in primary school, and that obviously speaks to perhaps the status that the subject holds, whether or not it is the right thing to do to go down that road?

Rebecca Sullivan: I think a concern is that both in Ofsted and in our own work, that there is many primary teachers that don't understand what progression looks like in History, and they are very good at stories, they are very good at episodic understanding, as in Mike Maddison's History for All report but what that means in terms of assessing, and if you look at just parents even, there is very little feedback even to parents at primary in how kids are doing in History, so that is something we might look at, more informal feedback, and understanding what progression is.

Q10 Chair: It is interesting to actually pick up that point in terms of profession, what would you say to the argument that within Maths you have the concept of numbers and numeracy, and the size of numbers, and in English you have the concept of language and paragraphs and sentence structures, whereas in History the concept of chronology and spatial awareness of the past, would that be something that you think pupils of a

certain age should develop in order to access the next level of History?

Mel Jones: I think we would defiantly that an understanding of what time looks like, and it is quite an abstract and difficult concept, 7 year olds are still having trouble telling the time, so historical time is a difficult concept, but I think that is what part of History is.

Jamie Byrom: I am really pleased that you have raised the point about primary, I think it was 1999 that the last national review that incorporated the full 5-14 for History and perhaps 5-16, and I welcome that approach to this review. In primary schools, it all gets very anecdotal, there are some remarkably good things that go on, back to our friend relatively low status, because of the relatively low accountability, external accountability, and so it can easily be sidelined whether it is just the way that the weeks are organised, if it appears in the afternoons not the mornings, that something that happens. With the arrival of the national literacy strategy in particular, that point History is found to be probably one of the big success stories of the national primary curriculum. Almost immediately it took a hit and it was rather sidelined, but there are pockets of very good practice, but picking up your point about the chronological framework, I would certainly share concerns about that, and certainly want to find the model that made that higher profile, and more important and more explicit, and I think that everybody would.

Graham Stuart MP: What does that look like? We can all say what we would like but our job sadly is to come up with mechanics to get us from A to B.

Jamie Byrom: Yes, and that was where my next sentence is going, there are difficulties of how you would go about that, but I would want to put down the marker that certainly in the view of I think most people who work in the History curriculum, they wouldn't see it as being as simple as your start early and finish late, that will not produce a chronological understanding by taking you down the chronological journey, it really doesn't work that way. Most of us to get our heads around something find it helpful going back and revisiting what is needed. The danger with that model is that you get the 'we have done this before' syndrome. So I am not going to try to answer the question in detail now, but I am going to put down the marker that I really do not think the answer can be just starting early and finishing late and travelling in a linear fashion.

Graham Stuart MP: Well tell us what it isn't, I mean our great difficulty is that we are asked to make evidence based policy which is either a joke or a desperately needed thing, and yet when we get the experts in front of us and we say 'what can I conclude then, that I can do as a result of what you have told me, I have got a list of things that I shouldn't do and a pretty picture of where I agree with you and where I would like to be, but somehow we have to move from A to B and that means either we add assessment in primary, do you want to add assessment in primary? Do you want to make it as driven as it is in other topics? Do you want to abolish the assessment on the other topics so there is no assessment up to Key Stage 2 and we lose all of our base data for pupil performance, what is it?

Jamie Byrom: I am happy to focus on one aspect of we do not want the linear run through, as I said at the very beginning, some form of thematic subset of History, some story through History, and look at that from its earliest days to recent times, and using that as a fibre optic going back into the past, and we are studying on the face of it, a dreary example, transport or something, but you take that one thing, and by moving quite quickly through it, you are giving them experience of different ages and how they relate to each other rather than moving slowly through from the day they get into primary school until the end, which would be a bit like trying to detect the hour hand on the clock moving. You want something where there is enough pace in it, where you sense the change, you sense the difference, so two or three units or occasions where they are studying History. But there is enough pace and a strong narrative story there of change that they detect those different periods, that they get a sense of how they relate to each other It is more likely to give them that chronological framework than just the slow run though.

Sean Lang: We could go for a consulting exercise with primary schools when we were preparing our submission for review, and it was very clear what they wanted, first of all they wanted chronological coverage from the ancient world up to the modern times, not big heavy, but particular topics, Romans, Greeks, Tudors, Victorians and they were very opposed to the idea of only doing the early stuff. Secondly heavy emphasis upon the story, I have no fears or worries at all about that it is very important concept in History, and indeed I think all the way through, and thirdly,

not keen on building this in to the assessment pattern at primary school.

Simon Harrison: Part of the importance of primary element is the imagination of it as well, I mean that why the Egyptians and the Romans are, which is in the story telling, which seems to be a virtue of it, because it sparks imagination, and it might potentially come at the cost of chronology, not that it should have to, but it gives students a taste.

Mel Jones: Going back to some of the research, some of our Key Stage 1 Key Stage 2 people that couldn't be here today, we don't have any primary experts here today, but one of the things that they were saying with very young children was about learning from your life, you're here and now, and you build up from there, your personal History, but also the constructs of stories, your personal stories, and then leading into bigger stories and learning the difference between fairytale and historical story, so you begin slowly to build up that picture, and it is also visual things are quite important, I think it is in the Ofsted report, that just timelines with proper gaps, and getting that sense of what time might look like is quite useful for young people, building up towards doing more specialised History in the later part of primary through Key Stage 2.

Dr Adam Smith: This is beyond the Royal Historical Societies brief, so I am speaking on my own behalf really that the point that Becky made earlier on really needs to be underlined, and that is about CPD, so we can invent all kinds of interesting, essentially top down constructs for the curriculum, but unless you have really serious intervention to help and support teachers, then none of it

really will be fed into the classroom anyway. There is a related issue, which again I refer to the HA, you know more about this than I do about the supply of History teachers at secondary level, but at primary level as well, the CPD issue is critical, and is all the more important in the context on the decline of LEA support which always provided some kind of access to specialist in the local area. I want to echo, again just anecdotally, that a lot of the primary History teaching is superb, and there are some incredibly imaginative primary teachers who are able to use the outline of the National Curriculum to do projects with children that meet the criteria that we set out in our submission, that they introduce children to the citizenship function of History, but certainly also to the humanities function and even to some of these higher level analytical skills, extended pieces of writing at primary school level, old fashioned type History projects where they go and gather things and stick things in books and put together extended pieces of imaginative work. Sometimes that is more possible at primary level than it is at Key Stage 3. So it is a question of sharing that best practice and trying to enthuse primary teachers as far as possible to do what is already it seems to me easily possible within the existing framework, and that is where the CPD comes in.

Rebecca Sullivan: You are absolutely right Adam, and there is a huge amount of enthusiasm as I said for the subject at primary, but we do know that even the most History co-ordinated primary schools have had little or no training in History. So you are dealing with a bit of a problem there.

Mel Jones: We both think that the results of the primary survey completely back up what the Ofsted 2011 report said and that is that training is a massive issue within primary, and that teachers are great at telling stories and delivering content, but the historical thinking is not there .

Chair: In terms of CPD within local primary schools, I know the government is working now with English Heritage, personally to me you are trying to find an appropriate balance between local History, national History and international History. At primary local history can come to the fore if there is the support there from local organisations that want to help with school trips and have specialists actually on site.

Mel Jones: There are local organisations, there are secondary schools where primary are the feeder to specialist History teachers. If there is space to do that, there are ways and means of doing good work.

Jamie Byrom: I would just add to that goes back to the CPD thing, that the more one is asking quite bluntly for local History to be rich in primary school, the harder it is for the teachers to do it because local History is exactly the History where you are not going to find resources in the sense of thought through, prepared resources. You have the resources in terms of wonderful buildings and old pathways and highways, byways and statues and who knows what, but making sense of it, understanding his words and not all its context, it seems to me that what History is about and why we value it is if individuals and areas the nation, a sense

context and a disposition to look for a context, those teachers are left with their hardest challenge doing the local History.

Graham Stuart MP: The citizenship, where are we now in terms of citizenship in the curriculum?

Rebecca Sullivan: Still there.

Graham Stuart MP: The anecdotal evidence that I always had was citizenship was basically dumped on History teacher's shoulders, it cut into History lessons, and then we had an absolutely crazy report that said we should teach ideas of citizenship through History. I thought we should just teach History.

Colin Jones: Well in actual fact it tends to end up on anyone's shoulders, apart from P.E.

Simon Harrison: The picture you have painted is actually probably rather more positive in terms of if only were always deposited with the History department it would perhaps have better delivery. What has tended to happen is the curriculum in some schools whoever had the space on the timetable after everything was divided up, unfortunately that is not always the case, and there is some excellent citizenship teaching going on out there, including in my own school, but it is the exception rather than the rule unfortunately, and it is not an explicit feature of the expert panel report.

Graham Stuart MP: So there is a statutory obligation at present?

Simon Harrison: Yes

Graham Stuart MP: For how much a week?

Simon Harrison: There is no measure of time.

Graham Stuart MP: But the expectation is that is going to be quietly faded out?

Rebecca Sullivan: it would need an Act of Parliament, wouldn't it?

Graham Stuart MP: Right.

Q11 Chair: Thanks very much, well that ties in nicely with what I wanted to bring up with timetabling, because we can talk about our ideal History school and what they would teach, and probably forget about all the other subjects in the mean time. Just in terms of the nuts and bolts of the issue of the timetable, I know that the Historical Association has put forward proposals of how many hours of History teaching should be taught each week, and wondered if you all had your own views over what should be the requirement in primary schools? Whether that should change through primary schools and also then in secondary schools and what would be the bare minimum and what is sensible to actually achieve.

Rebecca Sullivan: We went for a bare minimum of an hour a week in primary and two in secondary, as a bare minimum, and it would have to be, because of the way timetabling works it wouldn't quite be that simple.

Sean Lang: It much depends on two other factors; one is the broader curriculum within which it fits, and the

length of the school day, and the second factor is resources, and what I mean very simply is that if you have an hour, and you have got topic A,B and C to cover, it then depends on what your role as a teacher is, so if you have got to get up there and explain everything, in which case it is going to be crushing, and probably awfully crushing for the kids who listen to it as well, or if you have the right sort of resources where you don't have to do that, or if you don't have to be up at the front explaining every fact, and because you have that sort of resources support to just get the knowledge from somewhere else, then you could play about with it. So it is difficult to say it's got to be done in X number of hours per week because of these things having an impact upon it.

Jamie Byrom: In terms of time, I am very happy to support the minimum figures that you choose, with the proviso that Sean has added, that again it is this awful notion of the coverage model that creeps in. We are back to what is the point of all this? And if the point of this is a certain way at looking at certain dispositions to think, then that is way beyond telling people. Politicians do not need reminding that telling people something is not the same as persuading them if it and making their behaviour change, and in our classrooms they are all the time seeking those ways of judging which part of this anthology story can be told, and just enjoyed. A context has been set, and where do we need to drop down and really let them get their teeth into this so that they are nourished by the process, and it changes them. It isn't a mono-pace work through, so what we do with that time, we cannot then just start choking down whole

periods into one because that means you will do this and this bit and so on.

Q12 Chair: Anecdotally that could happen. We have spoken about the curriculum and the three years into two. Then there is the separate issue of how the curriculum is divided into half terms, terms, and how it fits. Is that something that has to be left up to the teachers professional judgement, how to integrate content?

Mel Jones: At primary that is exacerbated even more by the way they design their curriculum entirely, you find that History sometimes is taught weekly, sometimes it is divided into half term-ly chunks, sometimes it is enrichment, it is very different from school to school. So then you have got the added thing of mixed year classes, in smaller rural areas, so it is not as easy as that just to stipulate X hours per week.

Jamie Byrom: Can I just pick up on that point of mixed age classes, it is extraordinarily important in terms of the model that is used for History in primary schools, because if one does adopt a chronological run though model, then you have the scenario where a teacher with a mixed age class that I am familiar with in Devon primary schools, might have years 3 and 4 or even 3,4 or 5 in the same room together, it is teaching three periods of History to three different thirds of that classroom, and keeping it coherent. So the chronological model is hugely problematic for small schools in particular, but it is not only small schools that do that, sometimes they do it as a way of ability grouping. So it is an issue.

Q12 Chair: one of the questions that I wanted to ask, following on from the timetable I realise that it is controversial, and I ask because I know that people have strong views on it; whether we should teach History as being an entirely discreet based approach, or whether there is any possibilities that if History was made compulsory to sixteen then History would be taught in a cross curricular way, and is has been in other countries in Europe?

Mel Jones: I think by and large that we wouldn't be for that.

Chair: I thought so.

Mel Jones: We like our subject.

Simon Harrison: I would say that it is perfectly possible to teach History in a cross curricular way, in certain ways. Where what I would call an interdisciplinary approach rather than a cross curricular approach, where there are certain aspects where two or three subjects can come together and produce something that is really effective, but that would be when it was appropriate and done it the right way. I think the idea of trying to put it into some old scheme, some sort of competency based mush, which is unfortunately what happens in some cases, clearly wouldn't work at all. We certainly wouldn't be against collaboration across subjects, and that happens very effectively in school where it is appropriate, and where it can be done.

Q13 Chair: So what kind of collaboration would that be then? In terms of a good practice model?

Mel Jones: Working with the English department, and poetry, say if you were studying First World War poets, you would be working with English and History, working with the art department looking at buildings, looking at the building environment. There is a lot of areas that you might look at. But I think putting History as a post 14 qualification into a sort of humanities bucket would not be appropriate.

Jamie Byrom: I think that is an important point to pick up, because curiously the examples that we reach for are most readily with English Literature, Art and maybe subjects in search of a context, for instance Drama, but not the one that most people assume that History pairs with, which is Geography. I think the tensions are too great by that stage, or course there are overlaps, but by that secondary stage, interestingly the closer cousins I think are Art and Literature in particular, I would suggest.

Simon Harrison: Well that is the baccalaureate model that we referred to, and I know Sean has written about as well, and that is something where you could preserve subject specific models within a broader suite of subjects.

Q13 Chair: This comes back to the Ebac I guess; can you use the tools of assessment? Are the tools too blunt that they are worthless? Or would you think you should be creating an entirely new form of baccalaureate?

Sean Lang: This is one where we do think you need to be quite radical, because at the moment we have got different sets of assessment criteria, particular structures, GCSEs, single subject GCSEs which is why the

international comparison are difficult, because I am not aware of any other country which has such an important assessment unit at 16.

Rebecca Sullivan: Yes, it is unusual.

Sean Lang: Yes, so there is no real equivalent for GCSE anywhere else, so we have got this sort or set of blocks, and it does make the practicalities of the sort of thing that we are talking about here quite difficult. In actual fact you encounter History in all sorts of subjects, it is in English, it is in Art, it is in Geography, it is in R.E. And History, when you realise that the other teachers in other subjects are given, is often quite horrifying, but you sort of overcome this, because you have got the timetable and in practice, unless you yourself are going to do something for the English department because of pupils and their timetable bit, this is easier to talk about than it is to actually do, but if you are serious about really looking at the curriculum's abilities at sixteen, a real baccalaureate would mean probably not having GCSE', it would be a baccalaureate not made up of GCSE, a different sort of thing, there are different models, the idea that at 18 there are models there with different levels, higher level and moderate level, there are ways of doing it, but it's that radical change, otherwise we are hemmed in the by the structure of the GCSE. That's a big thing to take on.

