



## **SEND assessment in schools:**

the DfE has responded to the Rochford Review, but are we any closer to an answer?

By Dale Pickles & Alex Hurle

December 2017

Dale Pickles,  
Managing Director

Alex Hurle,  
Head of Education

Published in the United Kingdom by B Squared Ltd.  
December 2017.

B Squared Ltd. is a proud member of the British Educational Suppliers Association  
(BESA)

## Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Introduction  | 1  |
| History   | 2  |
| Primary School Pupil Assessment: Rochford Review Recommendations                          | 4  |
| Inclusive assessment  | 4  |
| Assessment for pupils not engaged in subject-specific learning                            | 4  |
| Reporting assessment data   | 5  |
| Implementation  | 5  |
| Pupils with English as an additional language (EAL)                                       | 5  |
| Reducing burdens within the assessment system   | 5  |
| Future statutory assessment arrangements for pupils currently assessed using the P scale: | 7  |
| Primary Assessment in England   | 8  |
| Preparing children to succeed at school   | 8  |
| The best starting point for measuring progress in primary school                          | 8  |
| A proportionate assessment system   | 9  |
| Improving end-of-key stage statutory teacher assessment                                   | 10 |
| Evaluation  | 11 |
| How are B Squared's Products changing?  | 12 |
| Frameworks for pupils engaged in subject-specific learning                                | 12 |
| Frameworks for pupils not yet engaged in subject-specific learning                        | 13 |
| Appendices  | i  |
| Government actions following the Rochford Consultation                                    | i  |
| Government actions following the Primary Consultation                                     | iv |
| Timescale for future assessment requirements  | ix |
| Timescale for implications of the consultations   | x  |
| Works Cited   | xi |
| Bibliography  | xi |

## Introduction

The Department for Education ('the DfE') responded to the findings of their consultation on 'Primary School Pupil Assessment: Rochford Review Recommendations' (the 'Rochford Consultation') on 14 September 2017. The consultation sought views on the recommendations made by the Rochford Review Group ('the Group') for assessing pupils working below the standard of the national curriculum tests because:

*A proportion of pupils haven't completed the relevant programmes of study when they reach the appropriate age for statutory assessments, and are therefore unable to sit national curriculum tests. This is a diverse group, with above average numbers of pupils with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND), pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds and pupils with English as an additional language. It's crucial schools support all children to achieve their potential.*

*Through this consultation, we aim to establish an appropriate means of assessment that allows these pupils to progress to the mainstream forms of statutory assessment if, and when, they are ready.*

(DfE, 2017)

They released their response to this consultation in conjunction with their response to the 'Primary assessment in England' consultation (the 'Primary Consultation'). With this consultation, they sought views on the future of primary assessment and the implications for accountability because:

*We have introduced a number of changes to primary education in recent years to raise standards so that every child, whatever their background, is prepared to go on to succeed at secondary school. The new national curriculum, introduced in 2014, and new statutory assessments have raised expectations of what pupils should know and be able to do by the time they leave primary school. Recognising the scale of the changes that we have asked primary schools to deal with, this consultation represents a significant step towards establishing a settled, stable primary assessment system that is trusted by teachers and parents.*

(DfE, 2017)

**Although we now have a reaction from the DfE, we still do not have the statutory guidance, legislation, or exemplar material that underpins it—only an intended trajectory and an estimated time of arrival.**

Links to both of the DfE's responses can be found below.

Primary School Pupil Assessment: Rochford Review Recommendations consultation

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/644729/Rochford\\_consultation\\_response.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/644729/Rochford_consultation_response.pdf)

Primary Assessment in England consultation

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/644871/Primary\\_assessment\\_consultation\\_response.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/644871/Primary_assessment_consultation_response.pdf)

## History

When the primary curriculum was released in 2013, it was obvious that provision for pupils with special educational needs and disabilities ('SEND') had not been considered. Whilst the National Curriculum ('NC') programmes of study may have repeatedly used the term 'every pupil', it was clear that they were not designed to meet the needs of all children, but rather those of pupils who were capable of undertaking the end of key stage statutory tests. With the change of curriculum, the obligation to report progress against NC levels was also removed. Some professionals believed that, as the P scale no longer correlated with the new curriculum, the requirement to report progress against P levels was inappropriate and therefore unnecessary. So how should teachers assess pupils who were working beneath the level of the tests? There was a lack of clear information. The DfE produced only a limited amount of guidance, and this was often convoluted or contradicted by some local authorities ('LAs'), multi-academy trusts ('MATs'), Ofsted inspectors, and a range of other parties from the broader education sector. The whole situation left many senior leaders and classroom practitioners feeling exasperated and unsure of how proceed. At this time, specific guidance from the DfE would have been extremely useful, particularly for the teachers and the families of children with SEND.

It was not until July 2015 that Schools Minister, Nick Gibb MP, announced a review into the assessment of pupils with lower attainment. Overseen by executive headteacher Diane Rochford, a group of experts with backgrounds in assessment and working with SEND and disadvantaged children was established to '*advise on a solution(s) for the statutory assessment arrangements for pupils working below the standard of national curriculum tests*' (STA, 2015). In December 2015, the Group released their interim recommendations. These recommendations included a new performance descriptor for the assessment of Key Stage 1 ('KS1') pupils and three new performance descriptors for the assessment of Key Stage 2 ('KS2') pupils. From our analysis, these new descriptors were similar to the capabilities of pupils working between P8 and below the level of the respective end of key stage test.

