

Grammar School Heads' Association

Newsletter - Edition 15
November 2013



Chairman: Charlotte Marten
Chief Executive: bsindall@aol.com

Can we, and should we, shape our students' characters?

For more than a century as a society we have been locked into a nature versus nurture debate. On the one side are the geneticists arguing that we are largely what we inherit and on the other are the behaviouralists arguing that it is what happens to us, how we are raised, that determines the kind of people that we are. Those who are interested in the former may enjoy reading about Robert Plomin's latest research on GCSE results. As an eternal optimist (something my cousin tells me I inherited from my father), I've been recently very struck by the research coming out of America on character education.



Devising an educational programme that explicitly seeks to develop specific character traits is not a new idea. For generations people have been arguing that education should have a moral dimension. There isn't a single one of us who hasn't at some point and in some way been responsible for cultivating specific moral values in our students. Our school's culture is imbued implicitly and often explicitly with our moral values. They are reflected in the language that we use, the example that we set, the role models whom we praise. I wonder, however, how many of us set out to systematically and consistently teach moral virtues.

This is exactly what has been happening in some of the charter schools in the USA with some impressive results. You can read about the initiatives in three Boston schools: Boston Prep, Roxbury Prep and Pacific Rim in Scott Seider's book 'Character Compass'. All of these schools have an urban catchment, 90% of their students are Black or Latino and 2/3rds of their students receive free school meals. Historically, this kind of learner profile would place these schools in the bottom quartile for attainment. However, students from these schools are amongst the top performers in the MCAS (Massachusetts' rigorous state wide examinations). These schools set out with the premise that their students should be aiming to go to college (university) and that they are capable of winning places at the country's elite universities. Despite their families' impoverishment, students at these schools compete on level terms with students from some of the wealthiest Boston suburbs. Seider attributes this success specifically to the culture that each of these very different schools has chosen to develop.

Inside
this issue

Can we, and
should we...
Page 1 - 2

Fischer Family
Trust
Page 3

A curriculum fit for
the 21st Century
Page 4 - 5

Digital Learning
Page 6 - 7

Key Stage 4 Floor
Target Measures
Page 8

Poor Grammar
Page 9

Post 16 Funding
Page 10

Ofqual / Dates
for the Diary
Page 11

Executive
Committee
Page 12

Can we, and should we, ... (cont.)

Each school has a different character focus; so for example Boston Prep focuses on developing its students' moral virtues helping students to consider the ethical dimensions to the decisions that they make. The school curriculum includes a weekly ethics lesson. Younger students may begin by exploring the ethical dimensions of the decisions made by characters in children's stories but will move onto discussing Aristotle's account of *philia* in *Nicomachean Ethics*. In contrast, at Roxbury Prep it is performance virtues that are emphasised: 'effort, diligence, a strong work ethic, a positive attitude, ingenuity and self-discipline'. At the heart of this school's programme is a weekly session known as Advisory in which a small group of students reflect on their performance, prepare for new challenges and explore topics such as 'What it means to be a true leader'. Pacific Rim fuses elements from Asian and Western education and cultural systems. In particular it seeks to cultivate *gambatte* (persistence and a refusal to give up) and *kaizen* (a commitment to working for the continuous improvement of the whole community). Students at Pacific Rim have a weekly civics lesson in which theoretical discussion fuses with practical community based projects.

Character education requires more than a curricular tweak and the passion of one or two individuals. It infuses the whole culture of these schools. It drives their language, reward systems and their rituals. The leaders of these schools wholeheartedly believe that traits like perseverance can be taught and their students' achievements are testimony to the effectiveness of this philosophy in action. Are there lessons here for us? I believe that there are. Respect, Resilience, Responsibility are virtues that we can all sign up to, that we would all want our students to cultivate. I for one will be thinking about how I can place these at the very heart of my school.

