



Department  
for Education

# **Reforming Key Stage 4 qualifications consultation**

**Government response**

**February 2013**

# Contents

Introduction	3
Comprehensive reforms	4
The Government Response	6
1. Raising expectations to help our young people to compete internationally	6
2. The characteristics of world class assessment	7
3. Getting the subjects right	9
4. Supporting all pupils to help them achieve their potential	11
5. Putting the plans into action	12
6. Competition to identify the best qualifications	14
Annex A: More information about the consultation period	15
Annex B: Organisations that provided written responses to the consultation	17

## Introduction

On 17 September 2012, the Department for Education launched a consultation on the Government's proposals to restore rigour and confidence to our examination system at age 16. It set out our proposals to develop new qualifications which will match the best in the world. It sought views on the assessment characteristics that would help achieve that goal, on the support that schools and colleges would need to prepare to deliver more challenging qualifications, and on the arrangements that would help to prepare all our young people to achieve them.

The consultation ran for 12 weeks before closing on 10 December 2012, and received nearly 5,500 written responses, from schools, further and higher education, employers, curriculum and assessment experts, Awarding Organisations (AOs) and the general public. We also held valuable discussions with individuals and groups likely to be affected by the proposals. This gave us a chance to understand the views of AOs, unions, head teachers, young people and equalities groups in greater depth. The written responses and the views expressed in meetings have been important in shaping how we intend to move forward with these reforms.

## Comprehensive reforms

The Government is determined to reform qualifications at 16 to set expectations of rigour and challenge that match and exceed those in the highest performing jurisdictions. The demand of GCSEs has lessened over time and it is right to take action to raise expectations and standards. There was broad agreement in the meetings we held during the consultation period that GCSEs as currently constituted are not giving our pupils the best chance to succeed, and that change is required. However many have also argued convincingly that GCSEs themselves could, with comprehensive reform, once again be highly respected qualifications in which pupils, employers and further and higher education institutions can have faith.

With this in mind, we have decided that GCSEs should be comprehensively reformed, building on the work that Ofqual has already done to strengthen the qualification. We have asked Ofqual, in revising regulatory requirements, to take account of the need to: increase the demand of GCSEs to reflect that of high-performing jurisdictions; avoid forcing pupils to choose between higher and lower tier papers; reduce internal assessment and access to examination aids to a minimum; consider the needs of employers and others for greater reassurance of literacy and numeracy; and consider the need for a new grading structure. We want to see new GCSEs in at least English language, English literature, mathematics, biology, chemistry, physics, combined science (double award), history and geography ready for teaching in schools from September 2015. Other subjects may be in a position to move to the new approach by that date as well, with changes to remaining subjects following as soon as possible afterwards. We want that to happen for all subjects for first teaching in September 2016 and have asked Ofqual for its view on the extent to which this is possible.

In opening the consultation on new qualifications we set out our concerns about the perverse incentives in the current system that have led to a 'race to the bottom'. We proposed to reform the qualifications market so that one single AO would offer qualifications in each subject. We have considered carefully the points made by Ofqual and others about the potential risks of reforming the qualifications market at the same time as fundamentally changing the qualifications themselves. While our concerns remain, we recognise the significant steps Ofqual have taken to tighten up the regulation of GCSEs and to ensure that standards are right. In this context, we are persuaded that no changes to the market should take place at this time. We will keep this position under review should it become clear that there remains a tension which acts against our shared priority with Ofqual of rigorous and challenging qualification standards.

In addition to setting out reforms for GCSEs we are, today, opening two further consultations: on the programmes of study that make up the national curriculum at Key

Stages 1- 3 (publishing for information draft programmes of study for Key Stage 4), and on the best way to hold secondary schools to account for their performance.

# The Government Response

This paper sets out the views that we have heard in response to the consultation and explains how the Government has decided to proceed.

Some respondents who provided written responses to the consultation chose only to answer a subset of the questions that were posed, while some questions allowed respondents to give multiple answers. Therefore, response figures for any given question relate only to those who answered that question and may sum to more than 100 per cent.

## 1. Raising expectations to help our young people to compete internationally

To make sure that our qualifications allow pupils to compete internationally, we need to make sure that the level of challenge is set correctly, that the qualifications are accessible to the vast majority of pupils and that the right grading structures are in place.

