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## Introduction to the day

*Dr Michael Maddison followed by Dr Katharine Burn, Honorary Secretary of the HA*

Following a short introduction to the day from Dr Michael Maddison, Dr Burn explained how the HA has been tracking school history for over ten years through our secondary surveys. The main focus of our last survey was Key Stage 3. Teachers are making changes where they feel they can that we’ve not seen before, and there is a sense of movement.

We have seen a multiplicity of ways that teachers are making change, incorporating Black British histories, the wider world and women. Many have pointed to a moral reasoning – being true to history.

She emphasised that it would be helpful to think about barriers, the importance of class and whose experiences are told. Teachers are enthusiastic, despite the challenges.

## Teacher presentations

### Teacher A

**About:** History consultant for a large multi-academy trust in London  
**Exam board(s):** All but one of their schools take Edexcel at GCSE, the other takes AQA

#### Current approach

Teacher A explained that the MAT are encouraging schools to take up the new ‘Migration’ unit offered by Edexcel. So far, seven schools have taken it up, with a further two doing so in September.

They have also been encouraging schools to engage with support on the Pearson website. They also like the partnership resources produced with The Black Curriculum*.* They encourage engagement with these but are unsure about how well their schools are engaging.

#### Areas for development

Light-touch pupil voice work has indicated that, for students, there are not enough LGBTQ+ or Black and other minority ethnic histories within GCSE units. Students also felt that the teaching of empire was either missing or very one-sided in specifications.

Similar teacher voice work indicated similar points, in that LGBTQ+ and female voices are lacking. Teachers wanted more African history, both pre- and post-colonial. They expressed concerns about accessibility at GCSE.

Teacher A has felt that Black people are written about in outdated ways and that we need to think about how diverse people are represented. Research has suggested that pupils tend to view Black, Jewish or other experiences only in a set past, and not a living past with a contemporary and changing context.

#### Barriers

Their teachers have been reluctant to make more diverse curriculum decisions. There has been a tendency to think that if it’s not on the indicative content/specification, they don’t teach it. They are concerned about content overload.

### Teacher B

**About:** Head of history at a school in West London   
**Exam board(s):** AQA

#### Current approach

Teacher B explained that the school has a strong, well-developed and diverse Key Stage 3 history, but that the nature of examination requirements has led to this being lost at GCSE and A-level, harming some of the good work done at Key Stage 3. Teacher B felt that there are often cautionary tales of BAME history and no agency at GCSE.

#### Barriers

Teacher B pointed out that when you look at the choices, there are lots of voices available. However, the minute you choose units, you silence the voices of other units. Students only ever get a diet of what you choose. Teacher B is currently teaching legacy units that they didn’t choose. The school has been teaching the same units for some time.

They discussed the fact that the ‘Power and the people’ unit goes right up to the present day and there are opportunities to enrich teaching here. The challenge has been that it does leave some groups silent and could feed misconceptions. This unit leads you to believe that you’ll see yourself, but this is not the case.

Teacher B has been actively working with AQA on including more diverse voices. Diversity is allowed for within the specification, but it leaves silences, and the indicative content tends to shut this down. In their experience, with so much content to get through, most teachers will teach to the test.

They made the case that the utility of including space for diversity is limited without assessment. Only four times have there been questions about minority groups in the exam, which has meant that there is no incentive to teach these topics.

Teachers have tended to hide in their comfort zone and need lots of support to tackle new content, including from SLT. More diverse content in textbooks and in the indicative content would help.

### Teacher C

**About:** Teaches in an area with a relatively affluent White demographic in the North West and has a high proportion of high-attaining students  
**Exam board(s):** AQA

#### Areas for development

The specification is driven by indicative content. Shockingly, women do not appear in the ‘Power and people’ unit until the suffragettes in 1900!

Teacher C noted that interpretations by historians in exams are invariably from White men, and there is a need to include voices from female historians.

#### Current approach

Teacher C explained that their school does follow the specification but also brings in the power of individual stories, such as Anne Lister in the industrial period and fiction such as books by Floella Benjamin. They want to weave others in from other periods and show that the past was a diverse place.

In the ‘Power and the people’ unit, the school has brought it right up to the present to include the Brixton riots and Grenfell. They also cover the legacy of institutionalised racism. They use a ‘Meanwhile… elsewhere’ approach to widen the lens – for example, lesbian and gay support for the miners’ strikes.