Charlotte Marten

Further Reading and Watching on This Topic

Character Compass: How Powerful School Culture Can point Students Towards Success -
Scott Seider Harvard Education Press (2012)

Educating for Character: How Our Schools Can Teach Responsibility and Success-
Thomas Lickona Bantam Books (1991)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=suQ4-2p929E> Robert Plomin Radio 4 interview

<http://www.spectator.co.uk/features/8970941/sorry-but-intelligence-really-is-in-the-genes/>
Spectator article on Robert Plomin's research

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jsRf37lGZg> CNN

GSHA Discussions with Fischer Family Trust - Grammar School Benchmarking

With the release on Friday 19th October of the unvalidated FFT Dashboard and Self-Evaluation reports it is timely to update colleagues on discussions that have taken place between representatives of GSHA and Paul Charman, the Director of FFT in July.

The meeting began with a general discussion about the nature of the FFT data but then focussed upon what could be enhanced or added within the data and the generated reports that would be of particular interest to Grammar Schools and, perhaps, other high performing schools.

For colleagues less familiar with the FFT benchmark data, the system uses a probability model, rather than regression model, based upon the national results database to generate chances tables of performance from a given KS2 or GCSE prior attainment. The probability that an individual student attains a particular result is further modified using contextual information such as gender, date of birth etc. At A Level subject specific results as well as GCSE average points are built into the process. Using this mechanism the probability table for a given subject or student is relatively individual with students of similar prior attainment being assigned quite different performance indicators. The FFT benchmark grade is determined from these probability charts with an 'aspirational' result of one grade higher. It is possible to modify the probabilities at GCSE by identifying which ability percentile the school wishes to benchmark against – the commonly used FFT(D) indicator assumes that the school wishes to perform in the top 25% of schools with a similar intake. At A Level, based on my own school, the benchmarks are subject specific and more demanding than, for example ALPs, and therefore more helpful in setting performance indicators during Sixth Form study.

The Self-Evaluation and Governor Dashboard are useful particularly as they arrive relatively early in the year. The weakness is that they are based upon unvalidated results and will omit remarks, an increasing area of concern.

During our discussion it was agreed that FFT could provide from 2014:

- ◆ more challenging estimates and predictions for grammar schools
- ◆ an ability for grammar schools to compare performance with similar high performing schools
- ◆ more dashboard type reports benchmarking performance at KS5 for A Level and IB as well as KS4

All of which will be welcome developments. The Dashboard already benchmarks 5+A*/A grades but this could perhaps be further enhanced by including English and Maths in this figure, given the new national benchmark, with an equivalent modification to the 'Best 8' indicator.

Different Grammar Schools will have their own needs and wishes. I am particularly interested in estimating the 'mean' performance rather than the 'most likely' result. This is because I feel it is a fairer measure when it comes to Performance Management and Subject Review, overcoming the issue of whole classes being benchmarked at A* with no hope of progress. This could perhaps be provided in addition to current indicators as a point score.

We expect our conversations to continue and colleagues at FFT are open to suggestions, particularly where these may be of more general interest to high performing schools beyond the Grammar Schools. If you have any thoughts or requests, whether at GCSE or A Level, then please do let us know and we can discuss these at future meetings with FFT.



Mike Capon
Headteacher Ilford County High School



Grammar School
Heads' Association

A Curriculum fit for the 21st Century

The appointment of a new headteacher and deputy head in 2007 was the ideal opportunity for CCHS to review the all important curriculum it delivered. Clearly, examination results were excellent; the motivation of the review was rooted in a desire to assess the impact of our curriculum beyond those quantifiable outcomes.

We took inspiration from the RSA Opening Minds which promotes innovative and integrated ways of thinking about the curriculum where teachers design and develop a curriculum for their own schools around **five key competencies** (Citizenship, Learning, Managing Information, Relating to People, Managing Situations). Whilst this was a useful starting point we looked beyond the concept of competencies and explored the Guy Claxton concept of “**Building Learning Power**”. His focus on the 4 Rs (Resilience, Resourcefulness, Reflection, Relationships) was helpful but, in our opinion, led to an oversimplification which excluded important dimensions. We then considered **The Personal Learning & Thinking Skills** (students as independent enquirers, creative thinkers, reflective learners, team workers, self-managers, effective participants) which came out of the QCA review of the National Curriculum led by Mick Waters. He wrote:

“... the curriculum is the entire planned learning experience that the pupil encounters, encompassing lessons, events, routines and what takes place outside school hours.