There was broad agreement in the meetings we held during the consultation period that GCSEs as currently constituted are not giving our pupils the best chance to succeed, and that change is required. Some respondents found that the level of detail in the consultation was not sufficient for them to know whether to support the proposals, while others were concerned that the minimum standards might be too high. This meant that just under a quarter of respondents said that they agreed with the expectations for grading structures that were set out in the consultation, while nearly half of people responding were opposed to them.

Some of the AOs, and other groups to whom we spoke, said that our proposals were trying to achieve too many things at the same time. They suggested, for example, that it would be very challenging to make exams more stretching and also accessible to as many pupils as possible. They believed that it would be helpful either to reduce the number of objectives for the new qualifications or to prioritise them. We asked about priorities for the qualifications; the most popular responses were that they should ensure pupils have transferable skills (33 per cent) and are able to apply the knowledge they acquire in real situations (26 per cent). Nineteen per cent of respondents said that new qualifications should be comparable with international tests like PISA or with qualifications used in other high-performing jurisdictions.

There was strong agreement that there should be a common grading structure across all subjects, supported by over 80 per cent of respondents, including all AOs. Comments indicated that a common system would ensure comparability across subjects, whereas a variety of grading systems would cause confusion.

*Response: Reformed GCSEs should remain universal qualifications, accessible, with good teaching, to the same proportion of pupils as currently sits GCSE exams at the end of Key Stage 4. At the level of what is widely considered to be a pass (currently indicated by a grade C) there must be an increase in demand to reflect that of high-performing jurisdictions. At the top end the new qualification should prepare pupils properly to progress to A levels or other study. This should be achieved through more challenging subject content and more rigorous assessment structures.*

*We agree that it is important for young people to acquire knowledge and develop skills that they can take and apply outside the classroom, and would expect this to be part of any good qualification. We want our education system to equal the best in the world, and believe that stretching pupils further with these new qualifications will improve their chances to compete in today's international market place.*

*We believe there is a strong case for reformed GCSEs to have a new grading scale, to reflect the step change in our expectations and have asked Ofqual for views on this. Any changes should apply across all subjects, and should differentiate performance more clearly, particularly at the top end.*

*For qualifications in English language and mathematics we have asked Ofqual to consider the benefits of all pupils receiving more information directly from Awarding Organisations on their performance across the different areas tested by the qualification, in order particularly to support progression for those who may need to re-take the qualification post-16.*

## **2. The characteristics of world class assessment**

### **2.1 Tiered papers**

The consultation set out the ways the Government intended new qualifications to be assessed, including the proposal that, wherever possible, there should be no tiered exam papers. In response, a small majority (56 per cent) of respondents said that it would not be possible to end tiering across the full range of English Baccalaureate subjects, with the remainder fairly evenly split between those who thought it was possible and those who were unsure. Those who felt it would not be possible were often unsure that a single exam could assess all abilities, while others felt that tiering works well or that removing it might impact disproportionately on low attaining pupils. We asked what approaches might enable tiering to be removed; the most frequently suggested methods were a wider range of questions and additional papers aimed at narrower ranges of abilities.

AOs said that there would be particular challenges with removing tiering from mathematics qualifications, but most said that it would be possible to develop qualifications which allowed all pupils to access all grades without using tiering. Some of

the AOs spoke favourably of taking an approach where the qualifications are accessible to all pupils but may be taken at different ages depending on when each pupil was ready for them.

*Response: The current system of tiered papers, whereby pupils are forced to choose between higher and lower tier papers, places a cap on ambition. Reformed GCSEs should avoid that, while enabling high quality assessment at all levels. We acknowledge that the appropriate approach to assessment will vary between subjects and a range of solutions may come forward, for example, extension papers offering access to higher grades alongside a common core. There should be no disincentive for schools to give an open choice of papers to their pupils.*

## **2.2 External assessment**

The consultation expressed concerns about the use of internal assessment in qualifications and invited views as to whether it would be possible to remove it from the core subjects. Almost half of respondents said that none of the English Baccalaureate subjects could be entirely externally assessed, while a quarter said that all of them could be. Almost half of respondents thought that mathematics could be completely assessed externally, while around a third thought each of the other subjects could be entirely externally assessed. Practical science work was the aspect that was most commonly cited as requiring internal assessment, with oral ability in languages, English communication and geography fieldwork all identified by a significant number of people. Some respondents told us that coursework and controlled assessment can work well, while critics of external assessment said that exams are only able to test certain skills, suit some pupils more than others and rely too much on memory.