Chair: That sort of follows on to a final general discussion that if History was compulsory until 16, which we seem to be in broad agreement, to understand and reflect upon the supply side issues and problems that would then occur. One of the obvious things is the talked about

qualification, whether the GCSE will be an appropriate exam. It seems that if you are talking about a five year curriculum instead of a three year curriculum and a two year curriculum the duplication takes place in two separate curriculum's means the GCSE would have to be reformed, if not we would need to move a bit further. The second issue is the number of teachers supplied, whether we can reflect on the scale of the challenge that would need to be surmounted if we are to have History compulsory until 16.

Sean Lang: If I can move past policy to ITT, we could not keep targeting History courses in Initial Teacher Training.

Mel Jones: History has never been a shortage subject, it has just been the numbers allocated in initial teacher training has gone down in the last six years quite considerably, but I think that it still doing very well at HE isn't it? The numbers at A-level are certainly on the increase.

Adam Smith: Yes, there isn't a problem with supply of History graduates, and I could be quite surprised if there was a shortage of potential applicants for History at PGCE. The problem is the number of places allocated is going down.

Jamie Byrom: From our point of view, one of the things that we would have to do is try to help schools to understand, and this is going to sound patronising, that you cannot just ask anybody to teach History, because that will be the default position. If they find they need more History teachers, those History teachers will come from P.E. or Art or somewhere if they have many teachers on the timetable, and that would be their

first approach understandably, but it wouldn't happen with a modern foreign language, people don't speak German can teach still German, but people who cannot speak History, they still get asked to speak History.

Q14 Chair: What would be the minimum requirement for teaching History? Pass at A-level? Pass at GCSE?

Rebecca Sullivan: It's usually a History or Politics degree.

Q15 Chair: But say you had a situation where you suddenly wanted to create a compulsory History until 16. Could you allow schools to let a teacher with History A-level to teach History?

Jamie Byrom: I would hope it wouldn't be that sudden, it is something that people would plan for and prepare for, but they will have people on their staff presumably who. And I have been in departments where staff have joined from other subject areas, and over time, providing that they have an appropriate disposition and they are prepared to work at it.

Colin Jones: One of the consequences of this is that it is going to change in that way, it shouldn't happen suddenly, because if there is a bit of lead time into it one can see some changes that need to be made, increase in numbers etc for training. But to do it at a stroke would be very hard for teachers and for children.

Q16 Chair: If the government takes the position or the National Curriculum review takes the position that History should be compulsory what would you see as a realistic timetable for implementation as a recommendation?

Over how many years schools would have to, and what would be the point where you could say ‘right we could have this in place by 2020’? Five years?

Adam Smith: If the teacher training basis under whatever scheme or route into teaching are opened up, and given the PGCE is a year, two years.

Rebecca Sullivan: It should be quite straight forward, if you open up the places.

Q17 Chair: How many places?

Adam Smith: Well you are talking about effectively trebling the number of students who would be taking History at age sixteen, from roughly a third of the cohort to 100% of the cohort, so that would have an enormous effect, there is no school in the country that could cope with that immediately.

Jamie Byrom: Just to emphasise though, that while the supply side may be dealt with in terms of allowing the graduates to come forward, the training, places and the quality of training being there, inside the school by definition there will be people who used to be teaching something who will not be teaching it anymore, and they need to be borne in mind in this situation, because otherwise the arrival of the fresh faced History teacher is the squeezing out of somebody else who is extremely valuable to that school or community. So big issues around that, but in simple timetable terms what we have said is.

Sean Lang: It will depend also on how you operate that curriculum change, if you did it on the model of the previous National Curriculum, where you rolled it

up from year seven, then obviously you have a much longer lead in time until you reach the point where you have to deliver the compulsory. That also gives you time to develop the appropriate qualifications, which are so important in all this. And it would also enable time for supporting materials and so on to be developed; there is some specific CPD that would be needed as well for whatever would be developed, there are all of those things that take time. It can be done quickly, but quickly wouldn’t be good quality. I don’t think any of us would be interested in something that went through too quickly and wasn’t done well, because then again you come back to the unintended consequences of potentially a generation of kids being turned off of History, which is clearly nothing any of us want to do.

Q18 Chair: In terms of the subject being compulsory as a course being taken by all, one concern that I would have is around the needs of low attaining pupils, and how the double-bod assessments we needed for those pupils and also in terms of the pupils with specific needs such as special educational needs catering. Has anybody got any thoughts on that as an issue? Or how other subjects or countries approach this?

Colin Jones: We have an anxiety but not a solution, the anxiety is that if we do something which is a sort of lesser qualification, then it becomes a sort of mickey mouse qualification that will turn kids off of History, so we are anxious about that, but we don’t have any solutions. I think our colleagues in Historical Association have thought it through more seriously.

Rebecca Sullivan: There are possible solutions, it is not impossible to provide challenging, yet open ended kinds of assessment, for example, the HA have been working on some trial ASDAN style History assessment, which we are yet to find out how that pans out, but it will be interesting to see how it runs because the challenges are perfectly accessible to a wide ability range, so I am just saying it is not impossible to provide challenges that are perhaps by outcome possible.

Chair: When I spoke at the Historical Association I was struck by the hostility towards tiered papers.

Rebecca Sullivan: Yes

Mel Jones: Yes

Simon Harrison: I think that is right, the other thing there to put with that is there is an extraordinary commitment on behalf of many of the teachers to grapple this issue and find solutions, the problem I have more and more is what will be the parameters, what will be the name of the game, and the squeeze on coursework for entirely understandable reasons. I can get the rational behind that, and the shift towards controlled assessment. All those things actually take the direction of travel away from some of the things that might be needed to be part of the package, to make assessment viable. We would have to have a fairly wide remit within which to work but there is a commitment to creativity to find forms of assessment that can work.

Mel Jones: I think within the awarding bodies as well, they are involved in working towards good Level 1 type assessment as well it is fair to say.

Q19 Chair: In terms of other issues that I have not raised, or that you would like to have on record, I know we have skimmed across exams and assessment, and we have people focusing in depth on A-levels later on, particular issues around compulsory to 16 and what that therefore means for a qualification and the curriculum itself. In terms of what we have tried to look at in this report is we have tried to say 'let's all agree why History, let alone what History, whose History; and focus on the detail, when that can come as a secondary issue, once the actual understanding that History should be part of a curriculum as a core subject to 16. Is there anything else that you think we should be reflecting in the report?

Sean Lang: Well you mentioned one thing that we haven't raised which is you asked what we thought about the launch. And this is one where I said earlier I don't generally go along with the general consensus, and this has tended to be those who say that they are very much skills people and then you get the view from the community, which is silly because you need both and you have to have both. However there is an issue relating to progression, where I think there is a genuine demand. The amount that you know does affect how good you are at History, and you cannot simply separate it. There is a lot of talk about people using unconnected bits of knowledge, and I have certainly seen various people writing about them saying that you don't become a great historian just by knowing more and I don't think that's right actually. It may not be simply by knowing more, but knowing more is absolutely central to the process in getting to be good at

History, because that is what gives your insight into the document in front of you, the value, as opposed to that of a perfectly intelligent but uninformed person walking in front of the door, who would give you an opinion on something but doesn't have the background to do it, and I think that actually has quite profound implications to the nature of assessment and the nature of exams once you take that point on board.

Jamie Byrom: I would just like to pick up on that and say that actually I go a long, long way down that line with Sean, I am not sure I take that final turn that I understand you to take some of those proposals forward, but that's because, as you rightly say, for discussion, but the nature of that knowledge for me, this is why I always see knowledge as knowledge and understanding so that it is the resonance of this knowledge. It is what it allows other knowledge to be added to it, which is exactly the point that you make. So I think that we are absolutely together on that, but it is again the subtleties of how you set the form of assessment that rightly rewards knowledge, rather than, loosely.

Rebecca Sullivan: I completely agree.

Sean Lang: There are moments in a crazy situation where if you bring in information that hasn't been anticipated in the marks scheme you actually get penalised for it, which is madness.

Rebecca Sullivan: Yeah, I think we would all be in agreement of that.

Colin Jones: From the perspective of higher education looking backwards I

strongly agree with the last point that Sean made, that is something that we notice, even our excellent students at UCL at undergraduate level struggle with this idea that they can bring in information from whatever source they have got it from, that of course is a legacy of the way it has been taught in schools. We also have a concern about the nature of source work, which often seems to be radically de-contextualised, so students are trained to be bias detectors, but without fully understanding of the context from within the source operates. So when I think about the importance of knowledge and again, I would agree with the general assertion that Sean made at the start of his remarks just then, what seems to be is the right kind of contextual knowledge is not the 1066 approach, it is not a matter of knowing a certain number of key facts, it is about knowing the useful information in order to make sense of the material in front of you.

Mel Jones: Yes, absolutely, fully agree.

Jamie Byrom: Using the information outside and in your daily life, I think that's the thing that we are all after isn't it? Information that feeds understanding.

Chair: I think on that note, I will end the first session, thank you ever so much.

Committee Room 7, House of Commons. 3:30pm

All Party Parliamentary Group on Archives and Archives
History in Schools: Second Evidence Session
History for all until sixteen

Members Present:
Chris Skidmore MP (Chair)

Examination of Witnesses

Mike Goddard, Qualifications Manager, Qualifications and Curriculum (OCR),
Marc Booker, AQA, Head of Business Support within General Qualifications
Development Division, **Emily Scott**, Senior Manager, History, Edexcel, **Jamie Byrom**
(SHP Fellow), Schools History Project

Q1 Chair: Good afternoon, thank you for coming. Could I ask you to begin by introducing yourselves and telling us about the different organisations that you have come from?

Mike Goddard: I am Mike Goddard from OCR, Qualifications Manager for A-level History, but I do have a role on GCSE as well. OCR offers two GCSEs at the moment, until very recently we offered three, a Pilot, which is now still available, but no longer accredited as a GCSE. That is the Modern World and the SHP. The Pilot was capped at 100 schools and it was a very popular qualification, it was the one that seemed to cause the least angst amongst teachers delivering it. It relied very heavily on teacher assessment, I think it was 75% teacher assessed, and that is sadly the reason that it no longer has GCSE status. Also at GCSE we offer Ancient History, and we have developed a GCSE in Humanities, which I think should be at least of interest to groups like the Historical Association. At A-level we offer two distinct History qualifications, called History A and History B. History B is about 10% of our A-level History

entry, it is much smaller, but it is an attempt to update A-level History particularly in terms of historiography. It is built around different approaches to the subject, and again, it has a slightly different assessment structure, no traditional exams at A2, it has coursework and a three hour open book exam, where the schools can structure how they want, so three one hour sessions or one three hour session, with full access to notes and books.

Marc Booker: Marc Booker, until December I was senior subject manager for History and Archaeology and Classics, so that is really why I am here today, but also representing AQA widely, because I think there is actually a wider subject debate mentioned in the last session, in terms of the relationship with Geography for example and other subjects. In terms of History though we offer a range of qualifications like my colleagues here, GCSE really falls down in to Modern World History and also the Schools History Project, so we have just finished working with Lord Baker on a option within the Schools History Project that focuses on industry and

technology through time to compliment things like Medicine Through Time and Media Through Time. We also offer a Level 1, Level 2 certificate, which has to be called that because it cannot be a GCSE, but it is the same standard as a GCSE, and actually slightly more challenging because it has a third written paper that includes pre-released document material, although edited, so those documents are much fuller in length to actually be a valid replacement for controlled assessment, some of the benefits of coursework that used to be there, but actually really driven to engage and build contextual knowledge around documents in the assessment. At A-level we offer quite a large A-level specification with some 41 separate units so I think it is fair to say that we agree with many of the comments at the start of the last session about diversity of content, flexibility, choice, where that is coherent, I think that is also the key.

Emily Scott: I am Emily Scott, I am Senior Manager for History at Edexcel and we offer like AQA and OCR two GCSE History specifications, so the Modern World spec, and the Schools History Project specification, we also have an international GCSE in History, which is taken internationally, but also by independent schools in the UK, we recently launched a version of that called a Certificate in History, for state schools, which is the same as the international GCSE, and the key feature of that is it is a linear qualification, it has no coursework or controlled assessment, it is entirely exam based. We also have an A-level specification, which has a huge range, 45 different optional topics across the exam units, and an even wider choice of coursework options available, and we also offer an entry level certificate, at

Key Stage 4 level, so that is aimed at students that are working below a grade G, as a fallback from GCSE. We also produce a really wide range of publishing and digital resources for History across Key Stage 3 right through to Key Stage 5 for all awarding bodies.

Jamie Byrom: Can I just chip in here, because here I am on the list, but of course we don't actually credit anyone's performance or anything like that, and there is an interesting relationship here because the Schools History Project, I think I am right in saying, has no say over what would be done under the label or Schools History Project in the specs that are produced by the exam groups, and I think that a lot of the time that has not been problematic, but if I am honest I think it has become problematic and I think that SHP would find itself hard to recognise all the things that it stands for, in the specs that go out in its name attached any longer. And I don't want to go into all the details here and no, it is probably not the right place, but there is a little bit of an issue that needs to be understood for contextual reasons here, where it says SHP, there is no formal relationship awarded by these.

Marc Booker: you are quite right generally, but we always go back to Mike Riley.

Jamie Byrom: Absolutely right,

Marc Booker: There is a dialogue, let's call it that.

Jamie Byrom: That absolutely right, it is just for others, who might assume that if it has got that label it has defiantly come through, the dialogue is strong, so thank you for that.

Q2 Chair: So what I would like to do is talk about the GCSE and specification and the move onto A-level, which I am sure the Royal Historical Society will have a lot of interest in as well, from the university. It seems from what each of you have described of the various qualifications that you offer is that as exam boards that you are all trying to innovate around the edges, that you are keen to do so, and you are all actively Piloting certain new types of qualifications but at the same time that if you agree with this, it seems that History as a GCSE seems to be have frozen aspects. In the introduction of the Schools History Project, we have not really had any major new reform or new content, it is Modern World or SHP, and I didn't know what you felt that was a barrier, or whether that was something that, you have to deliver what schools want as customers, but whether you feel that there is an opportunity to move beyond the diametric that you have to either choose Modern World or SHP, and look at something new. And whether compulsory History to 16 might give you that opportunity?

Emily Scott: I guess a lot of it is exactly what you say, which is that what teachers are looking for, and there is an element of, we all try to innovate by adding new options to our specifications, and adding new topics to increase the breadth of choice that is available to teachers, but inevitably there will always be a greater concentration around those topics where teachers feel confident and also for financial reasons, if they have the resources in schools, budgets are tight, so it can be difficult for them to make those changes, but absolutely I think we are certainly committed to

continuing to improve the choice that is available and to obviously work within the subject criteria that are established. face

Q3 Chair: And do you find that those are too tight?