It should secure high standards of attainment and achievement, as well as helping young people to develop healthy lifestyles, participate in civic life, and enter further education, training or employment as confident and responsible adults.

Most of all, young people should relish the opportunity for discovery and achievement that the curriculum offers to them.”

Whilst a School cross-curricular Focus Group was exploring the various approaches quoted above the School was also exploring the possibility of introducing the International Baccalaureate Diploma programme; considering its major component which is the Learner Profile with its own 10 distinct traits (Students as Communicators, Thinkers, Knowledgeable, Inquirers, Open- minded, Principled, Risk-takers, Caring, Balanced, Reflective) was directly relevant to our work as well as the 5 areas of interaction within the IB Middle Years programme (approaches to learning, community & service, homo faber, environment, health & social education).

In 2008 we devoted an entire INSET day to discussing our school curriculum, in cross curriculum groups led by the staff who had been part of the Focus Group. Debates were highly productive and led to the creation of **5 Learning Dimensions: Learning to Learn, Communication skills, Managing Situations, Local & Global Awareness and Personal & Social Skills**. These were discussed among staff, parents, and students. We looked at integrating them into the curriculum and mapping them across the whole range of school activities. We then concluded that they were more a series of skills than cohesive and therefore more difficult to own as a school. We returned to the IB Learner Profile and the issues that had been identified by the staff at their INSET day and agreed that single words are more powerful and easier for the students (and the staff, and the parents, and the governors...) to remember and adopt. That was the genesis of the **CCHS Learner Profile**. By the time they complete their education at the School we aim for our students to have become **Articulate, Creative, Enquiring, Knowledgeable, Principled, Reflective, Resilient**.

To quote Mick Waters again: this was to be “a launch pad, not an anchor”. It intended to bring coherence to what each separate subject was trying to achieve with the students.

This work did not happen overnight; it was not until an INSET day in 2010 that the Learner Profile was launched to the teachers and then to the School Community at the start of the new academic year. Members of the Focus Group had expanded on each characteristic/ attribute to give clarity to students, staff, and parents and presented the detail to their colleagues.

Individual staff have championed aspects of the Learner Profile: our Head of Art developed Creativity as part of her AST project; the Head of Latin explored Resilience as part of her MA research; Student Researchers have centred various projects around the Learner Profile. Subject Leaders have embedded the LP in their schemes of work, shared good practice at Faculty meetings. Enrichment days have focused on aspects of the LP building up a coherent programme for the students. Students were asked to self-assess against the characteristics and identify what they needed to develop.

The LP is an established aspect of lesson planning and observations; we can therefore assess its impact and address shortcomings.

The greatest joy about this major school development is to receive feedback from students and their parents expressing how grateful they are that CCHS is not the academic hot house they might have first thought. The work is not finished and we are constantly exploring new ways of developing this further in the context of curriculum freedoms we enjoy as an academy.

Mrs Nicole Chapman
Chelmsford County High School for Girls



Digital Learning



We have just completed a day's training session for colleagues from some fifty organisations regarding the use of iPads in the classroom. Working on our digital learning programme for some two years it is a particular joy, whenever possible, to share our experiences with other schools. A highlight of this training day, held jointly with Square Group, was hearing some of our students talk about how the use of iPads in the classroom had changed their learning. In particular a (relatively) disaffected Year 10 student said it had completely changed his attitude to education. Using his iPad in the classroom he claimed, "has made life so much easier" (slightly worrying!) and then went on to elaborate that it has made things so much faster in terms of doing research, creating interesting presentations, sharing work and receiving assessed work back much more speedily. This particular student spoke very highly of his extensive use of Keynote and Explain Everything and how useful Apple TV is in the classroom. Other students talked articulately and positively about various different aspects of their digital learning.