Where possible, school C has also tried to bring in a local dimension to widen the diversity of what they teach, but it is not easy. In their area of the North West, there are a number of possibilities, such as Jack Gladstone (leader of the Demerara Rising in 1823) and Edward Rushton (a blind abolitionist).

### Teacher D

**About:** Teaches in London  
**Exam board(s):** OCR B

#### Opportunities

Teacher D felt that there is a lot of scope for diverse options in this specification. This is particularly obvious in the ‘Migration’ unit. It is nice when sometimes the students click and realise that people like them were here a long time ago.

They felt that there is slightly less prescription in the indicative content, which means that teachers can be creative. Moreover, the questions in the exam have sometimes focused on specific diverse events and people. This year there was a question in the exam about women and girls, for example.

Teacher D felt that a local study on the Tower of London also allows for equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI), examining those connected to the Tower over time. This freedom of choice for a local study is therefore an important way of weaving greater diversity into teaching.

#### Current approach

Teacher D explained that the majority of students at school D are Punjabi Sikh but, given the choice, pupils didn’t want to study the Mughals, so they went for a unit on the USA instead. Pupil voice was a key factor in their choices.

The teacher is the only female on her team and talked about doing the unit on Elizabeth I as one of the only opportunities to cover a unit where a female is the central focus.

#### Areas for development

Teacher D emphasised that ‘The making of America’ unit needs to include a greater native perspective.

#### Barriers

Teacher D felt that getting teachers out of their comfort zone is tricky, and time is also an issue. There needs to be a whole-school focus and it should be an Ofsted priority too. There need to be widely available resources.

### Teacher E

**About:** Teaches in London, and is currently undertaking an MA in Black British history at Goldsmiths  
**Exam board(s):** Edexcel

#### Current approach

Teacher E outlined how the school operates three different tracks of history in Year 9 (including early entry). Their approach was to read a lot in 2020 to look for case studies and sources. They then put enquiries around the ‘Medicine’ topic to facilitate breadth and depth for those in the three-year Key Stage 4 pathway. They also made use of precursor contextual units.

#### Barriers

However, they struggled to go beyond slotting into a narrative framework about which they have concerns already. They identified indicative content as an issue, as it tells senior leaders what has to be learned in GCSE history in order to get the grades. Students think that if it’s not in the indicative content, they don’t need to know it. This is also the case for senior leaders who aren’t specialists. Teacher E felt that there is a lot of teaching to the test, and it is hard to persuade SLT to swap units.

#### Areas for development

Teacher E questioned the fact that a requirement at GCSE for 40% British history can sometimes be reductive and distorting. Who or what constitutes ‘Britishness’?

In the specification units that they follow, school E noted that they look at Black people after 1930 but nothing earlier, which makes it difficult for students to make links or draw comparisons.

They noted that they look at representation of women, but don’t delve into the experiences of women.

### Teacher F

**About:** Head of history in a comprehensive in a northern, economically challenged, White working-class city, which they felt provided them with a unique perspective  
**Exam board(s):** Edexcel

#### Areas for development

Overall, Teacher F felt GCSE history to be dull, with a lack of emotion and lots of faceless groups. Most names on the specification are men.

Teacher F noted that the textbook they use for the American West unit features six women and 82 men. The role of indigenous women is crucial but missing. How did the actions of indigenous people shape the period? The paper is not reflective of a history of violence and genocide, talking about settlement and not invasion. Some research showed that there were significant voices missing from the narrative and the specification was from a White settler perspective.

#### Current approach

Teacher F emphasised the fact that there are powerful stories and history that can be used to provide good hooks, and there is much better scholarship as well as native voices and narratives.

They have shifted focus away from events themselves to the impact of events, which is the more interesting.

The school has made use of ‘slot-ins’, which has enabled them to cover new stories and a wider range of sources and historians.

#### Barriers

Again, Teacher F felt that the indicative content drives much of the teaching.

They identified the level of content overall in the GCSE as a really big problem, which has made it unmanageable for many students. They have restructured the way in which they teach it, but not done the best job, as the specification is restrictive.

#### Opportunities

They felt that, with some subjects/topics, bringing the history into the present can see impact, validity and resonance. It can be more powerful with young people.