In October 2016, the Standards and Testing Agency ('the STA') released and published 'The Rochford Review: final report' ('the Report'), in which the Group had given us their ten recommendations.

1. *The removal of the statutory requirement to assess pupils using P scale.*
2. *The interim pre-key stage standards for pupils working below the standard of national curriculum tests are made permanent and extended to include all pupils engaged in subject-specific learning.*
3. *Schools assess pupils' development in all 4 areas of need outlined in the SEND Code of Practice, but statutory assessment for pupils who are not engaged in subject-specific learning should be limited to the area of cognition and learning.*
4. *A statutory duty to assess pupils not engaged in subject-specific learning against the following 7 aspects of cognition and learning and report this to parents and carers:*
  - *responsiveness*
  - *curiosity*
  - *discovery*
  - *anticipation*
  - *persistence*
  - *initiation*
  - *investigation*
5. *Following recommendation 4, schools should decide their own approach to making these assessments according to the curriculum they use and the needs of their pupils.*
6. *Initial teacher training (ITT) and Continuing professional development (CPD) for staff in educational settings should reflect the need for teachers to have a greater understanding of assessing pupils working below the standard of national curriculum tests, including those pupils with SEND who are not engaged in subject-specific learning.*
7. *Where there is demonstrable good practice in schools, those schools should actively share their expertise and practice with others. Schools in need of support should actively seek out and create links with those that can help to support them.*

8. *Schools should work collaboratively to develop an understanding of good practice in assessing pupils working below the standard of national curriculum tests, particularly across different educational settings. Schools should support this by actively engaging in quality assurance, such as through school governance and peer review.*
9. *There should be no requirement to submit assessment data on the 7 areas of cognition and learning to the DfE, but schools must be able to provide evidence to support a dialogue with parents and carers, inspectors, regional schools commissioners, local authorities, school governors and those engaged in peer review to ensure robust and effective accountability.*
10. *Further work should be done to consider the best way to support schools with assessing pupils with EAL.*

(STA, 2016, p. 7)

The Group's recommendations reflect many of the ideas and attitudes that we have observed being independently put in to practice over the last few years. There were many positives within the Report, and it appeared to be welcomed by many educational practitioners

At B Squared, we wanted to understand how our customers felt about the Report and the implications of the Group's recommendations, and so we created a questionnaire to give them an opportunity to voice their opinions. Launched in November 2016, it ran for 25 days and gained 325 responses. A wide range of educational professionals responded to our questionnaire. Of the respondents, 87% were people who claimed to work in special education settings. Of the respondents, 58% claimed to work in settings with primary education provision. The largest single proportion of responses (34%) was from class teachers, but a further 23% identified as Subject or Department Leaders and 20% identified as Headteachers. The majority of respondents (55%) stated that, overall, they agreed with the Report's recommendations, whilst only 5% of respondents stated that they disagreed. The remaining 40% of respondents stated that they were undecided (B Squared, 2017).

On 30 March 2017, the DfE launched its own consultations; the questions they asked gave an idea of their intentions and concerns. Both of these important consultations were designed to give educational practitioners, parents and other stakeholders their chance to join in the conversation about the future of statutory assessment in order to help shape government legislation. Both of these consultations closed on 22 June 2017. The Primary Consultation received 4,165 responses, whereas the Rochford Consultation only received 594. The DfE published their responses to these consultations on 14 September 2017.

In our opinion, the good news is that they agreed with respondents and have accepted many of the recommendations made by the Group; however, the bad news is their lack of momentum and urgency, and their inability to provide the suitable resources and training for staff currently working with these children.

# Primary School Pupil Assessment: Rochford Review Recommendations

## Inclusive assessment

The DfE stated that, from the 2018–19 academic year onwards, they would remove the requirement to assess pupils engaged in subject-specific learning using the P scale. The “*P scale: attainment targets for pupils with SEN*” (DfE & STA, 2014) document was not in line with the 2014 curriculum, neither in content nor style. They accepted the Group’s recommendation that the interim pre-key stage standards be made permanent and extended to cover all pupils engaged in subject-specific learning; although, they would remain interim for a further year whilst they are reviewed by experts. Following the review, they will publish final pre-key stage standards for use for all pupils who are engaged in subject-specific learning but not working at the standard of national curriculum tests. They will support the use of these standards by producing a suite of exemplification materials to be used alongside the final pre-key stage standards.

In addition, the DfE stated:

- In the 2017–18 academic year, they will move to a more flexible approach of assessing English writing, which will also apply when it comes to assessing pupils against the interim pre-key stage standards in writing.
- In the 2018–19 academic year, they intend to trial a pilot for a peer-to-peer approach to moderation for the pre-key stage standards.

*After the release of the 2014 curriculum, we expected the P levels to be amended to reflect the new expectations and areas of focus. We knew that the P scale no longer supported the assessment of pupils being taught 2014 content. When it became apparent that this was not going to happen, we adapted our P level assessment frameworks to reflect the breadth and depth of the 2014 changes. As such, we welcome the DfE’s decision to remove the obligation to report against the P scale—it’s just a shame that this decision seems to have taken such a long time.*

## Assessment for pupils not engaged in subject-specific learning

The DfE agreed that statutory assessment of pupils not engaged in subject-specific learning should primarily focus on the areas of cognition and learning. However, they are very clear that the focus of statutory assessment in this area should not undermine provision for communication and interaction; social, emotional, and mental health; and sensory and physical development. It is important that schools continue to monitor and support pupils’ development in all four areas in order to foster engagement with the world and to encourage autonomy.

