



Department
for Education

Consultation Response Form

Consultation closing date: 16 April 2013
Your comments must reach us by that date.

**Reform of the National Curriculum in
England:**

Consultation Response Form

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

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

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

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

Please tick if you want us to keep your response confidential:	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for confidentiality:	
Name: Christoph Raatz	
Organisation (if applicable): Council for Higher Education in Art & Design (CHEAD)	
Address: 70 Cowcross Street London EC1M 6EJ	

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

Please indicate one category that best describes you as a respondent

<input type="checkbox"/>	Primary School	<input type="checkbox"/>	Secondary School	<input type="checkbox"/>	Special School
<input type="checkbox"/>	Organisation representing school teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subject Association	<input type="checkbox"/>	Parent
<input type="checkbox"/>	Young Person	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Higher Education	<input type="checkbox"/>	Further Education
<input type="checkbox"/>	Academy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Employer/Business Sector	<input type="checkbox"/>	Local Authority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other		

Please Specify:

CHEAD is the association of 63 educational institutions with degree or postgraduate provision in art and design, represented by their most senior academic concerned with art and design. CHEAD is a long standing Association which brings together senior figures in UK Art, Design and Media education. It has a strong international reputation for its work in promoting UK Art and Design and in activity which examines key contemporary issues affecting the HE curriculum and its implementation.

Our membership is composed of all types of higher education institutions (small-specialist, Russell Group, post-92 university, etc) and represents more than 60% of all students enrolled in HE A&D in the UK.

The authors of this response have consulted with the views of the National Society for Education in Art & Design (NSEAD) and the Design & Technology Association (DATA). This was to ensure that our response is consistent with those areas of art and design education that may have an impact on pupils' progression to higher education (HE) and / or their career choices but the precise workings of which may not be closely familiar to a HE audience.

Our response has been further informed by our network of higher education subject associations, including the National Association for Fine Art Education (NAFAE) and the Association of Art Historians.

Are you answering this consultation in response to particular subjects? Please tick all those that apply.

<input type="checkbox"/>	English	<input type="checkbox"/>	mathematics	<input type="checkbox"/>	science
--------------------------	---------	--------------------------	-------------	--------------------------	---------

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	art & design	<input type="checkbox"/>	citizenship	<input type="checkbox"/>	computing
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	design & technology	<input type="checkbox"/>	geography	<input type="checkbox"/>	history
<input type="checkbox"/>	languages	<input type="checkbox"/>	music	<input type="checkbox"/>	physical education
<input type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable				

1 Do you have any comments on the proposed aims for the National Curriculum as a whole as set out in the framework document?

Comments:

We support the overall aim to produce educated citizens and the suggestion that the NC should provide an outline of core knowledge but have reservations over the narrow range of methods, through which this is to be achieved; by focusing on *knowledge* but excluding *skills*, by teaching “*appreciation*” rather than *participation and engagement*, and “*what has been thought and said*”, rather than *engaging with the contemporary* or *encouraging creative development*, the NC will not allow teachers to explore the full potential of their respective subjects.

We believe that the NC would offer a more stimulating experience for all types of learners if its overall aims were therefore stated in more active and forward-looking terms, as well as rendering more explicit the differences between primary and secondary education.

2 Do you agree that instead of detailed subject-level aims we should free teachers to shape their own curriculum aims based on the content in the programmes of study?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not sure
--------------------------	-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------

Comments:

We would agree that the national curriculum should remain predominantly open to curriculum definition by the teachers and schools within which it is taught, as this would allow a better match between learning and choice of resources at the level of the individual school population.

However, for both Art & Design and Design & Technology we feel that the proposed content lacks ambition and insufficiently reflects the breadth and depth of the subjects. Moreover, neither draft PoS address moral, spiritual and social dimensions of the subjects. This therefore limits teachers' ability to shape a subject-level curriculum that would allow it to meet the overarching aims of the NC. We therefore strongly feel that for both A&D and D&T it would be more important to articulate the distinctive nature of these subjects.