In summary, it was inspirational to hear what the boys were saying and to have validation of a project producing the outcomes we hoped for. We are all very aware that in education initiatives come and go almost as quickly as education ministers (with an obvious current exception), and as a school we are cautious in jumping on any bandwagon or perceived Holy Grail. The potential benefits offered by using digital tablets in the classroom, however, were ones we could not resist. I firmly believe that this is really having a transformational effect on the way we teach and learn in the school and is having very positive side effects in encouraging staff and students to continue to explore different pedagogies. It has been a revitalising process.

There has been some e-mail correspondence between various grammar schools about digital learning and the issues surrounding it. There is no right answer for any school but we decided that for us, iPads were the most suitable device to support our project. iPads are somewhat more expensive over other devices but with the huge range of apps available combined with the advantages of iTunesU, Apple TV and iBooks, "ecosystem" made us decide the extra expenditure was worth it. It was important for us that we used the same device throughout the school, particularly as this will enable staff to become more confident in their use and streamline our training etc.

The implementation process has been a long one. Firstly, we had to ensure that wireless facilities were available in every part of the school including the playing fields. However, after this initial expense (actually less than we expected), our on-going IT costs will be lower, as we replace fewer lap and desktop computers. We then held a trial based on one class, and all the staff who taught that class, being issued with iPads. The teachers, students and, importantly, parents were all given training, on how to use the tablet in the classroom. This trial was evaluated at the end of one term by everyone involved. We also worked closely with some other schools across the country that were making similar decisions.

Every member of staff now has an iPad and has received considerable training on how to use the various apps. This, of course, is an on-going challenge as new staff join the school and need appropriate support. All boys in Years 8 to 11 now have iPads (Year 7 will have by January), and every room has Apple TV installed. We believe it is important that the boys have the pads 24/7, they have ownership of them, and see them as a tool for educational use and not a gimmick or as a higher performing laptop to be issued for particular lessons. The system we adopted was for the pupils to purchase or lease iPads with the school providing some for particular students with special or financial needs and having some available in the school for use on a one-off basis. As mentioned, we have made considerable savings on our IT budget by cutting back on the number of laptop and desktop computers replaced in the school as the lease expires or they deteriorate. We expect our budget to be 30% lower this year alone.

Digital Learning

In terms of general guidance, we always make the following points to colleagues who are considering going down this digital learning path.

1. Start with being clear on why you might embark on this path and what you want to achieve. You must be very clear on what you expect the educational outcome to be on whichever route you decide to take.
2. You must have a very robust wireless infrastructure across the whole school and be able to handle every student logging on simultaneously (could be some 1200+ devices).
3. You need to factor in a considerable amount of training for staff. This is particularly the case if you are having a large turnover of staff. Clearly staff do not have to know everything to do with the iPads, but nonetheless, in order to be confident they do need to understand the potential available. We have staff with responsibility points dedicated to supporting their colleagues in this respect. There is also some training needed for parents (more evenings in school...) and students.
4. Crucial to our scheme, has been the leadership by students. Each class has two or three pupils designated as Digital Leaders. They receive extra training to enable them to support other pupils and indeed staff with the devices. They run break and lunchtime sessions where people can drop in, and whenever there is an issue in a classroom (a teacher not understanding a particular app, for example), the Digital Leaders will solve it. They have been invaluable, and of course, it has been a great way of developing student participation and responsibility.
5. The key apps for us have been Edmodo, Socrates, Explain Everything, Google Drive and iTuneYou. There are, as you will know, over half a million apps available and one of the enjoyments of the project is the students finding new and relevant apps and then advising the school and staff of how to use them.
6. Back to my starting point, we receive lots of requests from other schools to come and visit or take advice, at least one a day, for the past eighteen months. This either means being firm and saying "no" (which we do not like to do) or accepting another drain on one's fairly limited resources. This is why we have moved to offering day sessions in conjunction with sponsors such as Four Square, to try and meet the needs of our colleagues without impacting too much the normal running of the school.