They also agreed that the ability to engage with education is an essential pre-requisite for cognitive development. They believe that there is benefit in focusing on areas that develop concepts and skills pre-requisite to subject-specific learning. However, they accept that the seven areas of engagement were not originally designed as a statutory assessment tool, and may not assess appropriate aspects of cognition and learning. They will therefore pilot this approach in the 2017–18 academic year, before taking any final decisions on whether to implement this approach on a statutory basis from the 2019–20 academic year onwards. In the meantime, schools should continue to assess pupils not engaged in subject-specific learning using the P scales.

*Cognition and learning is important—no one denies that—but it constitutes only a portion of the range of child development. Whilst we appreciate the DfE’s insistence that provision for the other three areas of development should not be undermined, we believe that more must be done to train new and less experienced teachers to deliver outstanding lessons that further all children’s growth in all areas. For those teachers who already provide outstanding provision in these areas, recognition must be given to them and their pupils for the effort they have put in to help sustain and enhance their wellbeing, make positive choices, achieve success and benefit from positive life experiences and outcomes.*

*Our main concern is that, despite the recognition that the P levels are unfit for purpose, the DfE have deemed that they are ‘fit enough’ for pupils not engaged in subject-specific learning for at least the next two academic years. For our most vulnerable children, the five-year-wait for a relevant assessment system is not acceptable.*

## Reporting assessment data

The DfE will still have to consider whether to collect data for pupils not engaged in subject-specific learning. Stating that if they did not, schools would have to report that these pupils having not demonstrated evidence at 'entry to the expected standard', and therefore being assessed against the seven areas. They insist that schools would still be held to account, as they would have to evidence pupil attainment and progress through discussion, with parents, governors, local authorities, Ofsted, and regional schools commissioners. However, there would be no expectation that performance and pupil-tracking information should be presented in any particular format.

*This seems like we have just dropped the old mainstream "W" level from P8 to P4. Am I alone in this thinking?*

## Implementation

The DfE agree that ITT and CPD must support teachers and school leaders to develop their understanding of assessment for pupils working below the standard of national curriculum tests. Stating that, in July 2016 they published the new framework of core content for ITT. Standard 5 within this framework details how to 'adapt teaching to respond to the strengths and needs of all pupils' and therefore contributes towards taking forward the Review's recommendations regarding ITT. They also claimed that stakeholders are developing 'toolkits' and resources for ITT providers in line with the new framework.

In a *benevolent* turn, they claim:

*Furthermore, we are giving schools the freedom to work together to identify and participate in high-quality development opportunities that respond to teachers' needs*

(DfE, 2017, p. 21).

They suggest that schools should actively seek to collaborate and share their expertise and practice with other school but despite remote support of the Chartered College of Teaching they make no suggestion as to how they will further encourage collaboration.

*Will the DfE provide additional non-contact time or increased numbers of cover teachers? Will they set up digital forums or employ local network representatives? We very much doubt it.*

## Pupils with English as an additional language (EAL)

As with the Group, the DfE believe that further work needs to be done in order to consider the best way to assess pupils with EAL who are working below the standard of national curriculum tests. They intend to update statutory assessment and reporting arrangements ('ARA') in order to provide further information relating to the assessment of pupils with EAL and will consider whether there is any further guidance that it would be appropriate to provide. They also identify research (being carried out by the Education Endowment Foundation amongst others) trialling different approaches to raising the attainment of pupils who are considered to have EAL and come from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds. These evaluation reports will be published from spring 2018 onwards.

*Yet again, an increasingly numerous and often underrepresented group in our society will have to wait for the Government to make its mind up.*

## Reducing burdens within the assessment system

The DfE believe that the simplified pre-key stage standards will reduce burdens in terms of the evidence that teachers have to collect about each pupil. The full review of the interim pre-key stage standards that will commence this autumn will also consider the guidance to accompany the standards, to ensure that it is as clear, concise and as helpful as possible. They will support schools by producing supporting exemplification materials. This will aim to reduce burdens by providing further clarity on what a pupil must demonstrate in order to be working at a particular standard.

*I am unsure as to how any of these reforms will reduce the burden on teachers. Through the DfE's responses to the final report of the "Commission on Assessment without Levels" and these two consultations, they have essentially told schools that accountability measures, performance management targets, reporting to*

*parents, in-school summative assessment, and in-school formative assessment must all take different formats. To some extent, I do agree with this. All of these tasks have different requirements and outcomes, and use different indicators to identify success or failure. However, let us get one thing straight, these assessment reforms have limited impact upon the attainment and progress of the children. They are merely designed to align the current accountability measures with the new curriculum. Instead of increasing the number of tasks required of teachers, would it not be more sensible to place the responsibility for school improvement with the inspectors, LAs and MATs? In doing so, additional funding and training should be provided to schools that are not providing the right level of support for their pupils.*