We further support the views of the NSEAD and the DATA that it is essential that clear structures and aims are provided for these programmes of study. On the one hand this should be transparent to all stakeholders. On the other hand, however, it would leave teachers free to structure their own class content but allow them to work within clearly defined high expectations for teaching and learning, how these resources will be used and what that learning will be.

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

Comments:

We support the NSEAD's and DATA's responses to this question. In particular, we support their concern that the content for each PoS:

- Is insufficiently ambitious
- Is too narrow
- Ignores non-European cultures and achievements relevant to the respective subjects.
- Ignores the breadth of current practice, as well as moral, social and spiritual aspects of the subjects

In this way we feel that it would risk introducing a dangerous wedge between what pupils learn at school and what may be expected at later stages of the pupils' progression through education, at higher education and beyond.

We further believe that this would be a welcome opportunity to link the national curriculum at KS3 (and also KS4) with some of the recommendations of the Henley report, Cultural Education in England, on children's use of arts-specific language, choice of cultural activities, and support given to teachers, all of which the government has endorsed in its response to the Review

For a more in-depth analysis of the A&D and the D&T draft PoS, we would refer to the respective responses by the NSEAD and the DATA.

We would therefore urge that any further development of the NC would include the expert advice from respective key associations, such the NSEAD and DATA, and we would also welcome an opportunity to contribute to the debate.

Learning about and *through* art, design and technology plays an important part in learners' overall development. We strongly feel that the proposed content for both PoS could be improved in order that the subjects have a greater impact on pupils of all abilities in their journey of becoming educated and better citizens.

4 Does the content set out in the draft programmes of study represent a sufficiently ambitious level of challenge for pupils at each key stage?

	Sufficiently ambitious	X	Not sufficiently ambitious		Not sure
--	------------------------	---	----------------------------	--	----------

Comments:

As set out above and reflecting the responses of the NSEAD and DATA, we are concerned that the content for both PoS seems to ignore the breadth and depth of the subjects. It is written in language that acknowledges only one discipline (fine arts for A&D) or ignores modern technologies, materials and processes (D&T), all of which are included within the creative, design and media industries and therefore integral to a vibrant economy. Moreover, this excludes such developments in contemporary art, design and craft practice that help prepare children for the demands of modern life, e.g. encouraging awareness for new technologies and socially responsible design.

In principle, we support the assertion made in the “Reform of the NC in England” (paragraph 7.3) that parents deserve a clear assessment of what their children have learned. However, we are concerned that this would have a perverse consequence in light of the inadequately worded draft content for A&D and D&T: a strict adherence to this aim would risk that providing clarity for parents is given greater priority than challenging pupils to learn about *and through* the full wealth and depth offered by the two PoS.

For a more detailed analysis of the content of each PoS, please see the respective NSEAD and DATA responses, both of which we would fully endorse.

While we acknowledge the need for the curriculum to develop a core skills foundation for later development of more mature ideas, at a level of higher education we have particular concerns with respect to the scope and ambition of both subjects at KS3 as they are currently prescribed. D&T in schools would serve our requirements as universities (and those of employers not just restricted to the creative industries) much better if the curriculum was much less about projects with absolute certainties (“This will be made in our workshops”) and more about intangible possibilities for the future, where risk-taking and creativity play a much larger part (e.g. “What will our TVs be like in ten years’ time?”). Alongside this, from a HE perspective it would be

desirable that more of the basic designer skills such as sketching, creativity and especially independent thinking were given more emphasis and evidenced in pupils' portfolios.

Greater encouragement of experimentation is also important for A&D: We need a positive attitude and an open mind that is not constrained by ill-conceived and narrow ideals but rather excited by possibility. Following KS3 students should remain open to experimentation and the application of new techniques and this continues to evolve through KS4 and in the preparation of Level 3 qualifications prior to HE. Experience with a range of materials and processes is a definite advantage though still subject to further development through Level 2 and 3 qualifications. By the time students enter university they need a good awareness of pictorial and graphic conventions, the balance of composition, options in both 2- and 3-dimensional compositional organisation, the relationship of volume and mass in complex 3-dimensional forms and the potential of colour and texture as both pictorial and volumetric devices.