Marc Booker: Yea, I think that if you say to a group of teachers 'here is a really good idea', you take the idea out of context, you probably get more degree in broadly speaking if it is actually a genuinely good idea, but if you then say 'would you like to change your teaching of Modern World History at GCSE or would you like to change specification', they are incredibly conservative bunch. I was one, I taught for thirteen years, and actually changing specifications is actually quite a headache. We mentioned resources, that is one element, but even within specifications and options, if you are really unpacking all of the issues that you were talking about in the last session, about progression, knowledge, context, knowledge, right the way through to formative and summative assessment, that is an awful lot of change to take place, so I think the last big specification change in 2008 when we asked many of our teachers, the answer that came back quite often was 'don't change much please, keep things the same', and I think in a way that probably reflects your comment about the lack of change going on in GCSE. With the exception of SHP and Elizabethan England, along the way we have lost things like Tudor History and other varieties of English History that have appeared in former A-level papers and very briefly possibly GCSE, and I think that that causes one of the problems. Year before last we went to a group of teachers to concept test what

would be an I-GCSE, that is the level 1/2 qualification, and we took British outline to them, in fact we took three British outlines. One that was which looking at a parliamentary democracy kind of study, looking into that, one that was looking at making the UK in that sort of sense, we looked at one looking at British Empire, and the reaction, no thank you, wouldn't touch it with a bargepole, because we have done that already at Key Stage 3. We don't want to be repeating the past. There are some slight contradictions there, what about Hitler, what about the year 9 work, doesn't that get repeated? But there is familiarity there, but I think in terms of when you listen to a group of teachers, we are very keen on meeting their needs, just as we are with all the steak holders of the History community, but they are very, very conservative.

Mike Goddard: Yea, the most significant development at GCSE probably was the Pilot, just not to sound like a salesman or to be blowing OCR's trumpet, especially but it was the alternative qualification. Yea, I would echo a lot of your comments, it is very difficult to persuade people to change, but actually there was a big waiting list for that Pilot, so there clearly is a constituency out there, who are willing to embrace new approaches or different approaches to the subject. Luckily we were able to build some resources around that, but that is another key issues, if there aren't resources.

Q4 Chair: What do resources look like in terms of how much would it cost for a new qualification, how many schools do you need to Pilot it? We talk about ideas what assessment should be and who should be being assessed, but

examination boards who are delivering on the ground, what is the reality of change? You have had it with the Pilot, but realistically, so say we bring History compulsory to 16, a new GCSE is somehow required, to assess over a 5 year period, what would that mean for you as examination boards in terms of creating and adapting a new GCSE?

Mike Goddard: Well the support can come in a lot of different ways; one of the ways the Pilot was supported was though setting up local networks, just acting as the facilitator that puts schools in touch with each other. It doesn't have to be just producing a textbook, it can be something as simple as that, and that is something that exam boards can, through the establishment of regional network groups, can play quite a key role. We can act to share good practice, the HA obviously does already, but it is not always negative, there will always be a core of teachers who say 'I'm not going to teach that until the textbook', but that is not the only answer, or advocacy.

Jamie Byrom: There is another dimension there as well; I am just taking Marc's point about teachers being conservative.

Marc Booker: I am over egging it I appreciate; there is a degree.

Jamie Byrom: Yeah, but I think it is important to understand where that conservatism comes from, and I think some of it is, there is a constituency out there who just wants to be given the textbook and get on with it, I think they are a minority, but I think those people do exist, but I think there is a much larger constituency out there who exist in a climate where they have to be risk

adverse, because they are held to account by people like me, who sit down with them in September and say, 'right, these results then', and I think that is where it comes from. I think the experience of the Pilot is very, very interesting, because I think that you have hit the nail on the head exactly there, in terms of the support and the ability of the teachers who work collaboratively together, and to understand what a qualification looks like, and to co-construct it to a degree, which is pretty much what happened with the Pilot, wasn't it? And I think that is one way of overcoming that conservatism, because I fully accept what you are saying, that conservatism is defiantly there, it hits you in the face every time you try to do something like that, but I mean I think it's about looking at it from the point of view that whether that conservatism is innate or something that is simply an outcome of where teachers are, in terms of the other things they have to bear in mind and there are approaches, and I go back to the Pilot as a really good example as something which has been incredibly popular, ok it was capped on one hundred schools, and as I am sure you know, if you had been able to, you could have had a lot more people involved in that if you had been able to do it.

Marc Booker: Can I just add, that while we would all want to look at the Pilot for those things that we would want to tweak and adjust, but there is that degree of creativity in those assessment formats and a breath to them which I think is part of the answer that Chris you were looking for, for the low attainer, although having said that, the Pilot, some schools I think tried to take it on with this word vocational attached at one point, and actually it wasn't in any sense

dumbed down, it was seriously considered a thought provoking approach, but it did take histories, liaison links with and feeding into other curriculum areas much more seriously than other GCSEs can. So there is a lot on there that we might go back to given the opportunity.

Emily Scott: I think that goes back to your theory about subject criteria and whether they are constraining though, because it is those in themselves really that prevent us from innovating, because one of the ways in which teachers would like to see us innovate is around the assessment, and how that works, and so where you have subject criteria that very tightly confine what a GCSE in History can look like, that is what counts towards Ebac, that's what counts towards performance table points, it does narrow the scope not in terms of the content necessarily, but in terms of what types of questions you can ask and how you assess and what skills it has to assess.

Q5 Chair: And this is where you have the percentage of the paper must be a particular type of question?

Emily Scott: Yes, and so the subject criteria specify that only 25% of GCSE can be assessed internally, so 75% needs to be examination and things, and the proportion of British History, and what proportion of source work needs to be assessed and all those kinds of things.

Marc Booker: Sorry, I realise we must give you all the time you need, but I just want to add another thing, that as soon as we start talking about changing those criteria or whatever it may be, the success of the Pilot, there is a danger that

people will think that we are asking for a lowering in standards, absolutely not. The History teaching community and the CPT that goes on in the History teaching community, it is so much about raising standards and raising quality, and the extended writing issue, essays, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes please. And it is the organised thinking and the relationships between things that goes into that that is sometimes best addressed in what from the outside looking in can look to be slightly odd, non academic approaches, but training the mind to see relationships and organise information and find forms of expression, that is absolutely what we are about. So all can in time move towards that kind of extended writing.

Jamie Byrom: So if you are a teacher, you are probably less familiar with the subject criteria, you probably know that they are there, you probably know about their existence, and probably even less so with general criteria which determine effectively the rules around GCSE or A-level. But of course now there is the criteria that is underpinning performance table measures, and requirements to have say a track record of a qualification, one might argue would also limit innovation. Because who is going to bravely start delivering a qualification that may have been credited by Ofqual, but won't necessarily achieve performance table measures in two years time, until it has had that track record. It is very chicken and egg, and it takes us back to the same place, the same argument really for the textbooks, and I think Mike Maddison wrote at length in the Ofsted report about the reliance on textbooks, and I think it raised at the last RHS meeting with all the organisations, because there is, for very clear, obvious reasons, teachers are concerned that they might get it wrong,

and if there is a textbook, better still a badged textbook, that they are able then, they have the solution in front of them that will lead to a success at the end, and there is so much pressure, performance tables and accountability sits around that of course that is kind of driving this, it is not a race to the bottom, but it is a very stale approach almost, that if we are not careful, can have quite an impact on the teaching, and of course that is what is potentially then driving some of the things that we were saying earlier about the teaching and the test. And you know, it is approaching assessment in quite a sterile way. I think personally there is a lot more you could probably do with the current assessment models, in terms of how you respond to them as a candidate and how you can actually, we would never mark down material that is made relevant, but it is absolutely the case that we are now in the sort of position where I think there is a sort of a fear factor in some schools that if you move away from the script in your teaching you move away from teaching towards that assessment, that it will have a detrimental effect on those results, but of course that is not really good History, and of course good History is where we want to get to isn't it? The assessment should look after itself, the results should look after itself, it's the good History that we want to get first.

Mike Goddard: Entirely predictably, I am going to completely agree with that, I think it's not so much the awarding bodies produced mark schemes that are producing formulaic answers if that is indeed happening, it is more that there has got to be a trick somewhere, there has got to be something somewhere that we can tell these kids and guarantee their grades. If you are getting formulaic

responses in examination papers I think that that is the source of it.

Marc Booker: Can I just amplify that, forgive me for any abruptness that may have been there in the way that I said it, but we see it so often that it would be wrong not to mention this context, and you have taken it with good grace, thank you, but I have watched lessons where honestly I have said to the teacher afterwards, and it is not easy to say about the teacher afterwards; 'it actually felt like what they were learning was the mark scheme, and the history was loosely attached'. That is what is happening, because you pinned it down there by 'there has got to be a trick I can find that allows me to send them in', because I will want them to do well, and not just for my kudos and the schools, but because for them getting good results and for all that comes with it, but it does produce that History is shoved to the side and the assessment is the thing in the centre of lessons from the beginning of Year 10, or the beginning Year 9 if that's when they start their GCSE.

Mike Goddard: But it doesn't give them the best results though.

Q6 Chair: So how do you get away from this mentality that I can download the mark scheme, I can download the criteria and work out the magic solutions you said to getting a certain grade? is it simply again through the criteria of that is should be more of a essay based approach, that there is ways in which those pupils that give the most unique individual answers can be rewarded without their teachers thinking, 'don't go there because you might lose marks, you are taking a risk'. How can we encourage people to take risks in

History? Do you think the examinations as they stand are right to be able to do that?

Marc Booker: It is easier to explain the problems in a sense rather than say 'here is a solution', because you already hit the nail on the head earlier on about lack of tiering, and I can certainly understand that. When you are setting questions, senior examiners are setting questions, that are going to be accessible to the entire ability range, we exist within a system that has to be and must be transparent, we have to set valid tests, tests effectively, they test what we set out to test, it is as simple as that. But actually doing that can be very, very challenging, and actually requires a lot of technical understanding to be able to produce questions of high quality. You have to have mark schemes that drive reliable marking, so that ultimately, we are able from discriminated answers across the ability range to draw stable grey boundaries, that teachers understand year on year, that make sense, that put their candidates, their students in the right rank order, they get the results that they expect, so this is a hugely high volume, high stakes operation, and in a sense that will always affect to some degree, the nature of assessment that you can sit in front of 200 or a 1000 candidates, this is massive.

Emily Scott: I think the other factor is the kind of shift from modular to linear might see some kind of changes, in that area there are a lot of teachers in the modular system whilst feeling that it worked for some students, felt that it does take a lot of time out the time available that you have to teach, and it is this constant teaching, but also preparing

for an assessment that is always looming very quickly on the horizon, so I think the move from the modular qualifications to linear ones might help with the kind of balance that there is able to be between teaching the content and preparing for the assessment.

Marc Booker: The question I was going to ask was whether these problems are peculiar to History, and I absolutely would absolutely imagine not, because of all those points of transparency and adverseness to risk must be more general, so the answers to the problems with History are going to be bigger than History, they are going to be more the system more generally. Obviously we are able to do some things I imagine, to get a better and more vibrant more positive historical culture in schools but if these things are absolute in the system, the league table, all those sorts of things, it is going to be a much bigger problem to really deal with effectively, isn't it?

Jamie Byrom: I was going to raise the issue which I think is relevant to this discussion, of breath and depth, because it always strikes me when I go into schools and I talk to teachers, what always hits me, because I often go in, because they ask for a subject specialist to go and talk about the sort of stuff that I am supposed to know about. What always strikes me is how much stuff, how many facts teachers are trying to convey, and I wonder whether there is an issue with when they are thinking about these mark schemes, and they are training their students to hit the A grades or whatever, what they are too concerned about is lots of detailed evidence of a kind that it seems to me, quite often goes beyond what I would expect my undergraduates to know. So I have been

in a situation in classrooms where I have given a general talk about some ideas, and these students, these are A-level students have asked me specific factual questions that I have no idea about. And I try to make a virtue of that as teachers do in that situation, but there is a kind of pedagogical issue of course underlying that, which seems to me they are bright students, no doubt in many cases, wasting their time and wasting valves in their brain cells by lodging away little nuggets of information, when what we would prefer them to do, from the point of view of HE, is to be thinking conceptually, and across longer periods of time, so this is where the breadth and depth issue comes in. So I wondered whether somehow if there was some kind of regulatory framework which required at GCSE level, as well as at A-level, longer, synoptic papers, then it just would be impossible for anybody, teachers, exam boards, peers and text book writers to cram the same number of facts in, and so you would be compelled to think about a 300 year paper in a different way, you would be compelled to do it in terms of thinking about categories and concepts over long periods of time, there is clearly a place for in depth knowledge as well, and I would say especially when it is connected to some kind of independent coursework, and I know there are issues about coursework. But I wonder what you feel from the perspective of the exam boards about that breadth/ depth issue, and getting more breadth into the curriculum, requiring schools to do more breadth might help to address this question of risk and compel them to take more risk, and compel them to take more risk in order to think over long periods of time.

Mike Goddard: I think it is already there to an extent, some of the things that you describe could partly be just a misunderstanding of what is actually required. We don't want them to be dumping lots of impressive knowledge into their essay if they are not using it in any useful way. It is always something to remember that at A-level the assessment objective is always use of knowledge, it is never just here is everything I know about Napoleon. The issue of themes, well we haven't got anything that is 300 years, but we do have an essay paper, so I think all History A-levels which requires a thematic approach to something.

Q7 Chair: I guess the sort of decision in my mind, and I guess in many other policy makers mind's is that we have got the GCSE, and to what extent ideas about what an A-level should be then fall onto the GCSEs lap, and what we should see as the GCSE. One argument and one battle is whether History is then compulsory until 16, does that level result in everyone taking a GCSE, maybe not, maybe there may be an alternative qualification out there, or for those people who have an ASDAN qualification for low attainers. But to what extent you can move towards a 300 year period in a GCSE. I am still very interested in the nuts and bolts. If History was made compulsory by the government, and as it will recommend in the national History review, what would you need to do as exam boards? If you had this sort of tapering in from year 7, so it gave you a 5 year platform from which to think about what a qualification would be. Because with the A-levels, which I will come onto, there is a large amount of choice and diversity which is welcomed, but that obviously brings up

the tension between as a pupil studying History, is one persons History completely different History, and the actual core content that someone will study. But for the GCSE you couldn't have the degree of choice, it wouldn't work in schools?

Emily Scott: I guess at GCSE you would have to take a view about whether, if History were compulsory, whether you were to have a chronological 11 to 16 approach, in which case the GCSE might inevitably end up with more of a focus on the modern world, or whether you would have a kind of model where you would still have a Key Stage 3 experience which might focus on British History, and then the GCSE experience which did allow you to go into more depth, International History, or Global History say, there are still different models for how you could structure the curriculum.

Marc Booker: I think one thing that you would have to do inevitably, is not so much focus on synoptic assessment, but try to build synoptic understanding through that course, and I think that is probably one of the deficits of A-level as well actually, because it is actually very difficult to do synoptic assessment. Ask a room of researchers and I suppose you would get five different answers of what that actually means anyway in terms of synoptic assessment. But typically in A-level, it always comes right at the very end, an attempt to draw together knowledge and understanding of different or new contexts. I think in History though, and I think what you would be keen to see that you are building up that synoptic understanding as you go along, especially in something like History where although we are not

quite talking about the ‘Yo Sushi’ approach of pick and mix what you like, we are talking about something that has coherence here, but nevertheless, as Jamie said earlier, that you revisit, that you are building up that understanding as you go through, I think there is certainly development models, SHP, where I think you might start to be a bit more critical is whether Modern World History really has a development model in quite the same way, where it is couched in, easily visible topics across a period of time. The difference with the SHP is that you have a very clear chronological period, from which you are testing and assessing particular developments. So it can be done, there is a very clear, very good model there already. But I think it is how you build that synoptic understanding rather than necessarily have something that is a little bit false, here is some synoptic assessment at the end, you should be benefiting from the synoptic understanding, and then of course writing, setting questions that reflect that you have candidates that coming to the examination with that understanding. So it is more than just the facts, it is putting the pieces together.