## Teacher presentations: follow-up discussions

**Following the teacher presentations, tables were invited to discuss the key elements that arose from presentations. What follows below is a summary of discussions across all tables.**

### Current support for teachers

Participants agreed that, within different contexts, the curriculum centres on certain voices. It was noted how much teachers are doing despite the specifications – not because of them – to slot in excluded voices.

Teachers were encouraged to take advantage of resources/support in their local area. Local history has the power to bring in stories.

Those in higher education emphasised the fact that they want to engage with this by offering their insight and skills.

An Edexcel representative mentioned that there are a lot of resources, but they are not sure whether teachers have time to read these. A lot of the work currently being done by exam boards involves creating resources, such as case studies, that can supplement and contextualise content.

There was discussion over the fact that there is uncertainty as to how much content teachers should create themselves that will speak to their students but which may not be supportive of the exam needs or wholly correct. If you just use other people’s research, which is not promoted by the exam boards, are you teaching a ‘fair’ or accurate version of the past?

### Indicative content

Indicative content came across strongly as a barrier in teacher presentations. An AQA representative also indicated that this comes through in their research. Boards were asked to look at what is in the indicative content, as impactful change can be made here (at relatively low cost?).

However, it was noted that when you specify content, it could be in the exam, and there is a tension inherent in the level of content specified. An Edexcel representative warned that if more content is included, there will either be more to teach or something will have to be taken out. How much is too much prescription, and should we leave specifications more open to encourage teacher creativity? It was discussed that sometimes less is more.

An OCR representative felt that, for example, the OCR B specification has less indicative content. Any relevant content can be included. This has led to higher rates of satisfaction for their teachers. Teachers appreciated the Edexcel ‘Migration’ module having fewer bullet points, and therefore being more open to interpretation.

### Textbooks

It was noted that specification content, assessment and publishing have to work hand in hand. We need to make it clear, time and time again, that the textbook is not the specification. Publishers are reviewing but this is going to take time.

### Who makes the decisions?

Participants questioned who decides what is deemed significant. There is a big question over the idea that some history/people have greater significance/importance than others, which needs reviewing. If ten people need to be named, there must be a balance.

There were questions about how much the boards are constrained by Ofqual and the criteria. This was discussed in more depth later in the day.

It was mentioned that topics need to go where they fit, and not be shoehorned in.

Within schools, some teachers noted that they were only able to make decisions because either they were the subject lead in their school or they were not in a MAT. There were suggestions that some MATs were dictating top-down what content should and shouldn’t be taught in a subject, and this would have an impact.

### When and how does change happen?

An Edexcel representative noted that it is disruptive to make changes to a specification mid-cycle, as people have resourced their courses. It is almost easier to create a new topic like 'Migration’ and put that in.

It was agreed that if all exam boards were to start again now, it would all look very different. It’s not something that’s going to happen any time soon.

## Examination board presentations

### Pearson Edexcel: Mark Battye

#### Current approach

Edexcel has just launched a new ‘Migration’ thematic study. In 2022 there have been 213 entries, and this is expected to grow; a survey showed that 12% of their teachers are switching to 'Migration’, while 24% are considering switching.

They partnered with The Black Curriculumto carry out training to support teachers wishing to switch. In other current work, their website also includes a diversity and inclusion blog. For Key Stage 3 there is a topic of the month as a way to bring in more diverse history, e.g. Black cowboys.

Edexcel research has told them that the American West unit was outdated and focused on a settler perspective. Where are the indigenous people? There is also an issue concerning the terminology used in referencing. This is something that they are addressing, working with indigenous groups and historians to update specifications.

The representative explained that they are exploring optionality in papers for case studies, e.g. a case study on Asia or Africa in the Cold War option. More optionality within topics enables greater choice and diversity.

#### Looking further ahead

They noted that market forces are a concern. Moving too far too fast could be problematic and lead to a loss of audience/market share.

##### Content

Edexcel research indicated that teachers feel there is too much content to cover in the specification, but their hands are tied by the criteria. Three units/papers would provide more scope for EDI.

It was noted that the specifications are too political and emphasise elites and White men. Eighty per cent of teachers want more EDI, while 45% of GCSE and 60% of A-level teachers would like to see new topics. Teachers expressed that they want greater world-building – what was life like?

Edexcel noted that they are also thinking carefully about the popularity of units and about topic placement in specifications, e.g. Nazi Germany is a hugely popular unit, and whatever you place against this won’t get done.