For A&D these are some of the basic areas of grounding that can be informed through the study of art and design history and theory. By contrast, the proposal for an imposed critical art history following one conventional timeline fits better with a sociological study of art history and does not assist in any specific understanding of art and design principles. Learning how to critically analyse and formally deconstruct images and forms would be far more helpful as the many timelines and philosophies affecting critical and cultural theories of art and design cannot be resolved or matriculated in the school curriculum and certainly not before the age of 14 as this would prescribe one world view and could not reflect the diversity of our society. Indeed, attempting such a fate would not help developmental learning or feed the instincts of the individual to pursue their own learning beyond instruction. It is very important that Art and Design students in Higher Education can feel comfortable with their own ideas and confident in pursuit of their own learning agenda. These habits need to be initiated very early. Students need to be responsive, sensitive and reflective and these habits can only evolve over time. They need to be confident with speculative approaches to making and problem solving.

5 Do you have any comments on the proposed wording of the attainment targets?

Comments:

No.

6 Do you agree that the draft programmes of study provide for effective progression between the key stages?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not sure
--------------------------	-------	-------------------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------

Comments:

The draft programmes of study for both A&D and D&T do not provide clear routes for effective progression between the key stages and there does not seem to be evidence of building effectively on pupils' learning. There does not seem to be any continuity between the key stages, which is likely to render the programmes incoherent and hinder pupils' progression between key stages.

We are particularly concerned over the likely detrimental cumulative effect this may have in preparing pupils for further study and possible careers in the creative industries.

7 Do you agree that we should change the subject information and communication technology to computing, to reflect the content of the new programmes of study?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not sure
-------------------------------------	-------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	----------

Comments:

We support the DATA's view that the emphasis on computing in the draft programme of study is desirable and will have a positive impact on the teaching and learning of programming. However, we are also concerned that the draft programme seems to ignore the important contribution that D&T makes to the teaching of programming. Similarly, for A&D we agree with the NSEAD that by failing to reference the creative industries and the importance of the digital, this risks losing the awareness of the important contribution that A&D can make to other subjects.

8 Does the new National Curriculum embody an expectation of higher standards for all children?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not sure
--------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------	----------

Comments:

Please see our responses to questions 2 – 4.

9 What impact - either positive or negative - will our proposals have on the 'protected characteristic' groups?

Comments:

10 To what extent will the new National Curriculum make clear to parents what their children should be learning at each stage of their education?

Comments:

The NC for A&D and D&T does not make clear what children will be learning at each stage and for what purpose. At the most basic level, both PoS make it clear what children and young people will be *doing* but not what they should be *learning*. As the NSEAD states, a 5-year old may well be using colour techniques but *what for* and *why*?

As set out in our response for question 4, in this way we fear that the aim to make the NC clear to parents has led to A&D and D&T programmes that are narrow, disjointed and, in both PoS, prevent pupils to learn about contemporary developments and practices. It would be crucial to allow a wider interpretation of the subjects, enabling a more contemporary, active and forward-looking curriculum linked to the creative, design and media industries, fit for purpose to prepare young people for work and leisure in the 21st century.

11 What key factors will affect schools' ability to implement the new National Curriculum successfully from September 2014?

Comments:

12 Who is best placed to support schools and/or develop resources that schools will need to teach the new National Curriculum?

Comments:

It should be the DfE's responsibility to support schools and to develop adequate resources for schools to teach the new National Curriculum.

However, we would strongly recommend that the DfE should seek expert subject specialist advice, most appropriately provided by the National Society for Education in Art & Design (NSEAD) and the Design & Technology Association (DATA), as the two relevant subject associations. In addition, we, Council for Higher Education in Art & Design (CHEAD), would be keen to support and contribute to this dialogue where appropriate.