Jamie Byrom: When you use the phrase synoptic understanding there, there is very much what I am trying to drive at when I was talking to you about knowledge before, being resonant knowledge that you see this piece of information, or understand this bit of History, and it is resonant to that and that but not that, that is interesting, what is difference there, that the ability to do that, and I think that one can do that, perhaps at let’s call it GCSE, just by a requirement to draw on random, unspecified other periods in your

answer, begin to draw in allusions to, references to, similarities and differences with things outside of this narrower specification, and you will be rewarded. I think there are mechanisms that can be worked on to produce that. But I think the main thrust is about the conservatism, entirely understand, many of us in the classroom, and there are reasons for that. Therefore, to get this sort of qualitative shift in what we are looking for and rewarding in the classrooms, requires a bigger change than just a Key Stage 3 change, or just a GCSE change, it really is, I think 5 to 16 that will then kick start teachers in having to think differently. I think they will enjoy it and find it rewarding when they do.

Marc Booker: It is almost for me, a bit like the equivalent of numeracy, in that actually if you start drilling down into back as far as primary, you start to unpick some of the reasons and this is almost like historical literacy. But it is almost historical literacy that you need to build up and you need to build the foundations to be able to see the benefits at 16.

Q8 Chair: I am interested also in terms of particularly what Michael Gove has spoken about to where the government may be thinking. I don’t have an idea, but this idea of knowledge and of a core component of British History that if you had an 11 to 16 curriculum, and you had a summative assessment at the end at the same time as balancing what it is to be an historian in order to gain a synoptic understanding, current GCSEs as they stand do not qualify for being able to teach a broad basis of British History I would imagine so there would need to be a new qualification. How easy would

that be to produce? We have been running the Modern World and Schools History Project for 30 years. If you wanted to try and create an entirely new thing that went beyond Pilots, what would be involved? What would be the problems?

Mike Goddard: We have developed quite a few new things recently. The History A-level, History B which I mentioned, there was obviously the Pilot relatively recently, the Humanities. Each of those involved dragging in stakeholders from different directions, so teachers, who end up delivering it had quite a lot of input very early on at that stage. So we have got quite a good existing model of getting HE, and getting teachers in to help design the qualifications. We do talk to people like the Better History Group, on a regular basis, we don't just wait to be very on a very pressured time frame, so we would be ready to move quite quickly, but we would be very anxious about. At a recent consultative forum we held for History, which Peter Mandler and various other representatives from the History community were at, the issue of whether History should be compulsory until 16 was discussed was no consensus in the room at all, absolutely none, and one of the reasons, lots have been discussed today. Such as where the teachers are going to come from, but one of the other reasons was teachers out there should have the choice to deliver the type of GCSE that they think is most appropriate, and there still is a bit of concern that some of the established things like HP, like the Pilot, although that has already been hit on the head, like Ancient History, which is doing very well as a GCSE, would be

threatened, and there is a bit of fear over that.

Q9 Chair: But if they were told, then they can have a choice?

Jamie Byrom: Yes exactly, we could develop one.

Emily Scott: I think that we have done this quite a lot at A-level, and I think that the challenge is to develop and take those requirements, and to say that for example the requirements to have more British History at GCSE, to work with teachers and a range of stakeholders, as we already do. To find the most engaging and appropriate ways to do that for students, that both teacher which will feel confident delivering and teaching, and feeling that they have the understanding to deliver and also that would engage the most students. Because I think that many teachers would say is one of the reasons they choose at GCSE which to many might seem overdone, they do engage students. So I think that is the key thing, to find things that will motivate students to enjoy History and to go on and do A-level and to go on and study further.

Q10 Chair: How long does that take? Just as a process point to actually do that sort of stakeholder engagement, feedback, create trials, how long until you are happy with the qualification, in own experience previously?

Marc Booker: Depending on the regulatory hurdles of the time, you may be able to be able to do this rather more quickly, for example we developed a GCSE in Computer Science in eight months, and that includes concept testing, market testing, buy in from

employers, and other stakeholders, but that is development.

Jamie Byrom: Do remember, we are working with historians.

Marc Booker: But the current A-level redevelopment, the DfE timeline rather than the publication of the final criteria in October from Ofqual, is then looking for specifications, ready for accreditation, and may be in schools for the following September, so that is less than 12 months. I will let you come to your own conclusions about the workability of that. But the key is that if you have the buy in from stake holders, you are clear about what will work and what won't work, but even then you can only ever reach a small group of your intended audience. If you are looking for a transformation in change, you have got to secure a lot of buy in, and you are also talking about lead times earlier, you have got to ensure that you have teacher knowledge and capacity, in addition to their willingness, if you are getting to the point of assessment. If this was compulsory, you are going from I think 280 000 to 786 000 candidates, and that is a huge number in terms of recruitment for all organisations, in terms of a viable examiner population. A large number of our examination workforce are over the age of 55, and I am not trying to be ageist, but I am simply saying that it is an issue that is affecting, I am sure it affects colleagues equally.

Jamie Byrom: So all those aspects that we talked about earlier actually become even more emphatic when in context of the sort of change that is being suggested. If it is done rapidly, then the question of plus compulsory, plus the sort of problems of training required and

then exam leaders are saying you need a whole bunch of exams, which is a very big ask.

Marc Booker: If we are talking about the kinds of assessment that is much more open and has challenge, although I am not sure of what the sort of grade F and G candidates would make of that if it is un-tiered, you have to bear that in mind. All sorts of issues there, but if you accept all of that, you have got to recognise that you have got to not only train your examiners to be examiners, but you have got to train them to a very high level, so that they don't ignore or don't wrongly suggest that something is irrelevant when it actually is relevant, and that we are assessing the quality of thinking, and the evidence that lies behind it. Again, this isn't exactly giving you solutions, but if you are saying I think bluntly, that to do this on the kind of scale that is being suggested, transformation, a real step change in History teaching and History assessment, that does require time and resources.

Q11 Chair: How many pupils or examination papers per examiner would you have on ratio? 100 papers per examiner?

Mike Goddard: It depends on the experience of the examiner, a new examiner would do 120 as a maximum, but an experienced examiner might be able to cope with 200, so that sort of numbers.

Jamie Byrom: And it depends on the length of the paper.

Marc Booker: Can I just chip in, in answering your question about the logistics and practicalities of this. In a

sense, while SHP doesn't run accredited exam courses and such like, and as I started this afternoon by saying that it is about its principles and priorities of diversity and such like, it has closely identified with some particular GCSE specs, that have particular content, and the clearly if that were re-arranged, there would be serious work to be done by the SHP community, mainly classroom teachers in terms of devising at precisely the same time as looking the exam groups are working on these responses to whatever is proposed. So I think there would be a rich opportunity then to get more of the working together across the exam groups and in the classroom through such an idea, but there would be implications for SHP, and not tied down to this sort of minutiae that you have to control.

Jamie Byrom: Clearly History to 16 has a huge resource implication, fundamentally I think that we are all about making sure that if it did come to pass then it was done properly, but I think the fact of the matter is that it is all doable if the resources are there and timescales are right, and that's fundamentally the really important thing.

Marc Booker: And would solve lots of things which we are identifying in answer to your first question that we find difficult about the current situation in terms of mismatch between the Key Stages and people stopping early, so much more flow or coherence that could be achieved.

Jamie Byrom: I think my feeling is that sitting in front of us we have sitting a solution to so many of the problems that we are concerned about with the History curriculum, and with the right resources

and the right time. And I sensed Graham's frustration earlier on that he obviously answers, because at the end of the day there has to come a point when something is done, but I think if we are offering a solution that History to 16 is probably it, but with the proviso that there is an understanding of the very real implications that that has, and that a realistic appreciation of what the timescales would need to be and what sort of resources that would need to be committed to make it work.

Q12 Chair: In terms of looking at the methods of assessment to 16 rather than just A-level, we will come onto A-level in a moment. Looking at coursework assessment, I know that there has been political narrative that there has gone against coursework in the past five years. But if you had a baccalaureate which usually a written piece of work is a key component of that kind of baccalaureate. You obviously had a situation with your GCSE which is no longer a GCSE because of 75% coursework. Would you welcome an element of coursework if there was a GCSE that catered for compulsory History? What are your thoughts about whether the makeup of a History GCSE if you had compulsory History for all, whether coursework would help, or be a hindrance?

Emily Scott: I think coursework can deal with some of the issues that have been talked about already, so the approach to sources is one of those, the ways of assessing, the ways that you can assess certain skills in an exam are limited by the amount of time that you have available, and what students will be expected to do where as more thoughtful enquiry based work, coursework can be an effective way of assessing some of

those skills. So I think absolutely there is a place for it, I think schools will struggle with the introduction of controlled assessment, because some of the administrative issues and the manageability of that in schools, and potentially a place for different models, so we have got our international GCSEs and certificates suit some schools, who don't welcome specifications that happen in our assessment or coursework, and there is the possibility for choice as well.

Q13 Chair: Because the I-GCSE does have coursework?

Emily Scott: Doesn't.

Mike Goddard: I was going with that, not much more to add to that, I think that giving schools the choice is something that OCR would support, and you do get a lot of out of coursework. Examiners say to me that they see the best work in coursework, and it is not difficult to see why.

Jamie Byrom: Can I just also make a neutral observation that in the Pilot, the distinction wasn't between coursework and teacher assessed work, which is also worth bearing in mind, that it doesn't need to be the well trodden path of coursework, there can be things where the pupils are given on raises all sorts of issues that is broadly not just teachers that understand the phrase, coursework.

Emily Scott: I think it can help with some of the issues that we talked about low attaining students as well. Some teachers talk to us about their fears about linear assessment is the volume of content the students have to hold in their heads for the exams at the end of the course. I think that different types of

students suit different sorts of assessment and it could help to make History a subject that is more approachable, because you get rid of some of those of issues about the accessibility of questions in the exams, so its understanding what the question is asking you to do, because there is more scope for teachers to grade it in a way that is appropriate for students.

Marc Booker: Can I ask is History pretty much at the far end of the spectrum in terms of recall threshold where you can start doing something with what you bring into the exam answer, so literature they might bring in notes and things, English Literature, but History they don't?

Emily Scott: I don't know that they do in English Literature anymore, I am not 100% sure. I don't know.

Marc Booker: Okay, but I do think that that is an issue that not only is the conceptual demand high in a History exam, but before you can even playing with the ideas, you have got to pull them out of somewhere, there is a recall challenge as well, that is not the case for many other subjects.

Jamie Byrom: I don't want to sound like some dour person who turns up and rather depresses everybody, but there are some reasons why coursework isn't a great thing. Teachers have to mark it, not all teachers enjoy that aspect, and to be told they have to do it, look at the experience of Maths GCSE for example, where you have lots of coursework options, you then have to be absolutely clear that you have comparability across those options, so it is how do you go about achieving that comparability, if

you look at the legacy GCSE, that is the previous GCSE specifications, you will have seen coursework contributing more and more to a candidates overall outcome and written papers contributing less. Which kind of goes against the whole point against whiz-bang assessment, if actually at the end of the day all you are going to do is then load it up with coursework. So it is the difference between intended and achieved weightings, that's the technical phrase, and over time, coursework more so than controlled assessment, because controlled assessment as the rules go at the moment highly unpopular, you have to change the tasks every year, but because with coursework typically those tasks have remained, they were set in year 1 and still there in year 8 of a specifications life, sure teachers are familiar with how to teach around them, possibly to them, students benefit from that, and you see outcomes on the coursework units increase and therefore they have more impact on the overall outcome, so those are the sort of health warnings that have to go next to coursework.

Q14 Chair: If we can have a discussion around A-level provision, I know I consciously left it out of the discussions, simply because part of the aspect of the core meeting is looking at History to sixteen. But nonetheless in terms of the sort of loop feed as it were, I don't like to call it supply chains, it sounds like historians are like fish or something, but in order to produce those people who are going to go on and study History at university and have the progression, I think it is a valid discussion to have. You mentioned all three examining boards, about the variety now that is taking place probably since the

curriculum 2000 reforms I would imagine that in a way modularisation may provide a greater degree of content or options for pupils to take, even if it looks like moving away from the 2000 reforms, are you concerned at all? Or would you welcome, as you have mentioned, the return to the linear approach?

Marc Booker: I think for AQA we are concerned I guess on behalf of teachers, Graham raised the question I think earlier on about what was happening to History specifications at GCSE in fact there is a whole timeline so you have got the inclusion of SPAG, spelling, punctuation and grammar marks next year, which has been done in a really kind of quick way, not quite the best description for it, in terms of adding, simply adding or making 5% of the total marks late to spelling, punctuation and grammar. I think Ofqual are undertaking a research exercise to see how that should be done, so this is a kind of short term measure. 2014 you have then got linear examinations, so you are starting this September on a GCSE course, or if you were in Year 9 last year, that is supposed to be taking a linear specification, then in 2015 you will have slightly amended History specifications, because they all went back to Ofqual, because they were looking for some amendments, different things, different awarding organisations, because the previous accreditors which would have been QCDA, allowed some differences to slip through between the different specifications, so this was Ofqual's attempt to effectively tighten up. So if the question was targeting A01, it really was targeting A01 for example. So it was aspects like that. So you have got sort of small changes, but it is the

cumulative effect of change on teachers and I guess it is that kind of context in which we have got to put other change into, and that is affecting History. I think in a way the A-level development that is kicking off now, is a good opportunity because we expect GCSE to follow almost immediately, so that if we are starting specifications for A-level first teaching 2014, but we probably expect to see first teaching of GCSE in 2015, and first assessment in 2017. So in a sense it is timely to be having this kind of debate, but then the issue come to who owns the subject criteria. So for A-level, Ofqual absolutely doesn't own the subject criteria, at least not in terms of content, and Michal Gove's letter to Ofqual stated very, very clearly that that was in the domain of, higher education, but I know that there is a great debate going on in higher education as to how that should be done and whether what is suitable for one group of higher education alliances is necessarily good for all alliance groups, or indeed learned societies for that matter. There is a lot of debate and discussion that has got to go on there, but it is clear that HE has an input there into the content. Going forward, if Ofqual have said that they don't have curriculum expertise, then therefore don't own subject content, when it comes to GCSE, really interesting to see who does own subject content. So I am sure, as my colleagues here, I think we have all said that we would respond absolutely to our customers, and schools and colleges', other stakeholders, whether subject associations, learned societies and of course don't forget employers as well. So we would always respond to that, and we would listen to their demands as well, but of course it is whether there is going to be a very, very prescriptive

framework, and I guess that one way which a very clear idea about how you have compulsory History and it should look like this would get railroaded, but then if you don't have a framework in which prescription exists. So I think it's probably understanding the mechanisms at GCSE if anything else.