## Future statutory assessment arrangements for pupils currently assessed using the P scale:

| Year      | End of Key Stage Academic Year | Statutory Assessment (Subject-Specific) * | Statutory Assessment (NOT Subject-Specific) |
|-----------|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Reception | 2017–18/2023–24                | Pre-key stage standards                   | 7 Areas of Engagement**                     |
| 1         | 2018–19/2022–23                | Pre-key stage standards                   | P scale/7 Areas of Engagement**             |
| 2         | 2017–18/2021–22                | P scale/Pre-key stage standards           | P scale/7 Areas of Engagement**             |
| 3         | 2020–21                        | Pre-key stage standards                   | 7 Areas of Engagement**                     |
| 4         | 2019–20                        | Pre-key stage standards                   | 7 Areas of Engagement**                     |
| 5         | 2018–19                        | Pre-key stage standards                   | P scale                                     |
| 6         | 2017–18                        | P scale                                   | P scale                                     |

\*The DfE has stated that this broadly covers pupils working between P4 and P8

\*\*Subject to recommendations being accepted following the pilot

As the table above shows, the P scale will be used as part of the statutory assessment arrangements this year for pupils in Year 2 and 6. The current Year 1 and 5 pupils who are not engaged in subject-specific learning currently will also be assessed against P levels the following year. No pupils presently in Reception, Year 3, and Year 4 will be assessed against the P levels, and neither will pupils in Year 1 and Year 5 who are engaged in subject-specific learning.

As the DfE said in their Primary Consultation response:

*We are clear, however, that this [removing certain duties to report specific judgements] does not undermine the fundamental importance of the ongoing teacher assessment that takes place in the classroom throughout a pupil's time at primary school. Formative teacher assessment informs teaching and has a crucial role in supporting pupils to progress and achieve their full potential. In addition, the statutory requirement on schools to report pupils' attainment and progress to parents remains, as it is important that parents receive regular information on how their children are doing.*

(DfE, 2017, p. 25)

This means that schools can choose how they assess their pupils within each key stage and can move to a new assessment system that meets the formative assessment needs of their pupils. Several factors need to be considered before making decisions about a suitable assessment system; these include curriculum content, pupil challenge, teacher workload, parental engagement, progress and attainment recognition, and much more. However, all of these decisions are still being hindered by the DfE's lack of urgency to complete the relevant legislation and statutory guidance. The interim performance descriptors and the new 'Emerging' and 'Entry' descriptors will now be reviewed, released for use in the 2018–19 academic year. Exemplification material will be produced and a peer-to-peer approach to moderation will also be trialled next year. The seven areas of engagement are also going to be reviewed and may be ready for the 2019–20 academic year.

The DfE's response identified their intentions for the adaptation of the nationally standardised statutory assessment arrangements for pupils with SEND; however, schools are still left without any information regarding expectations of accountability bodies (LAs, MATs, Ofsted, etc.) in relation to practices of in-school summative and formative assessment. We still need to wait for the DfE to work with partners to consider how the department can best support and promote good quality, ongoing teacher assessment in the future. We are led to believe that the Report was completed and ready for release in June 2016, but was held back until October. The DfE then took five months to launch its consultations and a further three months to respond to it. Any reviews and pilots could have been conducted during the 2016–17 academic year. The findings could have been linked together with the response to the Rochford Consultation; and we may then have been able to start transitioning to the changes and giving staff time to get used to them.

## Primary Assessment in England

### Preparing children to succeed at school

#### *The early years foundation stage and profile*

The seven areas of learning and development specified in the EYFS will remain unchanged, as will the number of ELGs underpinning this framework. The expectations of the ELGs in the EYFS will be updated to come in line with KS1; they will also be made clearer. The DfE may also bring in an additional band within 'Emerging'.

*We will ensure that the ELGs are appropriately aligned with the year 1 curriculum, particularly the ELGs for literacy and mathematics. We will also ensure that the ELGs reflect the latest evidence on child development and predictors of future attainment, and we will undertake work to strengthen the teaching of literacy and numeracy in the early years.*

(DfE, 2017, p. 6)

The EYFSP will continue to assess each child's individual progress and development throughout Reception Year. It will give a Year 1 teacher accurate information about which individual children need more attention in specific areas of learning. The EYFSP will continue to provide national data to DfE and LAs, to provide a picture of provision across the country.

The DfE will retain the existing assessment scales ('emerging', 'expected' and 'exceeding'), but will review whether it is right to introduce an additional band within the 'emerging' scale and will clarify the descriptors underpinning these scales (particularly for 'emerging' and 'exceeding'). They will also explore ways in which individual information on a child's progress and development needs can be captured accurately and efficiently.

#### *Workload*

The DfE will review the EYFS profile handbook and supporting exemplification materials, to ensure that the assessment process and outcomes are adding maximum value to teaching, and that they are proportionate to classroom time. They will also make clear the requirements for evidence collection and sharing, and aim to dispel myths that have emerged over time. They will explore ways to support the wider use of online tools to collect and share evidence.

#### *Moderation*

The DfE will review the current approach to moderation, to investigate whether alternative models to local authority-led moderation, such as moderating within school clusters, would reduce burdens without compromising the rigour of the moderation process. They will also explore the feasibility of moderating a limited number of ELGs, working closely with the sector and with local authorities to determine whether this approach would be appropriate.