This is a fairly basic list. I must restate that we have found it a very rewarding and exciting journey. Personally, I am constantly surprised by the creativity that the students exhibit when using the iPads in ways I would never have imagined. The second surprising spin-off is the closer involvement of parents in their students learning, their engagement with what's going on in the classroom and with homework. And finally, even the most IT illiterate staff have found the pads useful if only for marking Sixth Form essays. Students submit work electronically (tasks can also be hand written and photographed on the iPad and submitted electronically) with staff dictating their comments which attach automatically to the relevant part of the assignment. Even this most basic of uses has resulted in a qualitative improvement in assessment and feedback which has led to improved work from students. It is also much quicker and easier (to return to the disgruntled student) for staff.

Stephen Nokes

John Hampden Grammar School



What Will Key Stage 4 Floor Target Measures Mean for Grammar Schools?

The recent announcements about changes to Key Stage 4 accountability measures seem to have attracted relatively little media attention. Perhaps the outcomes were anticipated, and many of the measures that will be adopted are broadly similar to those currently used. The devil, however, is always in the detail, and it is the details that will most impact on grammar schools.

Progress 8 Measure

The decision to introduce a Progress 8 measure echoes the current best 8 value added measure shown in performance tables. The new calculation will be based on English and Mathematics, three EBacc subjects and any other 3 GCSE subjects. The earlier consultation clearly favoured the option based on this combination. The decision to double weight English and Mathematics may be sound, but it really does mean that marking in English has to be more reliable than it has been in recent years.

A measure based on 8, rather than 5 subjects, should better serve grammar schools. Most grammar schools will also favour the decision to calculate a VA measure in each subject by comparing the performance in that subject of students with the similar prior attainment. It will mean that schools will not gain any advantage by entering students in so called 'soft options'

It is likely that the points system for each grade will change. Currently grade G is worth 16 points and a top grade worth 58 points. The proposal is that the scale should range from 1-8 and would neatly reflect the grade changes that will be adopted for examinations. In due course the range will extend from 1-9. The differential between top and bottom grades would be a return to that of a decade ago. The change would have positive impact on any comparative analysis of the grammar school sector. In the main, it will also help schools with high attaining pupils when compared with other schools.

Floor Standards

It is the changes to floor standards arising from the progress measures that will most exercise the minds of grammar school leaders. Each student will be given a VA measure based on a comparison with those of similar KS 2 attainment. This will be used to calculate a school grade.

There remains a degree of ambiguity in the proposals. Performance tables of the future will continue to show performance with similar schools but the methodology for the calculation of floor targets is rooted in comparisons with students of similar prior attainment in **all** schools. Measures for each student will be expressed in terms of being plus or minus a fraction of a grade against projected performance and this will be used to determine the grade for the school which will also be expressed in the same format.

A school will fall below the floor target if its measure is more than half a grade below projections; if it is a grade or more above target it will be exempt from inspection for a 12 month period.

There is the potential for some grammar schools to fall below the floor standard. The work that Jesson undertook on A*/A performance does not exactly mirror the changes but in a rough and ready way it does show that a small number of schools will be vulnerable. The introduction of the grade 8, and later grade 9, will raise the glass ceiling and it will give credit for achievement that is not currently recognised beyond the A* threshold, but it may equally reveal under achievement on the part of some very able children. There is also the question of the validity of KS 2 scores, an issue that could worsen as further changes are made to KS 2 measures.

There is recognition that confidence intervals have to be considered when deciding if a school is performing below average. The distortion at both ends of the ability range has been acknowledged, but it remains to be seen as to how this will be reflected in identifying the schools falling below floor targets.

Currently, there is a degree of confusion about when schools will be due for inspection. The 12 month exemption for schools with high VA may well aid the capacity of Ofsted to focus more on schools deemed to be coasting. It is estimated that the number falling below floor standards will double when the new measure is introduced. The new arrangements will not be introduced until 2016 but there is an invitation for schools to join the arrangements in 2015. It would be useful if some schools accepted the invitation for it would enable early identification of any flaws in the methodology. For many schools this would pose no risk, and it could help to secure a better system for all.