Jamie Byrom: Can I start by saying that we as university teachers in History departments always complain about the quality of the students, on the grounds that they are only half as good as we were at their age, but generally the one thing that is very, very obvious about them, and I think that all my colleagues have said this, is that they are passionate about their subject. They are not necessarily doing it because their mum and dad has told them you have got to do it to get a good job or whatever, even though they may well go on and get good jobs from it, but they are not seeing it in a functionalist way, they are seeing it in a way of, in terms of absolute commitment, engagement, to fit their imagination etc. So something is going right in the system, which is producing kids like that, and our sense is that the A-level is the lesser of the problem, and that there are issues, some of them we have talked about today, like the variety, we were worried about over prescription and all the rest of it. But we also fear, as I think, as Mark has been bring up that rushing has come up several times. Rushing thing through is going to cause problems, it will definitely cause unintended consequences which will then have to deal with all sorts of logistic and practical problems that need to be taken into account, we must lose the sense I think of things that are going well, and going right in the system. There is a lot of nudging to do, an all the

rest of it, but the system is good in terms of what we do. Now we know that is not the only reason A-levels, we only see a group of students come forward who do GCSE History, or A-level History, and I am sure that the universities will, as the suggestion seems to be, and certainly learned societies will come in on this and will be pulled in and asked to contribute towards the formulation of subject specifications. But there are lots of problems about that, I think that the Russell Group has been sort of designated as potential interlocutor there. We as learned society have, I think all the three authors of our report, and I think are at Russell Group Universities, I am I think only just in one which has only just been made, which is Queen Mary. But I think probably the majority of our colleagues are not at Russell group. We know that many of the indicators of where the research quality is suggests that research is not confined to the Russell group, and the RAF, the RAE and now the RAF has impersonated pockets of excellence right though the system, pre 92', and post 92', whatever, so it is not just the Russell Group. If you look at the national student survey, you will not see that totally dominated by the Russell Group, so there are many issues about that, which one is slightly worried about, but I think clearly if that is the way in which things are going, we will come in, and we obviously want to work in a very progressive way. But I think where we are coming in from is not sort of 'of lets be all imperialistic and expansionist about this, but let's work together and try and make things work, but let's also make sure that we don't chuck the baby out with the bathwater, because there is so much that's good about the kids that we see that have been through this

system, and that there are people that have dropped out and gone in other directions, I don't believe that they turn out to famous professors of Natural History, but we are aware of the partiality of our view, but that's where I think we would be coming in.

Mike Goddard: If I could just add to that, I think it would be a very good thing if universities and schools had more contact, and any increased contact between HE practitioners, which I guess we are, and the exam boards, can only be beneficial for both of us, so as Colin says, I think as historians in university, we would be enthusiastic about being more involved in A-levels, so long as the right structures were in place, and obviously the big issues about the time and money and all of those types of things, but if you could sort all that out, we would be enthusiastic about it, not seeing it as imperialism, but as in a two way process of learning, we need to understand better than we do, where our students are coming from, just as I think it would be, I hope, beneficial in the construction of A-levels, for you to understand a little bit better about what we are looking for at undergraduate level.

Q15 Chair: I wanted to raise the issue of something that was reported, of provision of GCSE History, and whether it is propagation of the big take in, broken down by free school meals, ethnicity, local authority, and begun to do some of the data on A-level, because obviously, the situation there just compounds itself hugely, and you have the situation where there are 4 pupils in Knowsley who passed, I think there were 12 who took History A-level in the whole of Knowsley and only 4 got a

pass. Do you collate any data as examination boards looking at who is taking your History qualifications, in terms of independents schools, selected schools, which particular, the geography of your markets? Is that something that you have some data on?

Emily Scott: I think that we do have that, I mean we certainly know what types of schools our centres are, I don't know to what level of detail we go, but we certainly do know what types of schools they are.

Marc Booker: Yeah, there are 9 categories of centres, we could send you details of that, and also AQA on behalf of JCQ, which represents all the re-organisations, produces annual data on entries and outcomes by those 9 categories, so there is a substantial data set. Where that data set gets used by awarding organisations is really around maintenance of standards from year to year, so it is not used in a sense of looking at social inclusions of a particular subject or that sort of nature, and similarly it is giving you numerical outcomes rather than something that you could then use in terms of marketing or some other purpose. So it is very much about standard setting and maintenance of standards, we produce that data.

Q16 Chair: In terms of A-level provision, and also we can talk about GCSE, have you seen trends in terms of schools, we spoke about this at the beginning about academies, but is there any comment you would like to make about the way that History provision at A-level is going? Is there a trend?

Emily Scott: At GCSE we certainly see, it was really interesting to see the results

of your report, but we have certainly seen that, this is more of an anecdotal level, but our GCSE entries for this year, for those first cohort of Year 10's have certainly increased, and we are seeing schools increase in terms of students, and I do get the perception from the schools that I have talked to, that the impact will vary across different types of schools, and naturally it is some of those type of comprehensive schools where the provision of GCSE History become very low. Where I have talked to schools where they have had doubling or tripling of candidate numbers at GCSE, and you can only imagine that that will over time have a knock on impact at A-level as more students take GCSE's, then more of those students will go on to do the A-levels, so.

Q17 Chair: Just on that point, do you ever look at retention, pupils taking your examinations and books, and then teachers then carrying on because they trust the brand, so you will have pupils taking the your examination at GCSE History, and then what percentage carry on through onto A-level?

Marc Booker: You can't, because you are not identifying individual students, so you are only getting global numbers which could be someone joining a post 16 institution, and you wouldn't necessarily know where they have gone to.

Q18 Chair: Well are there any other issues that you would like to raise, any examples that would be fed into the report that I have missed off?

Marc Booker: Well I mean it's probably actually in answer to the question that you start off with, the very

first session about should History be compulsory in schools until 16, and here is where I would probably get thrown into the Thames by my peers, but so I think AQA's position is actually that we don't necessarily support the GCSE History compulsory to 16. But we do regard the inclusion of a humanities subject as important and I think some of the reasons that we outlined earlier on, and maybe even the expert panel considered and I think there, I know your attention was very much talked about how much is taught rather than what is taught and why it is taught, but I think you can only be address, the notion of compulsory if you do address what is taught and the why, because I don't think all History is the same necessarily, it has different meaning, and different meaning to different groups, at different times. You are a historian and you know that. So I think where we are, is that we couldn't necessarily say at the moment is that History is necessarily better than Geography, or better than Modern Foreign Languages. So I think from that perspective, we would, it sounds a bit like we are sitting on the fence, I appreciate, but it will depend very much on how society, how employers, perceive and therefore value whatever History qualification that you produce as to whether then that then is more popular in uptake than say Geography for MFL, I think it is looking at the whole curriculum, rather than being too narrow.

Jamie Byrom: Can I just say that I think we are probably closer to that, because I think our standing point is that whatever happens, we do not want it to be botched, because we think a bad outcome of a really bad new way of doing things which taught History to 16 would be far, far worse that, so we

would be willing to look at other possibilities. We accept after all that something like Geography or Modern Foreign Languages, it is something that I as a historian oversee, in France in fact, feel very strongly about, which does impact on this whole aspect, the problems of Modern Languages that they face in schools, right through the system, and that is not something that we are gonna solve. We have to take that on much more seriously at university level, and there is a slight anxiety that I have, as I know that many colleagues do, that an over emphasis, or a major shift of emphasis towards British History, would actually have an impact. Probably in terms of Foreign Languages, but also in terms of the type of student that is coming though and their range of experience, and the range of histories which they would study probably wouldn't be a good thing. But I understand obviously, that many colleagues feel very strongly about British History, and I understand that the wider narrative points, we are not going to find unity in any of these aspects, but on the other hand there are a number of concerns that I.

Emily Scott: I think that I need to agree, as I have said, we did supported a balanced curriculum, and have always stood for a balanced curriculum, and if we do look at these issues, we have to look at them in the whole, History cannot exist within a vacuum, and very much in favour of that notion that Jamie brought up, that Michael Riley has discussed, and that is British, European, Global, Intellectual History, it is a broad subject, and we shouldn't narrow it.

Jamie Byrom: Just to add to that if I may, I want to pick up on the, maybe not

on the History, but yes, the humanities. I just am very uncomfortable when we all use the phrase humanities. It isn't a National Curriculum subject in the same way that expressive art or something like this has got a clearer identity, but still not a measurable.

Marc Booker: Humanities subject is what I was driving at.

Jamie Byrom: Sure, yeah, but even there I was struggling a little bit because of what I said before about curriculum alliances that are helpful at 14 to 16 tend to be with the art and the metric literature and so on, so I got back to the needs of the young person, which is what the SHP has always based itself upon, and trying to make sure that that sense of meeting needs in terms of identity, cultural literacy and making sense of what is relevant. Those needs need to be the centre of it, and therefore I would be reluctant, for example to see a 'well if you don't do this History through to 16, you have to be the Geography to 16', because I don't think it is doing the thing that I want to do for young people. History has the power to do that, Geography I am sure has the power to do extraordinarily useful things, but they are not the same as the History.

Marc Booker: And I would say that AQA as a large research centre which, in terms of how it informs our positioning and thinking, it is very much evidence led, so I guess I would throw the challenge back and say 'show us the evidence, if it is compelling, I think we would shift our position.'

Chair: Well thank you all for coming, you have all been very patient to spend the entirety of your afternoon here. In terms of what happens now, obviously we are taking a transcript of the meeting, and in addition, I was hoping to hold another session, possibly with David Cameron and a couple of historians, but the idea will be cross party group of MPs we will sit down and there will be a report being released around the end of June, but obviously I will keep you all fully in the loop and engaged in the process. So thanks so much for giving up your time, to have what I think has been an incredibly important discussion, sorry I seemed so obtuse at times, I just wanted to get down to the nuts and bolts of what things would mean, because I think while you can have a linear debate about the dogmatic, ideological approach of History until 16, we have to go steady and look at every single issue in terms of what that means as well as what History should be, so thank you very much for everything.

All Party Parliamentary Group on Archives and Archives
History in Schools: Third Evidence Session
History for all until sixteen

Members Present:
Chris Skidmore MP (Chair)

Examination of Witnesses

Fred Bosanquet, History Teacher, Dartford Grammar School

Q1 Chair: For this evidence session we have Fred Bosanquet, History Teacher at Dartford Grammar School for Boys. Fred could you explained briefly what History provision there is in Dartford, I understand that it is quite unusual in that it is related to the IB and the middle years IB programme, is that correct?

Fred Bosanquet: That is right, we are still doing three Key Stages, Key Stage 3 History is taught as part of combined Humanities, so it is not necessarily taught by a subject specialist. We do a fairly standard Key Stage 3 programme; on average they would be taught two lessons a week, 50 minutes each. That would be mostly British history, medieval, early modern, Victorians, World War one, World War two. At GCSE we do the SHP, AQA exam board, and for that we do Medicine through Time as the breadth study, American West as the depth study and the coursework is on fortified castles and reasons for their location, and we use ruptures to castles as a case study for that, and where that is different is the IB. We do the IB diploma, and History is taught as part of that, it is an option, it

comes under group 3, which is the societies unit, or societies group of subjects and that is standard level

History, mainly 20th century History, we do causes, practices and effects of wars, single party states, higher level develops after that was mainly 19th century History. So German and Italian unification, Bismarck and Imperial Russia, there is also coursework unit which is 2000 words, source based analysis, well not sourced based, but they get their own range of books and write not quite an essay. It is a carefully structured essay, a piece of deeper historical analysis, on a topic of their choice, and that can be on anything.

Q2Chair: In terms of the number of pupils taking each strand, do only certain pupils take the diploma aspect of the IB, or do some do the SHP?

Fred Bosanquet: Well the way it works is because GCSEs are compulsory, they do for the middle years project, which is the Key Stage 4 strand of the IB. But that is done alongside GCSEs, they are not assessed or anything, they do various projects towards the middle years project, and then they will do their GCSE.

Q3Chair: And they complement each other?

Fred Bosanquet: They do, there is a debate within the school about how

much they complement each other, some teachers don't think they do. With GCSE results the focus that most teachers tend to focus on GCSE.

Q5Chair: So in terms of the two lessons that are 50 minutes each, how would it break down when you are focusing on the IB middle years programme as opposed to the GCSE content and working towards the exam? Is that up to the teacher to decide how they balance the two projects or are there guidelines how?

Fred Bosanquet: There are guidelines. Key Stage 3 is two lessons; Key Stage 4 is where History is an option. About up to 50% of pupils take History, they can only take one humanity. That is another part of the IB, so they will have three lessons a week for years 10 and 11 where they follow the Key Stage 4. There are guidelines, teachers are meant to do certain NYP assessments, they are meant to be focused more on independent learning. There is various things like pupils coming up with their own research questions and developing, going beyond the textbook to do their own independent research. Assessment is more presentation based than just written based, there is a large written component, so there are guidelines on how it is supposed to be mixed, some teachers won't do it at all at the moment if they don't have to, some teachers will make an effort to try and link them. The overall emphasis though is on GCSEs, that is the overwhelming focus for Key Stage 4.

Q6Chair: Just in terms of those NYP assessments, there are obviously internal assessments, and there are no exams as

part of the NYP to 16. What guidance, does it come from the IBO?

Fred Bosanquet: It does, every IB school has to have a designated middle year's programme co-ordinator, who runs the middle year's programme, at the moment that is a history teacher, but it needn't, it could be any subject, and they will give guidelines. It is incredibly complex, the whole system of setting up middle years programme assessments and it keeps changing from IB, which is what puts a lot of teachers off. A lot of teachers agree with the principles of it, but the admin and bureaucracy that goes with it tends to be quite a lot, because it keeps changing every couple of years or so. They have a range of assessment guidelines as to how you award a grade, the levels go from 1 to 7. It is all internally assessed, how it is awarded is based on various criteria, such as how well they complete their presentations. The progression levels, there is some similarities with GCSEs, so better analysis, more detailed answers, more rigorous critical analysis and so on, so there is a range of those factors. Generally because it is internally assessed, the assessment is not taken as seriously as GCSEs. At the report it is very much 'this is your GCSE grade, this is your NYP grade', to be honest the GCSE grade is what really counts, it is what the parents will value, it is what the pupils will value. The NYP grade they will just be like 'oh that's nice.'

Q7Chair: Do they correlate it all in terms of performance?

Fred Bosanquet: They tend to, though not necessarily, the reason why the NYP was introduced is because the GCSE is very much a schematic, 'you do this, you

follow this and you get this grade' and the IB, the NYP is more of a messier, sort of open ended approach to learning.

Q8Chair: So in the two year for Key Stage 4, I remember the GCSE and the necessary approach to assessment is to sort of drill you through how to answer the paper. In terms of the NYP as well, in those two years to Key Stage 4, what sort of additional aspects would the pupils be studying, in terms of how many extra projects, what would you see as the extra load upon the pupil in addition to the GCSE? So they have got to do their standard go through the textbook. If you had to estimate per pupil, how many extra presentations or bits of coursework that they would do?

Fred Bosanquet: In year 11 we focus just on the GCSE, in year 9 and 10, which we do at Key Stage 4 over three years they will generally do about four or five middle years programme assessments a year, one of them might be an essay, so you might write a 1200 word essay, which is more than you would have to do for GCSE. There is no, certainly not the SHP AQA band, you wouldn't have to do anything like that for GCSE, so you could develop essay writing techniques, and for which you would have to write references and a bibliography.

Q9Chair: And that is coursework rather than under exam conditions?

Fred Bosanquet: Yea that would be internally assessed, so usually it would be under the guidance of the teacher and they might finish it for homework. They might do a group presentation on, it could be anything; renaissance medical pioneers for instance, for which they will

have to research, go through various, come up with a question, come up with a methodology and reflect on it. All of this you won't get from GCSE, where you don't need to reflect for instance on your GCSE test. That is a good approach to learning anyway, but there is no official assessment built into the GCSE for those sorts of elements, so it does bring in, if done properly, additional ways of learning and ways of doing work.