*An additional band within the 'emerging' scale will be beneficial, as it will enable settings to identify learners with additional needs at an earlier stage in their development. Nevertheless, I do not think this goes far enough. If a child has been assessed as working at the expected level in the EYFS then it would follow that they would be on track to being assessed as working at the expected level at the end of Key Stage 2. Emerging would therefore cover everything below this. Even by splitting this in to two brackets covers a wide variety of abilities from those children with complex needs on to those that just require a little more support.*

*We value their intention to explore ways to support the wider use of online tools to collect and share evidence.*

### The best starting point for measuring progress in primary school

The DfE has come back to the idea of a Reception baseline assessment as a means of measuring progress at the end of primary school. This will be introduced from 2020–21, so will not be utilised until 2026–27. This means two statutory assessments will be administered in Reception. They have used the experience and knowledge gained from the previous multi-supplier model and this assessment will be provided by a single supplier. The results of the baseline assessment would not be used to judge, label, or track individual pupil progress, to set targets for them to reach, to 'predict' the Key Stage 2 results of individual pupils, or assume that they make linear progress

*We will also carefully consider how to make the assessment as accessible to as many children as possible, including those with special educational needs and disabilities, and English as an additional language.*

(DfE, 2017, p. 14)

They will also consider how to make the assessment as accessible to as many children as possible, including those with SEND, and EAL.

The STA will shortly start the process of engaging a commercial partner to develop the assessment, which will not be an observational assessment carried out over time. The prime focus of the new assessment will be on skills which can be reliably assessed and which correlate with attainment at the end of KS2. However, the STA will also ask the potential suppliers to explore ways in which it would be possible to assess some form of 'self-regulation' in their bids, for example persistence with a task or following multi-step instructions.

A large-scale pilot and evaluation will be conducted in the 2019 to 2020 academic year and they will explore whether, and what, numerical data to share with headteachers at cohort level only, in order to be clear that data should not be used to judge individual pupils, teachers or schools.

#### *Interim years*

The baseline assessment will be implemented in Reception Year, rather than trying to improve the KS1 assessments. However, the DfE intend to continue using KS1 teacher assessment as the baseline for progress measures in the interim years. They also state that any data gathered is just the starting point for a conversation about how to improve a school, and no single piece of data will determine any intervention action.

#### *The role of statutory assessments at the end of KS1*

In the summer of 2022, the first cohort of pupils to have sat the new reception baseline assessment will reach the end of KS1. At this point KS1 National Curriculum tests and statutory teacher assessment will become non-statutory. Requirement for schools to report on pupil performance and attainment to parents in more detail at the end of KS1 will be retained and they will periodically sample KS1 assessment data from a small, representative sample of primary schools.

#### *School types and assessment*

They admit that there is a need to give schools clarity regarding infant, first, junior and middle schools accountability arrangements as soon as possible and will work with sector representatives to fully consider the options in order to have a settled position before the new reception baseline has been through its initial first-year design phase, in January 2018.

*Will it be possible to assess a pupil working at a low-ability level effectively in the short period of time that the baseline assessment allows? Will additional funds be allocated to schools with a lower-attaining intake? How will the DfE recognise the progress of children who transition schools during a key stage? At this stage there are still so many questions.*

#### *A proportionate assessment system*

##### *Collection of teacher assessment data at the end of Key Stage 2*

A more worrisome concept is that of the removal of the requirement for schools to report teacher assessment judgements in English reading and mathematics at the end of KS2 for pupils working at the level of the tests. They intend to implement this from the 2018 to 2019 academic year onwards. However, where pupils are working below the standard of national curriculum tests, teachers will continue to have a statutory requirement to assess pupils, initially using the P scale and then the interim pre-key stage standards, and to report these judgements.

##### *Key stage 1 English grammar, punctuation and spelling test*

They intend to keep the KS1 grammar, punctuation and spelling test non-statutory in future years, and will continue to make optional test materials available for schools to use as they see fit.

### *Multiplication tables check*

The multiplication tables check will take place at the end of Year 4 from the 2019–20 academic year onwards. This means that the check will correspond with the point in the NC by which pupils are expected to know their times tables, and will not add to the existing assessments taken by pupils in later years of KS2.

Whilst they will collect assessment data from the check, this will be published at national and local authority level only, and not at school level. As they said in the consultation, the data will not be used to trigger inspection or intervention.

### *Reducing burdens within the primary assessment system*

The DfE believe that they have taken a number of steps to make the assessment system as proportionate as possible. They claim to have done this by removing the statutory requirement to carry out teacher assessment in reading and mathematics at the end of KS2; keeping the KS1 grammar, punctuation and spelling test non-statutory; and making assessments at the end of KS1 non-statutory at the earliest possible point. They will look to consider how technology could be utilised to reduce burdens associated with assessment in the future.