##### Criteria

They emphasised that the thematic studies are British in emphasis due to the criteria, and this is a problem. The criteria offer a greater range of period, but at the expense of modern British and global history – does the wide range of time required leave the actual history chosen too narrow?

Inadvertently, the 200-year rule and requirement to study the early modern period has resulted in more pupils doing Nazis and Tudors at both Key Stages 4 and 5. How do we create new topics that can compete with Elizabeth I and Nazi Germany?

##### *Assessment*

They noted that loss of coursework and/or controlled assessment also narrows scope and range, plus added difficulty for students.

Pearson Edexcel outlined their commitment to being brave in both specification design and publishing. They are setting up expert panels, including an advisory panel on EDI. They are looking at existing topics to see how they can make them more diverse, then working with the expert panels to do this so that they are ready for subject review when it becomes time.

### OCR: Mike Goddard

#### Context of A-level review

They noted that reviewing A-level prior to GCSE in 2014 was problematic.

At the last A-level review, OCR had an EDI policy and a commitment to new topics, e.g. African kingdoms. This has not seen a lot of take-up, but generated funding and resources and, as a result, it was increasingly taught at Key Stage 3.

#### Current approach and responses

OCR entered a partnership with SHP for their specification B, which is enshrined in SHP principles, including diversity.

##### Criteria and assessment

Teacher feedback on this specification has been very positive. Teachers have liked the simplicity of the specification and find it not too prescriptive, giving the teacher freedom to adapt it and make more diverse choices. Not too much prescribed content has also meant more open questions and better accessibility for lower-ability students. Their feedback noted that the flexibility of the specification never feels like teaching to the exam, but like teaching history.

##### Content

Teachers have also appreciated having a proper local study in the OCR B specification, with freedom of choice. A true local study is also a great way to promote EDI. This is a key difference between OCR B and other specifications. They questioned how Ofqual allowed the disparity in approaches to the historic environment to arise.

#### Looking further ahead

They briefly considered what factors hinder the development of EDI in specifications – not many, but reintroducing controlled assessment and/or coursework would make a significant difference.

They felt that development time for boards for the current specifications was far too tight, with no chance to trial such significant change.

While OCR felt that they carried the spirit of the 2014/15 changes to GCSE, they did not carry teachers and had a huge loss of market share – they felt that too much change is problematic.

### AQA: Eoin MacGabhann

#### Context of the last review

They felt that at the time of the GCSE review, there was a feeling that ‘rigour meant bigger’ and this has resulted in unmanageable content levels. The specification design was rushed, as examination boards were given very little time for development. New specifications took teachers by surprise and there is a feeling of content gallop.

If AQA were to write specifications today, they’d be different. There have been missed opportunities, to be addressed at the next reform. At the moment, we are in an uncomfortable middle ground where reverse-engineering existing specifications is difficult.

#### Current approach and responses

They explained that AQA know that the current specifications aren’t perfect. They have been doing lots of work for the next reform, but the bulk will still happen at the time. They are currently providing research and support in the form of publishing, resources and so on. Their research has suggested that developments at Key Stage 3 will impact on change at GCSE and A-level.

How have AQA been supporting schools? They have a CPD series on teaching sensitive histories and are signposting specifications for EDI opportunities. They have also produced new editions of textbooks and are working with external resource providers. AQA is on the board of the TRACTION and Citizen 800 projects.

#### Looking further ahead

##### Content

Their research has shown that teachers and students want exam boards to focus on EDI more broadly. Student voice surveys have shown a much broader sense of diversity – students want big change. More climate, LGBTQ+, women and global issues, as well as Black British and other histories.

While EDI was important on an AQA teacher and student survey, the biggest aspect was the size of the course. AQA are unsure of how much change teachers will buy into. They almost feel like they are being told to add stuff but, at same time, make the course smaller.

They explained that, given the work involved and expense for schools to change topics, AQA feel that development within existing topics is better. How can we take what we know and apply it in new and diverse ways? AQA is currently redrafting selected topics to show how EDI can be integrated. These will be tested on teachers. They will look at the creation of new topics but need to respect current expertise too.

They noted that they want to place Britain into the wider world context. British political history will always have a place, given that school history is events-driven, but they want to beef up coverage of society, economy and culture and bring a broader range of perspectives to existing topics.