13 Do you agree that we should amend the legislation to disapply the National Curriculum programmes of study, attainment targets and statutory assessment arrangements, as set out in section 12 of the consultation document?

	Agree	X	Disagree		Not sure
--	-------	---	----------	--	----------

Comments:

We support the view of the DATA, which we believe applies to both the A&D and D&T PoS: “No. When the National Curriculum was previously disappplied in primary non-core subjects in the late 1990’s it had a significant narrowing effect on the curriculum as a whole. We expect the same would happen again if current National Curriculum programmes of study are disappplied across all subjects in primary and secondary schools. We also believe that children’s needs would be better served if changes to the National Curriculum are not hurriedly implemented in schools from September 2013, without sufficient time for teachers to attend CPD and access the resources and non- statutory guidance necessary. Rather, schools should be encouraged to continue teaching what they are currently resourced to deliver, mindful of changes necessary and plan with the aid of support made available from external bodies to ensure high quality provision is developed. This will lead to a principled assimilation of the new requirements, building on existing planning, practice and resources”

14 Do you have any other comments you would like to make about the proposals in this consultation?

Comments:

We would like to reiterate our strong concern that both PoS for A&D and D&T are reductive, passive and backward looking. Both subjects offer so much more than a narrow list of skills as currently set out in the draft content for each subject.

Careful and considered reform of the curriculum in close dialogue with the key expert organisations (such as NSEAD, DATA, and CHEAD) would allow access to the potential that is offered by creative education – as it might be understood by experienced practitioners. People learn through: disruptive enquiry, heuristic testing, speculation, kinaesthetic experience, basic experimentation; etc., even where it is not supported or measured. This is not merely a menu of exotic behaviours exhibited by and expected of, say, deviant art students; this is normal inquisitive creativity; for any child, at any age. A too heavy focus on literacy at the expense of experimentation and play, to ignore the presence of multiple cultures of learning means to suppress them and that means marginalising the type of active learning that has the greatest capacity for driving our culture and creating new expertise

Given the critical economic climate, it is also worth pointing out the role of art and design in the UK economy. Art and design are at the heart of one of the most important sectors of the UK economy. Measured by its share of the country’s GDP, the UK’s creative industries are global leaders. What is more, compared to the financial services the creative industries’ growth in the past 10 years or so has also been accompanied by a significant growth in jobs in the sector (see presentation by Ian Brinkley, Director of Socio-Economic Programmes, The Work Foundation, at the 2011 conference of the UK Art & Design Institutions Association (UKADIA)

<http://www.ukadia.ac.uk/en/conference/previous-conferences/ukadia-conference-2011/speeches-2011/index.cfm>).

The UK's global competitive advantage is not because Britons should be more creative than people in other countries. Instead, their strength stems from the educational system that underlies it and which has grown organically for more than 150 years. It would be complacent to assume that this dynamism could be maintained without a curriculum that is active, contemporary and forward looking, and which challenges learners of all abilities.

15 Please let us have your views on responding to this consultation (e.g. the number and type of questions, whether it was easy to find, understand, complete etc.)

Comments:

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

Please acknowledge this reply

E-mail address for acknowledgement:

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

X	Yes		No
----------	-----	--	----

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

The key Consultation Principles are:

- departments will follow a range of timescales rather than defaulting to a 12-week period, particularly where extensive engagement has occurred before
- departments will need to give more thought to how they engage with and consult with those who are affected
- consultation should be 'digital by default', but other forms should be used where these are needed to reach the groups affected by a policy; and
- the principles of the Compact between government and the voluntary and community sector will continue to be respected.

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

Thank you for taking time to respond to this consultation.

Completed questionnaires and other responses should be sent to the address shown below by 16 April 2013

Send by post to:

Consultation Unit,
Area 1c,
Castle View House,
East Lane,
Runcorn,
Cheshire,
WA7 2GJ.

Send by e-mail to: NationalCurriculum.CONULTATION@education.gsi.gov.uk