The announcements also highlight the importance of the work that GSHA is currently undertaking with the Fischer Family Trust.

Poor Grammar

Poor Grammar? Or is Just Poor Comprehension Skills?

It is difficult to know what to make of the recent published report, 'Poor Grammars'.

The report is based on 3 separate pieces of research.

One of these reports, 'Access to grammar schools for disadvantaged children' draws its findings from visits to 5 grammars identified by the Institute of Fiscal Studies and a visit to 3 schools from the extensive list of GSHA member schools with programmes to support access. In addition there were visits to 3 primary schools. The sample size is too small for reliable conclusions but the report does attempt to create a balance.

The report on the 'Creation, development and current state of grammars' is written by David Jesson and it gives due acknowledgment of the work of GSHA and recognises the actions taken by many schools to support access. The third report, 'Entry into grammar schools' uses a wide range of statistical evidence to try to analyse the factors that impact on the distribution of FSM children in grammar schools. In particular it considers the relative impact of attainment, disadvantage and distance on access. It also acknowledges that more needs to be known about whether differences in access for FSM children and non FSM are the result of test outcomes or lower rates of application from the FSM cohort.

It is the way in which the research is presented by the Sutton Trust rather than any of research findings that give rise to concerns. Through a process of statistical machination the press release chose to lead on the claim that 6% of prep school pupils provide four times more grammar school pupils than the 16% of FSM eligible children. Inevitably, this led to headlines that the independent sector dominates admissions. The reality, of course is that 88% of all grammar school students come from state primary schools.

There was no attempt in the press briefings to set the report in the broader educational context. The Sutton Trust report on the top 500 comprehensives which was published earlier this year claimed that the number of FSM in these schools was half the level that could be expected based on national and local data. Grammars select on ability and only 10% of FSM children reach level 5 at KS 2 compared with a national average of 25%. The report, quite reasonably, uses level 5 as the indicator of grammar school potential. On the basis of this data the proportions of eligible FSM children in grammar schools is significantly greater than the overall FSM proportion in the top 500 comprehensives. Taken together, both pieces of research show the challenges faced across education in reaching out to the disadvantaged and in raising aspiration. The failure to set the report into context predictably opened the door to the John Harris diatribe in the Guardian claiming that selection entrenches advantage.

In 2012 just over 500 FSM children entered grammar schools. For the success rate of L5 FSM to match that of other L5 would require 200 more FSM children a year to enter grammar schools. Just one more in each school would virtually close the gap.

The recommendations of the report are not, as claimed, either new or radical. All are areas that had already been identified by GSHA as options to aid access and represent practices that are already adopted by schools. This work, however, is usually carefully presented to avoid promotion of a coaching culture.

It is unfortunate that the press briefing both contributed to reinforcing the false stereotyping of grammar schools and failed to signal initiatives taken by grammar schools

Post 16 Funding

In August GSHA representatives met with advisers from the Secretary of State's office. The meeting was a response to the survey undertaken in May showing that grammar schools will be disproportionately hit by funding changes.

The meeting was constructive and there was an acknowledgement of the problem. It was clear, however, that there was no willingness to review the 600 hour funding model. The government is open to considering a weighting for IB but fears that doing the same for A level would result in an upward drift in the number of subjects studied. There was, however a willingness to explore others ways of closing the funding gap.

GSHA was asked to quickly collect evidence to show the cost and range of provision in grammar schools. The summer break is not the ideal time to gather such information and so we focused on an in depth provision in a sample of ten schools. We collected data on:

- ◆ **The teaching time allocated to Substantive A/S and A level subjects**
- ◆ **The time allocated to non substantive courses such as Critical Thinking and EPQ**
- ◆ **The time allocated to guided learning activities**
- ◆ **Group sizes**
- ◆ **The proportion of students studying STEM subjects**
- ◆ **The proportion doing Further Mathematics**
- ◆ **Mean teaching group sizes.**
- ◆ **Other costs associated with supporting very able students, such as Oxbridge preparation**

The evidence from the survey is compelling and demonstrates how the 600 hour model gives no flex to grammar schools because all students exceed the allocated time. Many other providers will have significant numbers that meet the 540 hours required for full time study, but whose taught programme is under 600 hours.