*The Government's lack of trust in teacher assessment and moderation is disturbing to say the least and details are still unclear as to whether these judgements could be used in unusual cases such as unexpected poor performance on the day of the test. There is also no current detail regarding whether the multiplication tables check will apply in special schools or for children with SEND in mainstream? Why are we still waiting for the details when the curriculum was changed three years ago? Where is the joined-up thinking?*

## Improving end-of-key stage statutory teacher assessment

### *Teacher assessment of English writing*

From the 2017–18 academic year, a more flexible approach for assessing English writing will be implemented. Although the teacher assessment frameworks for writing have been revised, very few of the 'pupil can' statements changed by any significant extent. It is rather that the information relating to the application of these standards has been adapted. Of particular importance is the following comment:

*A pupil's writing **should** meet all the statements within the standard at which they are judged. However, teachers can use their discretion to ensure that, on occasion, a particular weakness does not prevent an accurate judgement being made of a pupil's attainment overall. A teacher's professional judgement about whether the pupil has met the standard overall takes precedence. This approach applies to English writing **only**.*

(STA, 2017, p. 5)

The DfE have also published revised interim pre-key stage standards for writing and updated exemplification materials in writing will be published later in the autumn term but they believe that the current materials will be sufficient to support teachers to make judgements against the frameworks in the summer of 2018.

### *Supporting and strengthening the assessment of English writing*

The DfE will work with a company called No More Marking in order to evaluate larger comparative judgement pilots in the near future, in order to explore the potential within the assessment system. They will also continue to consider how the current system of external local authority moderation can be improved, to ensure that data from statutory teacher assessments is as robust as possible.

*We welcome the idea of returning to a best-fit model for writing. This should help support those pupils with reading and writing impairments. Why don't we extend this concept to the whole assessment framework, thereby supporting those individuals with specific learning difficulties in all areas of achievement? However, we are unsure as to what benefits the comparative judgement will bring to assessment as it can only indicate a subjective ranking system within a small cohort rather than acknowledging individual achievement against a standardised framework. Is it really only about identifying winners and losers?*

## Evaluation

Some of the changes will start to come in to effect in the 2018–19 academic year and we hope that these will complete during the 2019–20 academic year as is currently planned. We understand the DfE’s desire to allow schools to prepare by not rushing through legislation. This is very important, but our frustration comes from the time it has taken to get to where we are now.

Whilst the new primary curriculum was released autumn 2013 and the performance descriptors for pupils working at the standard of the tests were released throughout 2014–15; pupils with SEND have been severely let down by the DfE. The final performance descriptors for pupils engaged in subject-specific learning but working below the standard of national curriculum tests will be used for the first time in the 2018–19 academic year and a statutory assessment tool for pupils not yet engaged in subject-specific learning may be in place by 2019–20. This is four to five years after their mainstream peers.

I am left feeling disappointed, as the response does not allow us to move forward yet. The DfE have stated that the P scale is not fit for purpose, but many schools must continue to use it until 2019. What is the point of continuing to use an assessment system that has already been identified as unfit for purpose? The DfE must give schools time to prepare and transition; but in order for teachers and school leaders to do this, they must be provided with a final draft of the assessment criteria, the exemplar supporting material and sufficient time to begin using it in a low-stakes environment—not to just be told that something will be in place soon.

## How are B Squared's Products changing?

We have been developing new assessment frameworks since before the Group was first announced. The amount of work involved in ensuring that these frameworks meet the DfE requirements was immense and not a simple undertaking. Once the assessment frameworks have been created, we need to ensure that the software can provide the most appropriate reports in order to demonstrate the non-linear progress of pupils with SEND. The overall development will take around five years to complete, but parts will need to be ready in time for the 2018–19 academic year.

### Frameworks for pupils engaged in subject-specific learning

We started developing a new assessment framework for pupils engaged in subject-specific learning called Progression Steps. Work began on this framework towards the end of 2016. It has been designed to replace our National Curriculum (P levels) and National Curriculum (Steps) frameworks for pupils engaged in subject-specific learning. We based Progression Steps on the performance descriptor structure. We then analysed the ability required to achieve these performance descriptors against our current frameworks. The table below shows how we feel they compare:

|    |    |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1i | 2i | 3i | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|    |    |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

| Descriptor 1 | Descriptor 2 | Descriptor 3 | Descriptor 4 | Descriptor 5 | Descriptor 6 | Descriptor 7 | Descriptor 8 |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| P4–P7        | P7–Step 1C*  | Step 1C–2C*  | Step 1A–2A*  | Step 2C–2A*  | Step 2B–4*   | Step 4–5*    | Step 5–5+*   |

\* This is not a comparison to the old National Curriculum level descriptors. The levels given (1C, 2A, 4, etc.) relate to our updated 2014 content – these have an increased degree of challenge for pupils in comparison to the old National Curriculum levels.

This process showed us that the descriptors had some overlap and were not of consistent size, when related to previous achievement bands. It was also important to remember that for Reading and Maths these descriptors are 'secure-fit' and not 'best-fit', meaning that a pupil must achieve all the skills identified by the descriptor.

The Report did not give guidance as to when subject-specific learning should begin for pupils; however, the DfE's response stated that it should start approximately around P4. Based on this information, we noted that the initial descriptor 'Entry to the Expected Standard' required pupils to be working around P7 in order to accomplish it. Due to the size of this initial descriptor, we took the decision to split it into three steps for our new Progression Steps framework. These steps will be called 'Preparing for Step 1', 'Initiating Step 1', and 'Step 1'. This gives schools reasonably sized bands for pupils to achieve over time. We also took the decision to extend the scale by adding a Step 9, to be used to assess the ability of more able pupils or those who have 'spiky' profiles.