In our discussions with AOs, they pointed out the integral link between modes of assessment and the subject content that is being assessed, but generally agreed that it would be possible in principle to remove internal assessment from new qualifications. They shared the wider view that practical work in science is the area that might benefit most from internal assessment, and said that internal assessment can have some benefits.

*Response: We recognise the important role that internal assessment can play but we remain concerned about the amount of teaching time that can be absorbed by preparing pupils for, and conducting, internal assessment that contributes to a qualification grade. We note that Ofqual's recent report on English GCSEs found that too much emphasis on school-based controlled assessment, combined with the pressure the accountability system places on pupils achieving a C grade, had led to significant over-marking of controlled assessments.*

*We therefore want to see internal assessment kept to a minimum and used only where there is a compelling case to do so. We have asked Ofqual to consider this in light of*



*their review of controlled assessment. Certain aspects of assessment, such as the assessment of practical science or speaking ability in languages, lend themselves less easily to externally marked examinations. We do not want the assessment of those areas to become less effective, and we expect Ofqual and the AOs to decide where controlled assessment is absolutely required or where alternative, more innovative approaches to assessing candidates' abilities may be possible.*

## **2.3 Examination aids**

The consultation proposed removing examination aids wherever possible, and asked which examination aids are in fact necessary for pupils to demonstrate fully their skills and knowledge. The most common answer was calculators, which were specifically mentioned by 64 per cent of respondents. The periodic table (32 per cent), source materials (25 per cent), core texts (17 per cent) and dictionaries (14 per cent) were the next most frequently mentioned items, while there were other responses which suggested principles rather than specific items. Over a quarter of people said that use of examination aids should reflect their use in the real world, while more than a fifth of people said that exams should not become a memory test.

*Response: We believe that the use of examination aids should be restricted where possible, but agree with the view expressed by many experts during the consultation period that the use of examination aids should be determined by the skills, knowledge and understanding being assessed. Access to calculators in mathematics examinations, for example, might enable the effective testing of certain skills. Similarly, access to the periodic table during examinations in science allows testing of a pupil's ability to apply the table rather than his or her ability to memorise it. We are content for access to examination aids in those cases where it would allow better assessment, but remain of the view that the use of examination aids should be kept to a minimum.*

## **3. Getting the subjects right**

### **3.1 Maintaining a broad and balanced curriculum**

Respondents to the consultation expressed concerns that the Government is driving a narrow, academic focused curriculum for all pupils, and that other subjects might be marginalised as a result. Campaigns in support of arts subjects and Japanese as a foreign language made up a significant proportion of the written responses that we received, while concerns about access to a broad and balanced curriculum were also expressed in some of our meetings. Eighty-four per cent of responses said that we had not identified the right collection of subjects, with just over half of responses that were not part of a campaign giving this view.

More than three fifths of respondents felt that new qualifications in the English Baccalaureate subjects should take up the same amount of curriculum time as GCSEs, with many saying it was important to make sure there was space for other subjects and that those other subjects should not be devalued.

*Response: Reforms to GCSEs will be applied across all subjects. We have asked Ofqual's view as to the appropriate subject coverage of reformed GCSEs. The timetable for introducing new GCSEs is set out in Section 5.2.*

*Schools will decide how best to use their timetable but we expect new GCSEs to be about the same size as the current ones, and pupils should still be able to study a broad range of subjects that is appropriate to their interests and talents.*

### **3.2 English, mathematics and science**

There was a strong consensus on the consultation questions relating to English, mathematics and science. The majority (69 per cent) of respondents were in favour of including a combined science option, which respondents felt works well for those pupils who do not want to pursue a career in science, while only 12 per cent of respondents did not want a combined science option to be made available. There was equally strong support for the proposal that new qualifications in English language and mathematics should provide an assurance of pupils' literacy and numeracy (69 per cent). The remainder of responses were fairly evenly split between those who disagreed and those who were not sure, with those who disagreed likely to say that literacy and numeracy should be embedded and assessed as part of all subjects.