Q10Chair: In terms of the curriculum content for NYP, with Key Stage 4, given that it is driven so much by the assessment, often Key Stage 3 is a more rounded curriculum that Key Stage 4, I was interested that you mentioned with NYP that you had German, Italian History.

Fred Bosanquet: That is the IB.

Q11Chair: That is the IB?

Fred Bosanquet: That is just for Key Stage 5. The content for the IB, for the middle years programme is driven by whatever compulsory assessment that you do, so whatever country you are in, the form of assessment drives the content, there is no additional content. The 6th form IB diploma is different, that is exclusively determined by the IBO. So the diploma is their sort of, flagship education programme. The NYP is basically meant to prepare students for doing the diploma. So for instance if you learn how to write an essay in Year 9 you are better prepared to take the diploma in six subjects, rather than just doing a GCSE where for History at least you don't really have to write essays.

Q12Chair: So in a way, having the NYP Programme complimenting the

GCSE, it is almost like a Methods in History type of addition.

Fred Bosanquet: Yes, although it is not subject specific, that is the other shortcoming, that the criteria, such as coming up with your own research question, that is generic to all subjects. So there isn't really anything in the NYP that is specific to History, there is a humanities strand of the NYP, they don't ever refer to History as a discreet subject in that sense, and there are things you are meant to look at, but it is things like, concepts like time and place and space, they are fairly generic concepts. A lot of it is based on how knowledge can be developed practically for use in the real world, so you might do a presentation on modern surgery anatomy. If you were doing an NYP that would have to be linked to how that might be useful in some sense, rather than just writing about it in a GCSE sense, where it would be more traditional critical analysis of some sort of historical significance.

Q13Chair: You mentioned about the aspects of humanities, and in previous meetings that we had, a lot of historians are insistent that it had to be a discreet subject and we shouldn't move to a basis where we have Geography and History being taught in some sort of combined humanities. They also thought that there is a fear, particularly in Key Stage 3 in addition with what they saw was Key Stage 3 being squeezed into two years because as long as you teach the curriculum, it doesn't matter how fast you teach the curriculum. Do you think the humanities thing is something that works well in Dartford? Could you give me an explanation about what the Key Stage 3 humanities course involves and how you manage to balance?

Fred Bosanquet: Well a lot of the justification comes from a curriculum changeover; the idea was they would start Key Stage 4 a year earlier rather than in year 10, and do early entry for GCSEs, well a lot of GCSEs. That worked in some subjects, it didn't work in History because of emotional maturity and also the writing stamina, which tends to come more at sixteen than fifteen. So that was abandoned, so they do normal entry at 16 for GCSE, but that means the Key Stage 4 is being stretched over 3 years when it perfectly feasibly, it was designed to be taught in two. So what that means is they just do more depth in the subjects, we teach the American West for the whole year. That comes on the back of a two year humanities course, where they will study a lot of History subjects, but not in very much depth, only about a third of that will be taught by a subject specialist. So it is by no means ideal, and most teachers recognise it, but the reason it hasn't been changed is simply because that is the school curriculum at the moment and GCSE is such a priority for the school. But it does yield quite good GCSE results if you have been studying GCSEs for three years, and they are bright pupils the boys at Dartford are, you can drill in exam technique, even if conceptually their understanding of History isn't as developed as it should be. I think that is quite a common issue on the ground what happens in schools. So that is the justification. In terms of how it fits together, I think most teachers; certainly History teachers would say the curriculum doesn't really cohere from Key Stage 3 to 4, to 5, there are various steps trying to remedy it, but it is more sort of sticking plaster jobs,

like there is a History Club to try to develop more methodological skills.

Q14Chair: Well that is interesting that you mention the lack of coherence between the three Key Stages. I have seen in terms of media tabloid obsession with British History and how much British History should be known by pupils, do you find that British History is essentially taught in Key Stage 3, that you are able to teach the requirements of Key Stage 3 with the humanities course? Are you able to get through the entire Key Stage 3 curriculum as it currently stands? Or do you think that is too much to be fitted in to a three year period when pupils may not be intellectually mature enough to understand?

Fred Bosanquet: There has been various attempts to come up with better Key Stage 3 curriculums, I think no matter how good the curriculum, you are always working against the limitation that it finishes when they are 14 or 13, and I think that subjects that people have abandoned by that age and don't do any more, they tend never to get, or very rarely get the range of knowledge that would be desirable and more so the understanding of the subject. People abandon languages before then they tend not to learn very much. We teach a lot of British History in Key Stage 3, it probably could cohere a bit better than it does in terms of the theme, we tend to take power and authority and how that has evolved over the last millennium as a theme, and that is assessed at the end of each year. Fitting in more content would be difficult and probably counterproductive. I don't think there is any need to reduce it, we can cover a lot, but in terms of what is retained. I have done some research into this myself, and

from Key Stage 4 to Key Stage 3, the level of detail that is retained is not very much, and it tends to be kind of detail that is sort of clichéd, memories of the past like the fire of London or Guy Fawkes or some sort of interesting fact they have picked up, rather than some sort of narrative which is coherent, and is a reasonable account of historical processes over that time.

Q15Chair: In terms of with Key Stage 3, you mentioned earlier about the various aspects, Victorians' and getting across a sense of chronology is History taught with the chronology in mind so that you work from one particular point, one particular century and work forward? Or are pupils allowed to jump back and forth?

Fred Bosanquet: It is broadly chronological; we have tried to develop the curriculum a bit in various ways to get a sense of chronology. So one approach we have done, an idea that has come in recently is the idea of framework, which has been quite widely discussed, the Historical Associations for instance have done a lot of articles on this and teaching History. So they will do a few topics of say Medieval History and then revisit the whole period, to try and get a sense of chronology we will do some assessments that are based over several centuries rather than just a discrete topic like Thomas Beckett or Tudors or the Victorians. Success has been limited in terms of how well the average pupil gets that sense of chronology, most of them have quite a patchy sense I would say of the general chronology of events. And processes, over Key Stage 3, by the end of Key Stage 3, by the end of Key Stage 5 it is better, not because they have necessarily studied it more, just because I

think it's actually understand things better, they have got more grasp of history, they are older. But it is still, there are I would say very few pupils in the school who have a good sense of chronology of even British History over the last thousand years. By the end of Key Stage 5 probably, they have got good understanding of some depth studies and what they need to do for the exam, they are very adept at learning what they need to do to pass an exam, but in terms of broad chronology, because it's not demanded, it is not required, they won't, they tend not to require it.

Q16Chair: Do you think that is a possible failure of the Key Stage 4 assessment in particular?

Fred Bosanquet: I think it defiantly is, it depends what you want as an outcome, what are the aims and purposes of a history education? Do you want them to memorise fifty key dates and what happened, which would be perfectly possible, you could do it. History has moved away from that idea of trying to abandon the over arching chronology and going for more concepts like use of evidence, understanding of how change works, understanding of how different accounts are produced and why different people have different views of the same events and so on. So it is certainly a limitation.

Q17Chair: Do you think that looking at History as a possible core subject until 16, you mentioned that roughly 50% of pupils are taking History through to Key Stage 4, and obviously you are a grammar school, but even within the grammar school there must be a range of capabilities amongst your pupils. Do you

find that it is the best and the brightest who are taking History, and you have a capacity issue there, that it's the less able pupils who are deciding to drop History? Is there a pattern at all?

Fred Bosanquet: A broad pattern, not exclusively, but generally the brighter pupils will tend to favour History. But there are plenty of exceptions, and there is the range of abilities, exam results tend to be A* to C pretty much. We are trying to eliminate below C grades.

Q18Chair: So you are a five form entry?

Fred Bosanquet: A five form entry in year 7, yeah. 150 roughly.

Q19Chair: Roughly 75 pupils?

Fred Bosanquet: That will be about right, yeah.

Q20Chair: So you are talking maybe three classes?

Fred Bosanquet: Three classes, usually.

Q21Chair: And are they setted or?

Fred Bosanquet: No, there is a policy against setting in the school. I don't think it will ever happen in subjects like History. They do it for Maths, they do it for some languages, they wouldn't do it for History.

Q22Chair: And in terms of teaching across the ability range, in terms of having strategies for teaching those pupils who maybe struggling in the class and whether it is called differentiation. Do you use strategies? Is that something you have to use in History? Because

History is as a subject quite difficult to get across?

Fred Bosanquet: Yes, differentiation is something that every teacher probably would say they should do more of, of should be doing more of. You get the range of, you get the pupil who would get an A* if they sat the exam tomorrow, as soon as the first homework comes in you can tell who is going to get an A* easily and who is really struggling. It is really much linked to this use of write and capacity and literacy for History. If somebody is a fluent writer and has a reasonably memory and facility for producing some decent probes and supporting their points with fact, they can get an A/A*. I would say in most cases without too much trouble. If they struggle with this idea that History is an expansive subject, and you have to expand your range of explanation and you have to support things with points, you can't just write general vague clichés, you have got to use specific evidence, most of the feedback and most of the reflection is based on that. So there are things you can do if someone is really struggling with writing, along with piece of prose, you can give them a few points to work with. But the aim of that is the bottom is lifted up to a minimum.

Q23Chair: It is interesting that you mentioned also about internal assessments at the end of each year, based on a written exam?

Fred Bosanquet: Yes, well that would, in Key Stage 3 we write our own, which are based on the National Curriculum. Although that is changing next year, we are abolishing the National Curriculum for Key Stage 3, because we are an academy we are allowed to do that now.

It will solely be a middle years programme for Key Stage 3, Key Stage 4 we will obviously keep GCSE assessments, but there will be more middle years programme assessments.

Q24Chair: So what will the NYP for Key Stage 3 look like if you don't have to follow the curriculum anymore? Is that something that the curriculum is set out by the IBO or do you get to put it together yourselves?

Fred Bosanquet: Well, there are guidelines from the IBO, but as I say they are not subject specific, we could put it together ourselves, but it would probably be more global in outlook, there would probably be less History specific questions as unit questions and probably be more generic global questions such as 'How has immigration affected communities worldwide?' I think some sort of general question.

Q25Chair: And would it be up to the teacher to devise away from the National Curriculum, to devise which subjects, which countries histories are chosen?

Fred Bosanquet: Yea it would be up to the teacher, it is hard to see exactly how it would look because it hasn't been done yet, but I think they would certainly be. The emphasis on the international baccalaureate is obviously the international; it is almost a move away from the unit of the nation. It will be a mix between the very local, so they do sort of local citizenship type thing, based around Dartford and Rochester and Rochester castle and cathedral, and then the global, so immigration or human rights. It is more of a citizenship based curriculum.

Q26Chair: Because you are not required to do citizenship, you will be able to teach citizenship through History?

Fred Bosanquet: Well that is the sort of sub-text of the IB, certainly of the NYP level, it is very much History as a vehicle for making pupils more aware of themselves, and their role in the world, and how they should act towards others. So the History curriculum would be delivered around what they call areas of interaction, of which one is environments, one is community and service, one is approaches to learning, as in how do we actually learn things. None of it is History specific, but you have to somehow fit your curriculum through all of that. And that is what teachers have to do, they have to produce this ‘unit plan’ so you take your existing curriculum, and you change the emphasis so it fits the IB’s model.

Q27Chair: And then the NYP coordinator will?

Fred Bosanquet: Exactly, the NYP will check and review them, will assess whether it is suitable, will reflect on them. There are some good elements to it, I think the reflection on learning is good, there should be more of that, to help pupils understand what they have learned, why they have learned it, what it is being learned for, how they can improve their achievement and their attainment. What I don’t think is very good is the move away from History as a discreet discipline. To be honest there is not much there are the moment with the National Curriculum, with the NYP it would be in danger of being lost completely probably.

Q28Chair: But I guess the NYP is being used in other countries?

Fred Bosanquet: Yea, it is an international programme, it is not geared towards National Curriculum, it is an international one, so obviously it can’t have nearly the same prescribed content as the National Curriculum can and does to an extent.

Q29Chair: So is it just Dartford who are really sort of pushing forward on the NYP?

Fred Bosanquet: Dartford is one of the main schools, Wellington College is the main independent school. There are several others in Kent.

Q30Chair: And in terms of communicating ideas and good practice, do you therefore, those organisations or schools that have taken this on board, and then applied for academy status then got the academy freedoms around the curriculum, is there the opportunity to combine, work with each other?

Fred Bosanquet: There is, we often get visitors into school, often staff will go and present to other schools, there will be conferences where staff will go. There is an NYP community, of which all schools who do the NYP are a member. Again it is internationally based, so we will assess assessments that are done in Moscow, which will be translated into English, which is quite interesting as to how Russians teach History these days. Generally speaking the way it is implemented, for all the ideas of the IBO, the reality is incredibly mixed, probably within the UK it would be incredibly mixed. Some schools do it, some schools just do what they did

anyway, some schools don't understand it at all. It varies a lot within schools, certainly across countries it is incredibly varied, there are some countries that do it well and some that don't.

Q31Chair: I just wanted to come back to the GCSE, you said you have the AQA SHP exam, is there any option to do the modern world at all, or is SHP the only History?

Fred Bosanquet: That is the only History offered for GCSE, we could do modern world, the reason we don't is mainly because a lot of the content would be repeated in the 6th form diploma course. So if we did world war one, world war two, they would just be repeating that again. So the idea by doing the American West and Medicine is that they get different context.

Q32Chair: I think that is nearly all I wanted to ask. Is there any other things that you reckon? You see with the National Curriculum review ongoing, the idea of this report is that you look into issues of whether History should be compulsory to sixteen, and if it should be compulsory, what History to sixteen would look like. But also what barriers are there in terms of making history to sixteen. There is clearly supply side issues around History teacher training provision, sorry can I just ask another questions. You have non specialist working in Key Stage 3, even as non specialist, is there a minimum, do they have to have a History GCSE or History A level or nothing at all?

Fred Bosanquet: A non specialist no, we have P.E teachers who teach History, you don't need any qualifications. Only in Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4 it is all

subject specialist. It is a big issue; you could in a worst case scenario go through Key Stage 3 without ever being taught by a History teacher and you could well be taught by someone who has very little subject knowledge or conceptual knowledge of History, how it works and how to teach it. If History was to be compulsory to sixteen I think the curriculum would certainly have to up its game, certainly better than it is at the moment because although people tend to think it is important, it is not as central as say Maths, which everyone agrees is absolutely essential. History is tended to be viewed as not a luxury, but something that is a good option, is an important option. If it is to be compulsory it has to be a really rigorous course. And the disagreement around it would always be there.

Q33 Chair: In terms of the Key Stage 3, Key Stage 4 divide, if there was the option or possibility, as lots of schools are taking academy status and the freedom that comes with it, to break down that barrier so that you could actually teach some form of a curriculum, across the five years. I don't know whether you had any thoughts on that, or whether that would just be too long.