We have used the performance descriptors as a key to build a broad rich assessment framework covering the full primary curriculum with elements extending into the secondary curriculum. We used the statements within the descriptors to identify the level of ability for English reading, English writing, and mathematics. We then extended this principle to the rest of the subjects. In order to respond to a number of changes that have happened since the 2014 curriculum was introduced, we are also looking to develop Sex and Relationship Education framework and content to support the development of Communication and Interaction; Social, Emotional, and Mental Health; and Sensory and Physical skills.

The development of our assessment frameworks for subject-specific learning is now on hold until the DfE finalise the performance descriptors. Once these are released, we will continue development to make the assessment frameworks available as early as possible in 2018.

## Frameworks for pupils not yet engaged in subject-specific learning

We have created a brand-new assessment framework called Engagement Steps in response to the recommendations made within the Report. We designed Engagement Steps to support the learning and assessment of pupils not yet engaged in subject-specific learning.

In the principles section of the Report, it mentions the level of support that pupils may require, so the seven areas of engagement are not designed to replace to our levels of achievement function within the software. The CLDD Project uses the seven areas to assess a child's interaction with an activity. Used like this, they identify different aspects of a child's learning and engagement with learning. The CLDD Project gave broad definitions of the seven areas that help identify how to use them. The Rochford Review created new definitions, targeting the pupils working on non-subject-specific learning. When reading The Rochford Review's definitions, a number of the areas require a certain cognitive capability before they become relevant. Responsiveness may be the only area that some pupils (those with the most significant disabilities and difficulties) will be able to meet. The other areas will become relevant to pupils as they develop. The Report says the areas are not hierarchical so they will not move from 'Responsiveness' to 'Curiosity' or 'Discovery'. Instead, they will continue to develop their 'Responsiveness' skills and as they start to improve 'Curiosity' and 'Discovery'.

Once we completed development of our 2014 curriculum assessment frameworks, we undertook research and began development on a new approach to assessing pupils working between P1(i)–3(ii). We recognised that assessing against NC subject areas was not the right approach for pupils working at this level. We called this framework the Developmental Continuum and it formed the basis for Engagement Steps. The Developmental Continuum was constructed around the following four areas of child development:

- 'Receptive-' and 'Expressive communication'
- 'Social-' and 'Emotional affection'
- 'Memorative-' and 'Imaginative cognition'
- 'Sensory-' and 'Motor operation'

This approach is more suited to children working at these levels and was in line with the activities with which they were engaged. We worked closely with a number of schools around the UK to develop relevant content and to trial it within the classroom.

The Engagement Steps framework builds on the work we carried out for the Developmental Continuum. However, we have made a number of significant changes. We removed the focus on Memorative and Imaginative Cognition and replaced it with the Seven Aspects of Engagement. We also extended the ability range up to P6 (in old language). In doing so, we have overlapped this framework with our assessment framework for pupils engaged in subject-specific learning. This will allow schools to transition pupils to subject-specific learning when they are ready, not when they achieve a set attainment level.

We trialled our Engagement Steps framework with over 200 schools during the 2016–17 summer term. The feedback we received was extremely positive. Respondents found the content and structure was much more suited to pupils with complex needs. We are currently reviewing the feedback and updating the content of our assessment framework where appropriate.

The feedback we have received has led to our decision to allow schools to implement our Engagement Steps framework now. As the DfE has stated the P scale is not fit for purpose and it is with these pupils that it is the least appropriate. Schools who purchase our Engagement Steps assessment framework will receive a free update if the DfE reviews the seven areas of engagement and decides they are not an appropriate method of assessment.

# Appendices

## Government actions following the Rochford Consultation

### Inclusive assessment

We agree with the Rochford Review that P scales are no longer fit for purpose. As they are based on the old national curriculum, they do not support pupils to progress onto the new national curriculum. In addition, they replicate the old system of levels, which over time came to dominate teaching, and prioritised pace over consolidation. On this basis, it is our intention to accept the Rochford Review recommendation to remove the statutory requirement for teachers to assess pupils using P scales. **We will remove the requirement to assess pupils engaged in subject-specific learning using P scales from the 2018 to 2019 academic year onwards;** teachers should continue to assess these pupils using P scales in the 2017 to 2018 academic year, while we take forward the necessary changes to legislation.

We recognise that a number of consultation respondents were concerned that the removal of P scales would result in the loss of a common framework and language in terms of how the progression of pupils working below the standard is measured and described, both across settings and in terms of discussing pupil performance with parents. In the case of pupils who are currently assessed using P scales and who are engaged in subject-specific learning, we believe that the interim pre-key stage standards can provide this consistent approach and common language to measuring and describing attainment and progress. **We will therefore accept the recommendation that the interim pre-key stage standards are made permanent and extended to cover all pupils engaged in subject-specific learning.** To give schools adequate time to prepare for these changes, this recommendation will take effect from the 2018 to 2019 academic year onwards.

Extending the interim pre-key stage standards so that they are used to assess all pupils engaged in subject-specific learning will ensure that the statutory assessment system is as inclusive as possible. The interim pre-key stage standards are better aligned with the national curriculum and sit directly below the mainstream teacher assessment frameworks, meaning that there is a clear route of progression to national curriculum assessments. We believe that this will better support pupils to progress onto national curriculum assessments, if and when they are ready.