Even with non substantive A/S and A levels removed from the calculation the survey showed that:

◆ **Year 12**

100% of yr 12 students have a total programme of at least **625 hours**

85% of yr 12 students have a total programme of at least **723 hours**

15%+ of yr 12 students have a total programme of at least **873 hours**

◆ **Year 13**

100% of students would have a programme of at least **615 hours**

38-65% of students have a programme of at least **755 hours**

0 to 9% of students follow a programme of at least **823 hours**

The evidence supports the claim that schools will have to make drastic reductions to their programmes and that this will put at threat provision in subjects such as Further Mathematics. The numbers on group sizes show that the grammar school sector is generally cost efficient with little scope for further efficiency savings.

There are encouraging signs of a genuine attempt to do something, but it remains to be seen whether proposals will make the significant difference that is needed for those schools that are most heavily hit.

Further meetings will take place this term. In the mean time, heads are encouraged to continue to write to ministers, to ensure that there can be no doubt on their part of the problems that schools face. The responsibility for funding is shared across the portfolio of David Laws and Matthew Hancock and it would be helpful if letters were sent to the Secretary of State and circulated to the other two ministers.

Ofqual call for subject and assessment experts

Ofqual has recently announced significant reform to GCSEs and A levels that includes changes to structure and assessment. Alongside this, the Department of Education has made changes to subject content. New GCSEs and reformed A levels will become more engaging to study and teach and support a world-class education.

Ofqual is looking for high calibre professionals to contribute to Ofqual's work. This could range from the accreditation of single qualifications, through to monitoring and comparing standards across groups of qualifications.

Ofqual is looking for experienced teachers, former teachers with recent experience, assessors in Key Stage 4 & 5, academics with subject expertise, or those who work in assessment theory or practice.

Experts will be placed on a list of external experts from where they can be selected and commissioned for specific assignments. Experts will receive a fair payment for their work, with expenses reimbursed.

For more information see:

www.ofqual.gov.uk/experts or <https://twitter.com/ofqual>



... Dates for the Diary / Events ...

- ◆ *26 November* *Inaugural Meeting of the GSHA Deputy Heads' Group. King Edward VI Five Ways, Birmingham,*
- ◆ *17 January* *Training Seminar for Grammar School Admission Appeal Members and Clerks. Stone Kings, London,*
- ◆ *18/19 June* *GSHA National Conference. Broadway House, Westminster,*
- ◆ *18 June (eve)* *House of Commons Reception for Grammar School Heads and Friends of Grammar Schools,*
- ◆ *1 July* *Sixth Form Leaders' Conference, London,*

Executive Committee



Chairman:

Charlotte Marten - Rugby High School

Vice Chairman (Chairman Designate for 2014/15):

Stephen Nokes - John Hampden Grammar School

Vice Chairman:

Mark Fenton - Dr Challoner's Grammar School

Treasurer:

Yvonne Wilkinson - King Edward VI Five Ways School, Birmingham

Regional Representatives

Kent	Rosemary Joyce, Matthew Bartlett, Paul Danielson, John Weeds
Medway	Christine Probyn
Buckinghamshire	Stephen Nokes, Phillip Wayne
London	James Skinner, Liz Allen
Lincolnshire	Roger Hale
South West	Roy Pike, Stuart Smallwood
Gloucestershire	Jon Standen, Ewa Sawicka
Birmingham	Colin Parker
Reading/Slough	Jon Constable
Lancs/Yorks/Cumbria	Martin Pearman
Essex	Nicole Chapman
Midlands	Tim Swain, Michael Barrett
Trafford	Tim Gartside, Mike Thompson
Merseyside	Elaine Cogan
Warwickshire	Ian Blaikie