Fred Bosanquet: I think it would be certainly better, more coherent, it makes no sense going from the American West for a whole year to the History of Medicine to the Greeks to the present day to the causes of world war one. It is a very disjointed narrative, it doesn't cohere in any kind of chronological sense whatsoever. Certainly a curriculum that cohered in some way from Key Stage 3 though to Key Stage 4 at least would be desirable. Of course you have

the issue of how you would do that, given that it is optional for Key Stage 4. If it did remain an option, do you only teach up to 1500 or so the end of Key Stage 3 and then not do any modern History, I don't think that really works. Or do you teach broad curriculum at Key Stage 3 and then do it again at Key Stage 4 but with more depth, because you get the repetition. So if History were to remain an option it would be difficult to see how that would work.

Q34Chair: What is happening in Dartford with the move to the NYP and removal of the National Curriculum, will there be, I guess it is probably too early to tell, in terms of then, as you say, moving the Key Stage 4 to year 9, there is the possibility of almost beginning even in year 8 or something to look at the subject ready for GCSE. Do you think that is a tempting pressure? In terms of the best preparation for the best results at GCSE?

Fred Bosanquet: It is something that is sort of already being done, in terms of gifting and talented programmes, to teach, they have three years anyway to do GCSE technique, certainly I don't think they need any more. The idea is that when they are younger History is not being drilled though GCSE technique it is more expansive, people can do more independent research, they can do more of their own. History is an enjoyable subject as well as something that is just focused on the exam. So I don't think GCSE technique would be desirable to do in Year 8. There is also the issue of GCSE technique is not the same as good, historical methods at all. It is very much as Anthony Seldon said, we teach GCSE History rather than History. So that is a big issue, any

curriculum change should take into account what is the proper methods of studying History, and how could that be, and how do you assess it as well, because History is kind of, tends to be quite messy, but of course has to be assessed in a way that is transparent, it's accountable in that you can justify the grades that are awarded because so much store is set by them.

Q35Chair: Because I think in terms of the assessment, and you mentioned about the opportunity for a written essay as part of the NYP, that developing those essay writing skills, in terms of the internal exams, are those essay based? Or is it a mixture of sources?

Fred Bosanquet: They tend to be, any significant exam would be a written exam, whether it is source based analysis, or looking at different accounts or writing an essay. Presentations are all very well, and we do them as a sort of assessment through the year, and it would go towards it, but it is really hard to, certainly essay is the best test, if you want to assess each individual pupil and what they know. You give them some form of written assignment, because a presentation you could be in a group with some people that don't do it properly and then they let you down. I think it would be very difficult to do any kind of collaborative work as a major form of assessment for those reasons. It is fine to do it as assessment throughout the term, or the year, but at the end it's written, it's always written.

Q36Chair: Okay, is there anything else that you wanted to add at all?

Fred Bosanquet: No, I think that is it, certainly if you want to be in touch with

the NY coordinator at Dartford I can give you his contact details, Liam Grieve, because he has more knowledge about me about the NYP works, and he might be quite interesting on some of the issues he faces in dealing with it, from my perspective it is really difficult in that role to be responsible for a whole approach to learning and a curriculum on top of an existing curriculum.

Q37Chair: I am quite interested in what guidance he is receiving, because on the one hand freedom is great, but it must be quite daunting.

Fred Bosanquet: Yeah exactly, and also people can only cope with as much freedom as they are responsible to use. So some teachers if you give them a lot of freedom they will do a fantastic job, some teachers they will actually do worse than some prescribed curriculum, and some teachers don't want the freedom. Some departments really like that GCSEs tell you exactly what you should learn, exactly how it should be assessed. You can prepare every lesson so it is geared towards that, and the idea of something diverted from that worries

them and is quite oppose the NYP for that reason. So it is daunting.

Chair: It does sound like there is an aspect of ownership that teachers have with the programme, which if that puts across enthusiasm.

Fred Bosanquet: Exactly, yeah.

Chair: Well we will finish there, thank you very much.

Fred Bosanquet: I hope that was helpful to an extent.

Oral evidence taken on Thursday 21st June 2012

All Party Parliamentary Group on Archives and Archives
History in Schools: Fourth Evidence Session
History for all until sixteen

Members Present:
Chris Skidmore MP (Chair)
Examination of Witnesses

Caroline Nash, Pimlico Academy, **Joanne Saxon**, Pimlico Academy – Director of the Curriculum Centre, acting Director of Studies for Pimlico

Q1 Chair: Welcome to this All Party Parliamentary Group Evidence Session, we have Jo Saxon and Caroline Nash from Pimlico Academy with us today. I wanted to start by raising what has happened at Pimlico; it's quite unusual in that you are introducing History to 16 from September 2010 and you also have established a new curriculum, a knowledge based curriculum. I was wondering if you could explain a bit of the detail of how that curriculum is going to work, how it bridges the old Key Stage 3, Key Stage 4 and really to explain how you went about devising it.

Caroline Nash: Are you interested in primary as well?

Chair: We are interested in primary, so if you can talk about primary as well.

Caroline Nash: Well I think that we will divide it up, I will just give you some background on Pimlico, and then Jo will talk in more detail about perhaps the link between primary and secondary. So our plan at Pimlico has been is a sort of two pronged approach; our strategy is fundamental Key Stage 3 curriculum

change, and expansion into primary provision. So our Key Stage 3 curriculum that we have written now is a transitional document that is appropriate for the children coming into the school now. When we have a better curriculum in our feeder primaries and our primary free school opens, and the children start coming through, then of course we can up the game again. But our strategy has been to use E.D. Hirsch's core knowledge program sequences from America as the springboard, as our inspiration, and we have written a completely new Key Stage 3 curriculum over all subjects; English, Maths, Science, Geography, History, French, Drama, Music, Art. It encompasses virtually all of our timetable, apart from P.E. So all those subjects will be taught in a completely different way, starting in September, we are starting with Year 7, and we are building up year by year. We haven't had the benefit of being able to put this curriculum out to plenty of academics and had independent research on it, but we have brought a number of specialists in to help put it into the school. The content and the detail of the content is being in some cases difficult

to decide, but we have tried to keep out over-arching aims in view with written rationales in each subject. Jo is writing a rationale for the overall curriculum, and those subject rationales and conceptual introductions that we have for each unit act as the lynchpins for all schemes of work and lesson plans so we keep coming back to those when there is contention over what the content might be.

Q2 Chair: What about the rationale for History?

Caroline Nash: So the rationale for History is first and foremost for it to be a chronological set, clearly chronologically and geographically, to cover the ancient worlds in Year 7, the middle ages in Year 8 and the beginnings of modern times in Year 9. On the assumption that on the cohort that we will carry on with History, that it will be compulsory, we have that luxury if you like of being able to stop at 1688 with a bridge, there is an empire unit at the end, to link that to what they are doing now in GCSE's, because you can't really understand the first world war unless you do that.

Q3 Chair: And there are GCSE's in Modern World that you create?

Caroline Nash: Yes, so it's not perfect, but as and when GCSE's change into A levels and according to what that chronology is, we can adapt our curriculum accordingly. But that is what we have got now, we have got a year of the ancient world, a year of the middle ages, and a year of the renaissance, and we have tried to combine British and World History. We have tried to, because of our cohort; we have children

from all over, 69 languages spoken in Pembroke Hill. Having said that, it is a British history curriculum, the emphasis is on British History, and to try to help our children understand what it is meant to, being British in the past.

Q4 Chair: And in terms of the programme, the bones of the timetable; how many hours?

Caroline Nash: So three sessions of History, they are 50 minute sessions, so in the overall timetable that is a lot more than most schools, but it isn't obviously as much as English and Maths; English is five, Maths is four, Science is four, History, Geography and French are three 50 minute sessions each.

Q5 Chair: For History; compared to some schools, that is a third extra, because two 50 minute sessions seems to be the maximum that I have heard so far. Do you find in terms of actually the time; that the three sessions of History are there because you need to fit everything in?

Caroline Nash: Yes absolutely and in fact we are going to an extended day, extended school day as opposed to extracurricular activity, at the end of the day, and Year 7 are going to have an extended school day at the end of next year, and if we can't get through the content, then we will have to have four sessions of History. So just to go back, English is five, History is three, Maths, Physics, Chemistry, Biology – four, they are sciences combined, Geography, French three, Art two, Music two, Drama one. We forgot Drama because of the history of the Pimlico, it was a visual performing arts specialism, and we added History when it became an

academy. We are the only school to have History as a discreet specialism. It is all very much part and parcel that the curriculum we formed, that we got at Key Stage 3 is very much part and parcel of a bigger driver, so what we have done at Key Stage 3 is part and parcel of a long term plan of delivering rigorous History teaching at primary, and those children coming through, and we federating with two feeder primaries, and we have got out free school, so when all that cohort come through, it will be a very different scenario.

Q6 Chair: If we go on to the primary, because I can understand how it will change the nature of what happens at Key Stage 3, depending on what concepts and knowledge you have developed at primary, but for Key Stage 3, just to get on record what that nature of the course, you mentioned there is the chronological approach. Is there any coursework or project based work in each year that takes place as well?

Caroline Nash: No, none at all.

Q7 Chair: And in terms of what textbooks are used, or in terms of how assessment is monitored, is there an end of year exam?

Caroline Nash: Yes, there will be weekly assessments, so our idea is that it is a cumulative curriculum, and the assessment will be driven by; there isn't an assessment and then children are allowed to forget that knowledge, the pool gets bigger and bigger than can be dipped into and then assessed, and that is very much part and parcel of the new curriculum thinking.

Q8 Chair: So in terms of the weekly assessment, what would that involve? Would that be a written test?

Caroline Nash: Yes.

Q9 Chair: And that would be based around knowledge?

Caroline Nash: Yes.

Q10 Chair: Also, in terms of the 11-14 program, do you start to introduce essay writing techniques?

Caroline Nash: Yes.

Joanne Saxon: I think the bigger picture is that so much of History in schools in primary and secondary emphasizes enquiry and enquiry learning, and in a History curriculum what that particularly looks like is that is translated into an emphasis on historiography, rather than what I would think of as pure History, and I think what we have recognised at Pimlico, and the curriculum recognises and the additional timetable of History recognises, is to get to that point, where you can ask a question like; who was a better king? Or some of the things that Ofsted flag up as being good examples of History teaching like is religion only ever a force for bad, you need to have got more knowledge to meaningfully answer those questions. And in too many schools in the primary and the secondary curriculum they go straight to those questions, and children are allowed to lead themselves and each other and they make superficial milestones. So the time that is allocated to History at Pimlico is aimed at rectifying that, so you can meaningfully reach these points. The assessment model is being changed to support that. The conventional assessment model; the

leveling system which is being withdrawn required schools that are given the outstanding category to demonstrate the pupils are improving two levels in every academic year. But how they are being proven is being assessed at the moment is on skills, not necessarily on their understanding or their content knowledge. So we have been working with Tim Oates from Cambridge Assessments, who has been helping us and helping our teachers design the new assessment model, which doesn't just recognise skills, which are important, we are not saying that we don't want skills, but measuring and increasing content knowledge and understanding. So all of these things we are in effect piloting at the moment, but turning the ideal curriculum into something that has a meaningful outcome for students involves changing the assessment model, but also changing what our teachers know. That is the other thing that we are embarking on at the moment; supporting out teachers. Most of them, because of their own education, don't know very much about ancient history, so we are working with academics from places like UCL to do training with the teachers so that they can easily teach the ancient world.

Q 11Chair: What does that training involve?

Joanne Saxon: Well it is just starting really, so I don't know that we can really tell you the answer.

Q 12Chair: Would that involve the teachers going to university?

Joanne Saxon: No we are getting people to come to us, one of our ideas with the curriculum centres is that in

time we can expand that to other teachers in other schools who want to do the same thing. But we recognise the idea that the custodians of knowledge and the people who are generating the knowledge, who understand the best of all knowledge are typically at universities, so we are using that as a starting place for what is good History, what is the best current thinking and then making sure that our teachers know that by giving them access to that. I think in the past that was probably something that existed, there was a greater link between schools and universities, in terms of knowledge and we are trying to recreate that.

Q 13Chair: I just want to quickly mention with the GCSE, because there are limitations, whether you have Modern World or Schools History Project, would you like your chronological based approach prioritising the acquisition of knowledge or would you like to see ideally as an exit qualification?

Caroline Nash: Essay based answers.

Q 14Chair: And with the option that you are taking?

Caroline Nash: Essay based answers and plenty of scope to study pre twentieth century Victorian England and Europe.

Q 15Chair: And to ensure that part of the exam that pupils have to study, they can't specialise in particular areas?

Caroline Nash: Yes, but also for children to be rewarded for the extra knowledge that they can bring, the extra knowledge that they have still got, to

make reference to that extra knowledge, because at the moment that is not awarded, you can be penalised, because of that tick box mentality. I understand that there is the difficulty that the markers don't know enough, but children should be rewarded for showing more knowledge.

Q 16Chair: Pimlico would welcome an alternative History qualification?

Caroline Nash: Absolutely, very much so.

Q 17Chair: Interesting, because you currently have got your Key Stage 3 curriculum, but you are then shoe-horned into the Key Stage 4 by the requirements of the assessment process?

Caroline Nash: Yes.

Q 18Chair: Interesting. If there was a History examination that met the requirements that Caroline just mentioned, would you look to create a curriculum across a five year span?

Caroline Nash: Very much so, that would be marvellous if we could do that. At the moment it is very prescriptive, our curriculum, it is a list of facts that we want to children to know, but over and above that we have put in a conceptual layer, so for instance in year 7 the children will learn about ancient Egypt, but it will be in the context of an exploration of the meaning of civilization, a comparison between how different civilisations have evolved, what their enduring legacies might have been, comparatively drawing between Egypt, Greece and Rome. So that we want children to get an over arching view of how this knowledge can be useful to

them why it is important, why it isn't just learning, but in order to make judgments, and in order have opinions and verbalise those opinions you need the knowledge you need something to work in.

Joanne Saxon: The curriculum is founded upon the idea that you need knowledge and structured depth to be able to lead up to understanding, the starting point can't be understanding. And the National Curriculum goals as they currently are set think about achieving knowledge and understanding and skills, too many schools focus on that, and don't give the layer underneath to get to that point. So understanding is the outcome of what we are trying to do.

Q 19Chair: In terms of what is happening at primary level, do you want to give an explanation or outline.

Joanne Saxon: The primary National Curriculum as it currently exists; obviously it is no longer the advocated model, to try and cover as much of History as possible and because of the emphasis on children needing to be skilled, has become very episodic and is topic based. Some of that is lovely, but what happens in practice is that History loses all of its structure, as children when they leave primary school don't have a sense of what fits where and I have worked with seven academy or maintained primary schools, and what you see happening, particularly in inner city schools is to meet the required stands in numeracy and literacy, they devote increased classroom time to those things, and so because History leads itself to topics, like in the foundation stage the history of toys, sea side holidays in the past, which is basically

what becomes Victorians, and those kinds of things, they end up merging together History and Geography, or sometimes History and Literacy, they might write a postcard about a Victorian beach holiday, and that ticks the box that 'we have taught our History, and we have done out literacy, but actually those children have no idea what it means to be a Victorian, they can tell you about beach huts and striped swimming suits.

Q 20Chair: This is a very interesting point about the understanding, the chronological understanding and when pupils can develop that, a very similar comparison might be Algebra, that in this country 'you can't learn algebra until you get to 13'. In terms of developing your own primary curriculum, and focusing on knowledge and consequently developing an understanding of chronology and what chronology means.