*Response: We will publish for consultation, by May 2013, requirements for subject content in the reformed GCSEs in English language, English literature, mathematics, science, history and geography, in time to allow AOs to prepare specifications. The reformed GCSEs will include English literature and English language but not a combined English option. A combined science option worth two GCSEs but not a combined science option worth one GCSE will be available alongside individual GCSEs in each of those subjects. The combined science course should cover a narrower range of material than the individual sciences, but that material should be covered in the same depth. We are considering what the subject suite should be in mathematics and will confirm this in due course.*

*We know that employers and others are keen for greater reassurance that pupils who achieve a good level of performance in English and mathematics are literate and numerate, and we will explore this when we set out our requirements for subject content.*

### **3.3 Languages**

Respondents said that diversity of languages was important and that offering a variety of languages would help to ensure that the needs of employers are met; 75 per cent of respondents were in favour of developing new qualifications in all languages for which there is an existing GCSE. Fewer than 10 per cent of respondents wanted us to restrict the number of languages for which a new qualification was available. The languages which were most frequently requested to be part of competitions for new qualifications were Japanese (driven by a concerted campaign), Mandarin, Spanish, French and German. Respondents were generally in favour of introducing new qualifications in languages at the same time as those in history and geography (45 per cent, with the remainder evenly split between those who said they should be delayed and those who were not sure).

*Response: We are keen for new GCSEs to be available in a wide range of modern and classical languages. Decisions as to which languages are made available will be primarily a matter for AOs, in consultation with teachers, professional bodies, subject associations and other groups likely to be affected by those decisions.*

#### **4. Supporting all pupils to help them achieve their potential**

The proposed Statement of Achievement caused real concern for many respondents, with 41 per cent saying that it would not benefit any pupils. Significant numbers of people told us in meetings and in written responses that they thought Statements of Achievement would not be valuable and that there would in fact be a stigma attached to having one, while some said that they could be a barrier to employment. A number of respondents said that, if they were to be of any value, more detailed information about progress in English and mathematics should be made available for all pupils rather than specific groups. The groups that were identified by some respondents as potentially benefitting from a Statement of Achievement were low attaining pupils (16 per cent of respondents) and pupils with Special Educational Needs (SEN) (eight per cent).

The campaigns in support of the arts made it difficult to get clear feedback about the possible impacts of reform on certain groups, such as pupils with SEN, as those respondents said that all pupils would be disadvantaged by the proposals. However, even among those responses which were not part of a campaign, clear concerns were expressed that the proposals might have negative impacts on some pupils. Some respondents were worried that pupils with talents outside the scope of the English Baccalaureate would be negatively affected, and others that low attaining pupils or pupils with SEN would be impacted negatively. The groups identified by respondents as being likely to benefit from the proposals were high attainers and boys, who have been shown to perform better in examinations than coursework.

*Response: Having considered the options carefully, we have decided not to proceed with the proposal for a Statement of Achievement as set out in the consultation. As set out in*

*Section 1, the reformed GCSEs should remain universal qualifications, accessible with good teaching, to the same proportion of pupils as currently sit GCSE exams at the end of Key Stage 4. We have asked Ofqual to consider the benefits of all pupils receiving more information directly from Awarding Organisations on their performance across the different areas tested by the qualification, in order particularly to support progression for those who may need to re-take the qualification post-16. This will help those pupils who do not perform as well as they had hoped to focus their efforts on the areas which will improve their performance and enable them to reach a higher level.*

*Regardless of our reforms to qualifications, we need to ensure that young people are able to make smooth transitions beyond age 16, especially if they have not achieved the grades that, particularly in English and mathematics, are often required by employers and for further study. We are therefore considering how best to ensure that appropriate pupil information is transferred, from schools to post-16 providers, where a pupil is leaving school to continue his or her education elsewhere.*

## **5. Putting the plans into action**

### **5.1 Giving a name to new qualifications**

Just under two fifths of people were in favour of moving to a new name for new qualifications, with a very similar number of people against a change and the remainder unsure. English Baccalaureate Certificates was not a popular alternative name, with only 12 per cent of respondents supporting it and two thirds opposed to it. Those who did not like the name felt that it misused the term 'Baccalaureate' and could cause confusion with other Baccalaureate qualifications, and that the use of 'English' was parochial and would exclude other parts of the United Kingdom. Very few people suggested an alternative name, but the most popular alternative was 'Educational Certificate'.