##### Assessment

Eoin noted that local history in a linear assessment is difficult. Within examinations themselves there are too many different question types. The narrative question is despised by teachers and the board alike.

##### Criteria

They felt that the definition of British history given in the GCSE criteria is problematic, particularly for thematic units. AQA would like greater discussion of what is meant by British/Britishness. We need to have a shared understanding of what 40% British might actually mean.

They expressed the belief that the DfE and Ofqual are a problem – the DfE have shown no interest in change and Ofqual have no real guidelines to help with understanding the criteria.

## Examination board presentations: follow-up discussions

**Following presentations from examination boards, tables were invited to discuss the key elements that arose. Below is a summary of discussions across all tables.**

### What needs to change?

The need to link specifications more closely to current historical scholarship and to move away from the strong emphasis on political history was strongly noted.

It was pointed out that in all GCSE specifications the entire continent of Africa is missing. This must be reviewed.

It was discussed that we need a common understanding of what is meant by British history.

Participants noted that there is a balancing act involved, with lots of decisions to make, and unintended consequences. There has been a bit of a sausage factory approach; boards are constantly playing catch-up. The conversation is moving so fast that it’s easily out of date.

#### Case study: American West

An Edexcel representative explained how the American West was particularly problematical to make work as a period study, and that with some of the period studies there is, to some extent, a dominant narrative unfolding. That isn’t really the sense with the American West. There are so many strands that it’s challenging to put it in the period study box. It just about works. They start from the assessment model, which does drive decisions about content. Change the assessment order slightly, and then you can reframe the content.

### When and how does change happen?

An Edexcel representative emphasised that exam boards have to demonstrate how they have included/done everything lined out to Ofqual.

It was felt that GCSE reform must be slower and bring teachers and training along, and not just throw schools into the examination. What processes are involved to decide which specialists and teachers are being brought to the table?

Stakeholder engagement is something that has developed a long way in a short time. Exam boards are conducting reviews asking for expert input.

An Edexcel representative highlighted the short time for reform, meaning that there isn’t time for boards to do everything that they would like to do. For example, at A-level, there are something like 60+ sets of question papers and 30+ topics. They have to create all of those and do quality controls, and just getting somebody to write the topic content to the brief and get it in is challenging enough. They don’t have time at that stage to consult with everyone about the balance – the work has to start beforehand.

It was also noted that these discussions could be academic anyhow. With the raising of school leaving age, there are growing voices once again calling for the abolition of GCSE altogether.

### Barriers to change

#### The nature of the subject

It was noted that, as a subject, history is one that keeps moving forward. No matter what you do today, in ten years’ time any new specification will be out of date. We need to create a specification that caters for this, so that teachers can use their reading of more recent scholarship within their curriculum and not be penalised for that.

#### Criteria

Doubts and conflicts about the tension between prescribed indicative content and more open specifications were raised again, as both options can make teacher agency difficult in different ways.

#### Content overload

It was discussed that the big dilemma is wanting to include more content but, at the same time, there is already too much. Adding more voices but putting them on a diet is a difficult balance to get right. Content overload was noted as a big concern among teachers.

Academics noted that there is a similarity with universities, in the tension between wanting new content and time to teach. This is hard and will have to be a compromise.

#### Market pressures

Again, it was noted that problems with market pressures, existing resources and budgets mean that safer choices are made at many levels. An Edexcel representative noted that teachers often want to keep teaching the same topics, and if you get rid of a topic to which people are really attached, they are likely to look for someone else who offers it.

#### Subject knowledge

Teacher expertise was discussed as another reason for safe choices being made. However, this can change, and newer graduates will bring different knowledge and experience. Teacher knowledge is not immutable.

## The existing GCSE criteria and assessment

### What is ‘diversity’?

Many agreed that a common understanding of equality, diversity and inclusion within the framework of history would be helpful. This is in terms of a reflection not just of the classroom but also of the scholarship and research.

There is only one mention of ‘diversity’ in the criteria document. It was noted that this discusses diversity of experience, and not the diversity of people.

There was some discussion about how ‘diversity’ had been channelled down certain routes and still excluded many others, but it was difficult to reach any constructive suggestions about how to avoid that.

### What needs to change?

It was felt that existing topics need reframing; inserting more content and a few extra people is not helpful. There is a need to reflect a variety of perspectives in all specifications, and reframe the agents and geography of history – whose history and where?