Joanne Saxon: Well we feel that if you don't start with chronology in primary schools, then how can you expect your children to understand what chronology is. So in Pimlico we want to start with Ancient Egypt and Ancient Greece in reception. In terms of raising aspirations we believe that reception age children are ready to start being appropriately taught. They would move onto the Romans in year 1, so that by the end of primary school they would have had everything in chronological order. Interestingly enough, I did some research on what independent primary schools at primary and prep schools do, and I brought a copy of it. I looked in depth at what seven well respected, independent prep and primary schools do, and I looked at everything from the teaching of reading, right through to

their timetabling, and the idea was to look at whether there were any simple, straightforward, meaningful practices that could help other schools, maintained or otherwise. In terms of History, what was fascinating was, going around these classrooms, a lot of the displays that I saw, were very similar to that which I know are currently on the walls in maintained schools at the same time. Things about World War two, Florence Nightingale, the actual parts of History that students were studying were not necessarily different, they were lead by the National Curriculum, what was different was which year's classrooms walls those things were on, and the independent schools on the whole, these seven at least, said; yes we use the National Curriculum, but with History, we reorganise it so that we are doing it chronologically. So we start with the Egyptians, and we put it in order, so you might jump from Egypt to Victorians, but at least you are doing it in the right order. If you look at some recent information that Ofsted gave in its recent 2011 report; History for All, it gives examples of what it is offering as good examples of teaching of History. In these schools you see foundation doing history of toys, years one and two doing the Victorians, years three doing the blitz, years four do Guy Fawkes and King James, year five do the Victorians again, year sevens World War two, year eights English Civil War, year nine British Empire. I think it is not helpful if Ofsted are saying that this is a good example of History teaching, to reinforce this sort of episodic moving around.

Q 21Chair: In terms of an understanding of chronology, moving from as far back as possible through to the modern world, are there

opportunities to revisit at all at any stage? Because a concern might be that you have studied Medieval History at a young age, but then you have got no opportunity to come back?

Joanne Saxon: Yes, exactly, all good pedagogy would do that, and it is very clear on our scheme of work template for Key Stage 3, and important element other than the conceptual element other than why do the students need to know this is what previous knowledge do student need to be able to do this, and in teaching that, they would go over any requisite knowledge. At the same time what we are going to do is the Pimlico primary curriculum in a sense is going to foreshadow the Pimlico Academy curriculum. So with Ancient Egypt in reception, that is going to be revisited in more depth in year 7, so they echo each other and build on each other.

Q 22Chair: In terms of themes or frameworks for History, issues the public tend to expect to be taught in History, so for instance the establishment of enfranchisement and parliamentary democracy, is that something that you would study, franchise and classes in the 18th century?

Joanne Saxon: In the primary we would be wanting to end with around World War two, and have a sense of everything, all of those things will be there, those elements will come at the top of the pyramid if you like, once all of the building blocks are there, then students can redo those things.

Q 23Chair: In terms of knowledge and chronology; key dates and facts?

Joanne Saxon: Yes, well we are working at the moment, certainly the idea of at Key Stage 3, thing like 100 dates in British History that student should know

Caroline Nash: The trouble with this is you can get too worried about what those 100 dates should be, we are keen to train the teachers, for them to have enough knowledge, obviously they should know that Magna Carta was 1215, but they should know the whole event around that, it is not good just that fact hanging on its own. Our curriculum is very much driven by an understanding. I do believe that children need a story, they need a narrative to hang it together in their heard. Then History learns itself very well, our curriculum clearly has narratives in it. The nature and legitimacy of political powers is one of the narratives that we will encourage the teachers to revisit, so we have the enduring legacies of ancient civilizations as one narrative that will need to be revisited through the political, social and cultural impacts of religion, is hugely important to History. The nature and legitimacy of political power, invasion, migration, trade and empire, the economical and cultural impacts of those national identity ideas. Britain is an island nation, part of yet separate from Europe.

Q 23Chair: How are those narratives chosen?

Caroline Nash: I chose them, you could go on consulting forever, but someone has to dream up a rationale for History, and you could hand it to academics who would change those narratives, but anything we have got is one thousand times better than what has been taught.

Q 24Chair: Were you influenced at all by the Key Stage 3 National Curriculum?

Joanne Saxon: No, we have absolutely ignored it.

Caroline Nash: I have here for you, this is what Ofsted says is a good History lesson taken from History for all March 2011, you will be horrified when you see it. It is a huge difficulty for us, and a huge difficulty for our History teachers, that we are asking them to step up to the plate and know much more. They will be used to be expecting to deliver that sort of rubbish.

Joanne Saxon: And because it looks like it is something logical because of the margin down the side, I think that gives a false sense of structure, but actually twice Jack the Ripper. How is that the most important thing to be learning about at that time, why is there no industrial revolution, those sorts of things. That is defiantly not a coherent picture of History. It is episodic, and so much is historiography, it is asking things that really are the domain of universities; how you work out which is a better empire.

Caroline Nash: There is a problem too, because on breadth and depth everyone says why haven't you covered up to present day, but of course if you had ten hours a week you could cover much more, so what we tried to do in our three years at Key Stage 2, we tried to give children the idea that there is so much more History than just Victorian and the modern world. Now you could say or you could go from the Norman Conquest through to 1688, you could make all sorts of choices, but enough, you can go

on analysing it and go on worrying about it, but I think what this is, it is a god three years.

Joanne Saxon: But also there is an overview for the whole of the Key Stage 3 curriculum, so what they are doing in Drama, they are learning about classical tragedy and early theatre, that is supported by what is happening in History. So there is meaningful correspondence between the various areas, like Julius Caesar is a text in English. Though it is not superficial links, but it is knowledge generated links.

Caroline Nash: It is very specified so that the teachers know so that the teachers know what the children know, and what they will be learning, so they will know when they are studying Julius Caesar.

Q 25Chair: So how does the logistics of that, do the teachers have a plan, or?

Caroline Nash: So in each subject, there is the subject rationale and then there is the subject content, for the teachers, we can show you, it will be notes for teachers, as to what the links are with other subjects, and what they will already know and will be studying. Up to now there has been no knowledge from the teachers of what the children already know from other subjects, so if you followed a child around secondary school, it is a very random experience, you would go into a class and have 50 minutes of this and 50 minutes of that, and it is clearly difficult for their knowledge to be building on itself, because they don't see how it joins up; it doesn't join up.

Joanne Saxon: The problem is exaggerated in primary schools where generally you have a primary generalist who delivers to the whole year, so if you have been a year 3 teacher for ever, you may have no idea at all what happens in year 5. At least in a secondary school you have got History teachers, so you see the whole of History, I think primary schools, the independent and prep schools certainly by Key Stage 2 start using specialist teachers, or they have teachers who are dedicated 'as this is the History teacher, or these two are the History teachers.

Q 26Chair: And would you have specialist teachers at primary?

Joanne Saxon: That is the idea, yes, certainly for Key Stage 2. It is difficult for us to do at Key Stage 1 and the earliest foundation stage because there aren't really any.

Q 27Chair: So would the requirement be for the teacher to have an A level or a degree?

Joanne Saxon: Ideally, that is what we would like, some sort of actual specialist knowledge, certainly for Key Stage 2. And because it would be all through school, when it comes to something like Science, certainly by the end of Key Stage 2, years 5 and 6 hopefully our students could then go and do some of their Science in the Science labs. Perhaps once a week with a secondary teacher, and that is something that the independent schools do, the ones that do this to thirteen or beyond, because you have got to have specialists in for teaching Key Stage 3, they make use of those down the school, even if it is just for developing staff knowledge

internally, and that is something that we would like to do. Having a History room and a Geography room in a primary school, not necessarily where you have just got History posters and a timelines on the wall and things.

Q 28Chair: So specifically dedicated to History, and pupils would move to the class?

Joanne Saxon: Yes, not in Key Stage 1, but in Key Stage 2 that is what we would like to do.

Q 29Chair: Does that happen in the secondary school as well? Where you have a History zone?

Caroline Nash: Yes, but a general point about subjects that are compulsory in schools, and the current drive to make a language compulsory or at least encourage it. In schools like Pimlico, that can be quite counterproductive, because children are already learning in English which can be their second or third language, they already know lots of languages. We argue that it is far more important that the children learn History and Geography, far more important.

Q 30Chair: Will Geography also be compulsory for the 2012 intake?

Caroline Nash: Yes, well we haven't decided yet, but History defiantly will be for that cohort and from there on in. What I can't get to from that, is that it is very important that children have a sense of belonging, a sense of place, and they have entitlement to their cultural heritage, all be it whatever country they come from. And if you don't teach History and Geography, if you don't make that compulsory, if they are not learning that then I don't see how they

acquire that, I don't understand how children can, through their five years at secondary school.

Q 31Chair: You are a great example of a school that is producing compulsory History; I am really interested in the mechanics and the supply side issues of what this would mean for schools, in terms of are you having to take on new History teachers or are you able to achieve.

Caroline Nash: You have misunderstood, what is happening is that this curriculum starts in Year 7 and therefore for that cohort it will be compulsory when they come through.

Q 32Chair: I understand that, but in Year 1 you will have 210 pupils studying History in Year 7, and in four years time you will have 800 pupils needing History lessons, because it will be compulsory to 16, so as you go through, so you have far more pupils taking History, with more classes being put on and potentially more teachers.

Caroline Nash: Yes, it affects the bigger timetable of course, so citizenship for instance is being rolled down, and we won't be teaching citizenship, so we take that time, and the social sciences department will shrink, and the History department will expand.

Q 33Chair: So the citizenship teachers will become History teachers?

Caroline Nash: Preferably not.

Q 34Chair: So they will leave?

Caroline Nash: That would be better, Citizenship teachers can morph into

Geography teachers quite easily, but they would need quite a lot of training to be good History teachers.

Q 35Chair: So how many teachers do you have?

Caroline Nash: Seven at the moment, but in a lot of good schools the senior management come up through History. History makes people good leaders. If there is a disproportionate representation in the senior leadership team, so those people are of course part time teachers because of their other responsibilities, so there will always be extra that they could possibly do, each year will just have to increase year on year.

Joanne Saxon: Yes, there will be the need for more History teachers in time.

Caroline Nash: But it will be as big as the English department in the end, so English is twice the size, which does change things hugely.

Joanne Saxon: I think another sort of general point to make, and it is relevant to History but also to a lot of subjects is a distinction that we are drawing between pedagogical knowledge and skill and subject knowledge and skill and the current National Curriculum and a lot of school curricular and Ofsted documentation confuse those two things in my opinion, and teachers are encouraged to compromise or change what they are teaching to be engaging. So part of the point of this model of what we like about the core knowledge president is by being very specific about what teachers teach we are also saying that we are now freeing you as professionals to engage your children as you feel best to get the right results out

of them. So that you don't need to spend hours when you are talking about all the preparation that you have to do. A lot of teachers, certainly primary school teachers that I have worked with, that means looking on the internet to find out the dates and the information that is not in the National Curriculum, for example the former current national primary curriculum required children in Year 2 and I think Year 3 to learn about the battles of Boadicea, it doesn't say anywhere who was Boadicea, what date, why, which battle, and so good teachers go and they find that out and they use a good source. Less good teachers, teachers that haven't done History themselves might not get such good sources, or might just teach something that is just generally a re-enactment of a battle, that is something that happens quite a lot in primary schools, so we are working on the American model that has been very well assessed. If we are specific about the knowledge that we want teachers to teach then actually it is much more professionally empowering for those teachers to teach it.

Q 36Chair: So when you talk about specificity, are there materials provided for the teachers, you mentioned these possible seminars at universities for teachers, but are there certain core textbooks as such that you would say that every teacher needs to read?

Caroline Nash: The trouble is that there aren't textbooks that fit, so what we are doing is just trying to keep our nose ahead, this is why we are introducing it year on year, because we couldn't do it across the whole of Key Stage 3, it was too much to do. The teacher's resources are a huge part, so what has happened is the curriculum centre, of which Jo is the

Director, which is going to do more than Pimlico, only but acts as director of studies for Pimlico, our new curriculum at Pimlico.

Joanne Saxon: We are working on drawing up reading lists, sending department teachers' home with kind of a catalogue and it might have a selection of all sorts of different things.

Caroline Nash: But there are two things here Chris, if you go into a History department and you ask History teachers what the gaps in their knowledge are, they will give you that, so that is one piece of the jigsaw which is relevant, but also what is relevant is what they think they know about because they have been teaching it; Medieval Realms for instance, doesn't actually mean that they know much Medieval History, because they have been teaching it for years they think that they haven't got a gap in their knowledge, but they have, they need to revisit that. And they need to do more background reading in a way when you are starting, if you have never taught Roman Britain as a History teacher you would go and read a couple of books and you would get clued up because you would feel very vulnerable in class. But it is a bigger change for teachers to have to think about the content that they are delivering, because just because it covers the same period, to think in the same way, and Jo's new assessment model forces them to think about why it is they are teaching that, what the content is, and how they are going to teach it, that also has to be very rigorous.

Q 37Chair: I am afraid I have to finish it there.

Joanne Saxon: Just in terms of timetabling, just another point about independent schools and History in terms of prep and primary looking just up until Year 6, so I think it would be fair to say that most maintained primary schools spend 30 minutes a week on History, and quite often that would be combined with Geography or something else. In the independent schools that I looked at, the minimum amount of time in Key Stage 2 was an hour, and the maximum was 2 hours. And that just means you can be teaching an awful lot more, and you get through twice the amount.

Q 38Chair: I think that is one of the overarching things, the theme in talking to the schools that do History well and those that don't, it is, sorry to go on about the nuts and bolts of things, because there are the conceptual ideas, but often also there is.

Caroline Nash: No, absolutely, Michael Wilshaw, the head of Ofsted, Mossbourne, we have just employed a History teacher from Mossbourne, they do 50 Minutes of History a year for two years at Key Stage 3, and then they are allowed to give it up. He is a historian.

Q 39Chair: That is part of the problem that this report will be highlighting, that the National Curriculum itself is a permeable document, and that although you can teach it, it doesn't have any sense of chronology, which we spoke about, but it allows to be taught at a breakneck pace, so as long as you have covered it, it doesn't actually look at the depth.

Joanne Saxon: I think that it is relevant to look at Ofsted details, I don't know if

you go through what Ofsted are saying is a good example, they are advocating that it is fine to teach 2000 years of History in one term and then focus on Jack the Ripper for two whole terms. Ofsted could be a real instrument for good, if they were advocating positive things, but at the moment they are reinforcing something that isn't helpful, and I think the other thing that is very concerning is that Ofsted are saying is a good thing in that History for All document is where they talk about pedagogy, and they say the best examples of pedagogy are where the students did peer mediation, where they were supporting each other with their research, where they were using the internet for research, where the teacher didn't prescribe the outcomes; in other words where the teacher is not teaching. That attitude I think needs to change, we need to re-empower our teachers; it is ok to teach and share your content, and then your students can go off and do research. All of the neuroscience shows that you cannot meaningfully do research if you do not have some knowledge to start with.

Caroline Nash: There aren't enough History teachers Chris are there? In your prior 159 schools without a single student taking GCSE History. It is a tragedy isn't it?

Q 40Chair: I think in terms of looking at compulsory you have to come in as you do at Pimlico.

Joanne Saxon: Shortage of teachers' makes compulsory difficult.

Q 41Chair: Well it would never happen in Modern Languages, because even worse situation then.