*Response: During the consultation period, many argued convincingly that GCSEs themselves could, with comprehensive reform, once again be highly respected qualifications in which pupils, employers and further and higher education institutions can have faith. Therefore, we have decided that GCSEs should be comprehensively reformed in order to command the respect our pupils deserve as reward for their hard work.*

### **5.2 A sensible timetable for introducing new qualifications**

The consultation period raised some helpful ideas about the introduction of new qualifications, and we had a number of suggestions for the best way to do it. Just over a third of people who responded to the consultation said that they favoured a phased approach to introducing new qualifications, with English, mathematics and science introduced in 2015 and others following. A little under a quarter of respondents wanted all subjects to be introduced in 2015, while the remainder selected the 'Other' box. A lot of

those choosing to give an 'Other' response said that new qualifications should not be introduced at all, while others wanted us to take longer before introducing any new qualifications. Almost a sixth of respondents encouraged the piloting of new qualifications before their introduction, while others wanted them to be introduced all at once but to a longer timetable.

In meetings, AOs were generally of the view that six months' development time would be needed to design new qualifications, but that the timetable proposed in the consultation was achievable if this could be built in. They agreed that this was dependent on other factors; in particular that the secondary curriculum and any essential qualification syllabus content should be available prior to the start of the development phase, and that clear guidance must be given on the criteria which the new qualifications will need to meet.

The majority (55 per cent) of respondents said that schools will need more than 18 months to prepare for new qualifications, while a further 23 per cent said that they would need between 12 and 18 months. Only five per cent of people said that schools could be ready in less than 12 months.

*Response: We believe that it will be possible for new GCSEs to be made available in English language, English literature, mathematics, biology, chemistry, physics, combined science, geography and history for first teaching from September 2015. The first examinations in these subjects would then take place in the summer of 2017. Other subjects may be in a position to move to the new approach by September 2015 as well, while changes to remaining subjects should follow as soon as possible after that. We believe our aim should be for that to happen for all subjects for first teaching in September 2016. We have asked Ofqual to begin work immediately on revising the regulatory requirements for GCSEs so that schools can have at least a year to prepare for teaching these new qualifications, and we are developing proposals for the new subject content.*

### **5.3 Support for schools and colleges**

Nearly two thirds of respondents said that AOs must provide past papers or questions to enable effective teaching, while almost half wanted mark schemes to be made available. Forty per cent said that they want AOs to be required to provide training, while syllabi, examiners' reports and access to advisers were the next most frequently requested support. Fewer respondents identified things that they thought AOs should be prevented from offering but, among those that did, the most popular suggestions were textbooks (45 per cent) and training to the test (40 per cent). Just over half of those who suggested a way that AOs could reduce burdens on schools and colleges said that improved administration would help, while one in five respondents wanted each of more accurate marking and a period of stability.

The consultation also asked how the Government can best prepare schools and colleges for the new qualifications; the most common answers were that they needed time to prepare (50 per cent) and training (46 per cent). Good communication and early availability of materials (31 and 25 per cent respectively) were next most popular, with financial assistance being requested by 21 per cent of respondents. Most respondents felt that colleges would need the same support as schools in preparing for new qualifications, but 29 per cent of people responding to that question highlighted additional needs that they might have in terms of staffing.

The majority of respondents (54 per cent) said that we should expect colleges to be ready to offer new qualifications at the same time as schools. They felt that multiple systems running in parallel would be unfair. Almost a quarter of people said that colleges would need longer, with some of those people pointing towards the need to offer resits in the existing qualifications for those who had not achieved good grades at age 16.

*Response: We will expect AOs to continue to provide appropriate support and guidance to schools and colleges, in line with Ofqual's regulatory requirements. This is likely to include launch materials for the new qualifications alongside on-going support for the administration of new and existing examinations, ensuring that the administrative burden on schools is minimised as far as possible. We will continue to work with schools, colleges and others leading up to the introduction of new qualifications to ensure that schools and colleges are able to access the support that they need.*

## **6. Competition to identify the best qualifications**

Our consultation asked about the length of time for which new qualifications ought to count in performance tables before repeating competitions to identify the best one available. Responses to that question were fairly evenly split in terms of whether they felt that five years was an appropriate length of time, with 36 per cent of people disagreeing, almost as many unsure and the remaining 29 per cent in favour of a five year period. A number of respondents said that they disagreed with the use of qualifications in performance tables, while others said that five years would mean too much change in the system and we should choose a longer period of time.