As discussed in the previous session, it was emphasised that it is important for any review of the criteria to reflect the idea that history is dynamic and content needs to be reviewed regularly to reflect scholarship.

It was noted that, to an extent, the criteria should recognise how the history we look at also reflects issues of injustice in our own space and society.

Students have pointed out the lack of Elizabeth in the Elizabethan studies. She is more of a footnote in the topic.

#### Language

Participants questioned how the language we use can be interpreted by those who develop specifications, civil servants and ministers who comment on examinations, and the watchdog, Ofqual, who attempt to ensure parity across boards and papers. This would need careful consideration and unpacking of ideas.

For example: how do we define a depth study? Is this useful or does it cause problems?

#### Use of examples

Participants debated whether the criteria need to identify what we should and shouldn’t study, e.g. beyond just saying 40% British history, do we stipulate teaching of the transatlantic slave trade or Britain’s empire? It was noted that:

* As time goes on, what people think of any given topic will change.
* Does this risk being overly prescriptive and ultimately leading teachers to just doing exactly what it says on the specification? This is what happened with the first incarnation of the National Curriculum.

#### What do we mean by 40% British history?

It was pointed out that the definition of British history is currently included in a footnote:

Reference to British history here and elsewhere in the document means British history and/or the history of England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland as appropriate to the historical context and focus of the study.

This is open to interpretation, though the phrasing currently seems to imply a narrower geographical limit. For example, English history includes the transatlantic slave trade at the beginning of the seventeenth century. To say that this isn’t English history denies something important.

An exam board representative pointed out that a broader interpretation could be used to reframe existing topics, so that, for example, British America could now be considered as British history. But the case would need to be made.

There was discussion about use of the word ‘empire’ specifically. ‘Global’ or ‘global historical context’ was suggested as an alternative, which could include countries that weren’t in the Empire, and trade links/broader involvement with the wider world. You could still infer ‘empire’ from this.

It was noted that there is much historical illiteracy over definitions of Britain and empire. Most of Britain was outside of England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland; rather than ‘empire’ being separate, it was very much legally Britain, citizenship-wise. People had British identity and moved here post-war because they felt British. There is work to be done to make people more aware of this.

## The future of history at GCSE

It was discussed that, before any major changes are brought in for all young people, development time and piloting of new approaches and new content is essential.

### Purpose

There was some discussion as to why history is studied – is it for the subject, about creating an understanding of the past or about empowerment of people today? Should different groups always see themselves represented and if so in what context?

The point was made that we need a clear and common understanding of what we want history to do. There is a moral imperative to stand by the work that we do and ensure that we can do better by the teachers and young people. We need to help young people to shape their own questions – a real stepping stone to studying at A-level.

It was discussed whether it is the job of historians to develop ethical questions about history.

### Content and approach

It was questioned whether GCSE should adopt a more enquiry-led approach. How do you take the essence of enquiry into GCSE and exams?

Many agreed that local history needs to carry a reasonably high overall percentage of the examination. The OCR approach to historic environment was discussed as an example to follow.

It was suggested to perhaps look at current themes in history at universities: climate history, gender, interdisciplinary approaches and global histories.

The need to consider people within histories in their own right was discussed. For example, we include conflict in Asia, but it isn’t really about those Asian communities.

### Assessment

It was argued that the long-form essay and examination at both GCSE and A-level are things of the past in some ways. Essay writing is still important, but there are other ways and forms of assessment: group work, displays and presentations.

Many agreed that some form of coursework is needed, particularly to ensure real local history. This was very popular among teachers and requested throughout the key stages.

It was suggested perhaps, for source work, to look to geography with pre-release papers and also consider source booklets.

An exam board representative noted at the end that the discussion didn’t particularly consider the assessment objectives and whether they help or hinder things. Assessment seems driven by second-order concepts, and they speculated over whether that gets in the way of asking more interesting questions.

## Next steps

It was discussed that a working group is needed to review criteria. This group must not be unwieldy and does need to keep the conversation open with others. Any such group needs to include representatives from the subject association, higher education, initial teacher education, department leads and senior leadership in schools.

Within current specifications, the bullet points of indicative content need to be reviewed and refreshed with regularity.

A conversation is needed with Ofqual. They need a better understanding and we need to help them.

We need to bring more stakeholders/voices into the conversation as it moves into its next phase.