*Response: We are no longer intending to run a competition to identify the best qualification in each subject.*

## Annex A: More information about the consultation period

During the period of consultation, meetings were held with a number of individuals and organisations who have particular expertise in the matters on which we consulted. We met AOs in group meetings and individually and also held meetings with, amongst others, unions, groups of heads, groups of young people and equalities organisations. This allowed us to get a better understanding of the views of some of those who may be most affected by reforms to Key Stage 4 qualifications. Many of those who took part in meetings also responded to the consultation in writing, and we have considered views expressed in meetings alongside those submitted electronically or on paper.

A total of 5,496 written responses were received:

- 3,027 respondents identified themselves as “an individual”;
- 1,371 said they were head teachers, teachers, schools or Academies;
- 275 pupils responded;
- 235 respondents were parents;
- 113 responses were from the employer-business sector;
- 92 responses came from school sixth forms and colleges;
- 75 subject associations responded;
- 56 respondents were Governors;
- 53 Local Authorities responded to the consultation;
- 52 respondents said they were writing on behalf of a College;
- 31 responses came from Further Education Institutions;
- 15 AOs sent a response;
- 9 Unions responded; and
- 92 responses received were classified as ‘Other’ responses.

Those that fell under the ‘Other’ category included some private organisations, education consultants and charities.

That the majority of responses were received from people defining themselves as ‘an individual’ is a result of the text in a template letter used by one of the campaigns that was run in response to the consultation. Those writing in support of a campaign usually focused their response on the specific issue of concern for that campaign; while some

submitted a copy of the template letter, others sent tailored versions or completed the response form but only answered the most relevant questions.

The Department received 2,755 responses as part of a campaign for the inclusion of a 'Sixth Pillar' representing the arts in the English Baccalaureate, while a further 361 responses were submitted which also focused on supporting the arts but which came in a different format. A total of 430 responses were received following a campaign in support of Japanese as a language. Together, these campaigns constitute 65 per cent of the responses received.

A list of organisations that have responded can be found at Annex B.



## Annex B: Organisations that provided written responses to the consultation<sup>1</sup>

3Di Associates	The Board of Deputies of British Jews
Ajoto Studio	British Association of Teachers of the Deaf
Alcantra Communications	British Dyslexia Association
Alliance for Inclusive Education	British Educational Suppliers Association
Almeida Theatre	British Humanist Association
Anglia Adventures Ltd	British Psychological Society
Assessment and Qualifications Alliance	British Red Cross
Association for Citizenship Teaching	British Science Association
Association for the Teaching of Psychology	Cambridge Assessment
Association of British Orchestras	Capo Communications
Association of Colleges	Caro Gardens Design
Association of Employment and Learning Providers	The Cathedrals Group
The Association of Managers in Education	Catholic Education Service
Association of School and College Leaders	Catholic Independent Schools' Conference
Association of Teachers and Lecturers	Centre for Renaissance and Early Modern Studies
Association of Teachers of Mathematics	Chartered Institute of Educational Assessors
Axis	The Choir Schools' Association
Babcock Learning and Development Partnership	CITB-ConstructionSkills
Bath & North East Somerset Council	City and Guilds
Battersea Arts Centre	City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council
Birmingham City University	City of York Council
The Birmingham Group	Clore Duffield Foundation
Blackburn with Darwen SACRE	Comino Foundation

---

<sup>1</sup> This list excludes individual schools or colleges and those organisations who asked for their response to be kept confidential.

Common English Forum	EEF – The Manufacturers’ Organisation
The Confederation of British Industry	Embassy of Japan
Conservatoire for Dance and Drama	The English and Media Centre
Conservatoires UK	The English National Park Authorities
Council for Learning Outside the Classroom	The English Speaking Board
The Council for Subject Associations	Essex County Council
Crafts Council	Faber Music
Creative Education Academies Trust	Federation of Awarding Bodies
Creative Skillset	Federation of Small Businesses
Cultural Learning Alliance	The Field Studies Council
DanceEast	Focus Learning
Derby City Council	Free Church Education Committee
Design and Art Direction	The Gatsby Charitable Foundation
Design and Technology Association	The Geographical Association
Design Business Association	Girls' Schools Association
Diocese of Salisbury	Globe Education
The Directors Guild	Goldsmiths, University London
Directors UK	Grammar School Heads Association
Drama UK	Guild HE
Dudley Arts Council	Guildford 11-19 Partnership
Dudley LA	Hackney Learning Trust
Dyslexia Action	Hants LA
Dyslexia Information Group in Tamworth	Haslemere Educational Museum
The Dyslexia-SpLD Trust	Headmasters’ and Headmistresses’ Conference
Earth Science Education Forum	Hindu Forum of Britain
EDF Energy	Hindu Youth Association
Education Folk Dance and Song Society	Hiroshima University

HME Technology	Leeds City Council, Children's Services
ifs School of Finance	Leeds Learning
Independent Schools Association	Leicestershire SACRE
Independent Association of Prep Schools	London Design Festival
Independent Schools Council SEN Group	London Diocesan Board for Schools
Independent Schools Religious Studies Association	The London Mathematical Society
Industry Qualifications	Loughborough University
Information for School and College Governors	The Making Project
Institute for Learning	Manchester High School Heads
Institute of Civil Engineers	Manchester Metropolitan University
Institute of Education, University of London	Mathematics in Education and Industry
Institute of Mathematics and IT Applications	Million+
International Baccalaureate	Music Industries Association
Japan Foundation London	Music Theatre Projects
Japan Local Government Centre	Myscience.co Limited
Japan National Tourism Organization	National Association for Gallery Education
The Japan Society	National Association for Music Editors
Japanese Chamber of Commerce and Industry in the UK	National Association for the Teaching of English Secondary Committee
Jazz Services Ltd	National Association of Head Teachers
Kings College London	National Association of Language Advisers
Kirklees Council	The National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers
Kleio Consultancy	The National Association of Teachers of Religious Education
Kyoto University	National Board of Religious Inspectors and Advisors
Landau Forte Charitable Trust	National Children's Bureau
Languages Sheffield	National Council of Women of Great Britain
LEACAN 14+	National Dance Teachers Association
Leading Edge	National Deaf Children's Society

National Drama	The Royal Exchange Theatre
National Foundation of Educational Research	Royal Historical Society
National Governors' Association	Royal National Institute Of Blind People
National Society for Education in Art and Design	Royal Opera House
National Theatre	The Royal Statistical Society
National Training Awards	Rural Norfolk Federation
National Union of Teachers	Schools Music Association
Natural Environment Sector Education Providers Grouping	Science Community Representing Education (SCORE)
NCFE	Sensory Support Service
Norfolk LA	Shakespeare Birthplace Trust
Northern History Network	Shakespeare Schools Festival
Nottingham City Council, Children & Families	Shree Kutch Leva Patel Community UK
Nuffield Foundation	Sixth Form Colleges' Forum
Ofsted	The Society of Heads
Ofqual	Somethin' Else
Oxford City Canal Partnership	Sound Sense
Oxford City Learning	South Gloucestershire LA
Pearson	Southbank Centre
The Place	Sport and Recreation Alliance
Pop for Schools	SSAT (The Schools Network)
Practical Action	Staffordshire LA
The Prince's Foundation for Children and the Arts	Stroud International Textiles
Professional Association for Teachers of Students with Specific Learning Difficulties	Supporting Professionalism in Admissions Programme
The Publishers Association	Surrey Academies Group
Radio Independents Group	Surrey Secondary Heads' Phase Council
Rotherham LA	Tate
The Royal Central School of Speech and Drama, University of London	Teaching and Learning North West

Theatrical Management Association and Society of London Theatre	Vision Impairment: Education and Well-being
Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance	Voice
United Learning	Wandsworth Council
The Universities and Colleges Admissions Service	Warwick Arts Centre
University and College Union	The Wellcome Trust
University Council of Modern Languages	West Sussex County Council
University of Birmingham	What Next? Group
University of Cambridge School Classics Project	Whitechapel Gallery
University of Greenwich	The Whitehouse Consultancy Ltd
University of Leicester	Whole Education
University of Surrey	The Writer's Guild of Great Britain
University of the Arts, London	Youth Dance England
University of Vienna	Youthforia
University of York	



Department  
for Education

© Crown copyright 2013

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence) or email: [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk).

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at: [www.education.gov.uk/contactus](http://www.education.gov.uk/contactus).

This document is available online at <http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/teachingandlearning/qualifications/gcses>