The government response to the parallel 'Primary assessment in England' consultation sets out that we will, from the 2017 to 2018 academic year onwards, move to a more flexible approach of assessing English writing. This change will also apply when it comes to assessing pupils against the interim pre-key stage standards in writing. To support this change of approach, we have reviewed the mainstream teacher assessment frameworks in writing and have published revised versions for use from the 2017 to 2018 academic year onwards. To ensure that the interim pre-key stage standards in writing continue to align directly with the teacher assessment frameworks, we have also published revised interim pre-key stage standards in writing, for use in the 2017 to 2018 academic year. However, only pupils that are working at the standard that is currently assessed using the interim pre-key stage standards should be assessed using these pre-key stage standards in 2017 to 2018. Pupils who are currently assessed using P scales but are engaged in subject-specific learning (broadly those currently working at P4 to P8), should only be assessed using the pre-key stage standards from the 2018 to 2019 year onwards, once the additional standards proposed by the Review have been introduced. This is detailed in the table below.

The pre-key stage standards will remain interim for a further year whilst they are reviewed. This review will involve curriculum and assessment experts, teachers, school leaders (mainstream and special) and inclusion experts and will take on board the feedback on the interim pre-key stage standards that we have gathered through this consultation exercise. This review will also encompass the two additional standards that were proposed by the Review in their final report ('emerging' and 'entry') to ensure that the standards can cover all pupils engaged in subject-specific learning. These additional standards will be introduced from the 2018 to 2019 academic year onwards. Following the review, we will publish final pre-key stage standards, including these additional standards, for use for all pupils who are engaged in subject-specific learning but not working at the standard of national curriculum tests, from the 2018 to 2019 academic year.

A number of consultation respondents suggested that, as is the case with the mainstream teacher assessment frameworks, materials that exemplify each of the pre-key stage standards would support teachers to make professional judgements using the standards. We agree, and we will therefore produce a suite of supporting exemplification materials to be used alongside the final pre-key stage standards from the 2018 to 2019 academic year onwards.

In addition, some respondents suggested that introducing formal moderation of the pre-key stage standards would help to ensure that the assessment data produced is consistent and of a high quality. In our response to the 'Primary assessment in England' consultation we have set out our intention to pilot a peer-to-peer approach to moderation in the 2017 to 2018 academic year. We believe that a peer-to-peer approach, where schools work together in local clusters to moderate each other's work, overseen by an external moderator, could be particularly appropriate for the moderation of pre-key stage standards if piloting indicated that it could be a successful model, as it could encourage collaboration between schools with pupils working below the standard of national curriculum tests, as was recommended by the Rochford Review. Should the initial pilot of a peer-to-peer approach to moderation of national curriculum assessments prove successful, we would intend to trial it for the pre-key stage standards in the 2018 to 2019 academic year.

### Assessment for pupils not engaged in subject-specific learning

We agree with the principle set out by the Rochford Review that statutory assessment of pupils not engaged in subject-specific learning should primarily focus on the areas of cognition and learning. This ensures that statutory assessment is as consistent as possible for all pupils, so that pupils are supported to progress onto subject-specific learning if and when they are ready. However, as the Review set out, we are very clear that the focus of statutory assessment on cognition and learning should not undermine provision in any other areas of need set out by the SEND code of practice. As was emphasised by a number of consultation respondents, all of these areas are fundamentally important to pupil development and play a crucial role in promoting independence and quality of life. It is important that schools continue to monitor and support pupils' development in all 4 areas to foster engagement with the world and to encourage autonomy.

We also agree with the Rochford Review that the ability to engage with education is an essential pre-requisite for cognitive development among pupils with severe, profound and multiple learning disabilities. We think that there is merit in statutory assessment focusing on areas that support the development of concepts and skills that are pre-requisites for progressing onto subject-specific learning.

Those pupils who are not engaged in subject-specific learning have particularly complex, individual needs. It is important that statutory assessment takes account of these needs. As pupils with the most severe or profound and multiple difficulties frequently do not make progress in a linear way,

the Review recommended that schools should have greater freedoms in how they assess these pupils, in order to develop approaches that work for their pupils and the curriculum that they follow. Allowing schools the freedom to select an approach appropriate to their pupils would mean that the information captured by the assessment is not limited to any specific type outlined in a prescribed model. The approach could therefore demonstrate every kind of progress made by a pupil, be it linear, lateral or consolidation. We know that the teachers and other school staff that work with these pupils have the best expertise and understanding of their complex and individual needs, and therefore recognise that there may well be value in them having greater flexibility in terms of how they carry out assessment.

We are, however, aware that a number of individual respondents and representative organisations have expressed concerns about the introduction of a statutory requirement to assess pupils against the 7 areas of engagement, given that it was not originally designed as a statutory assessment tool, and it is relatively untested in its proposed form. Concerns have also been raised by some respondents about whether the model assesses the appropriate aspects of cognition and learning. We are clear that all statutory assessment arrangements must be robust, reliable and fair. We are committed to introducing a stable, sustainable assessment system, and it is therefore important that we are completely confident in any change that we introduce, to avoid having to make further changes to assessment arrangements in the future. **We will therefore pilot the Review's recommended approach to assessing pupils not engaged in subject-specific learning in the 2017 to 2018 academic year, before taking any final decisions on whether to implement this approach on a statutory basis.** This will mean that, if accepted following the pilot, changes would take effect from the 2019 to 2020 academic year onwards, following amendment to the relevant legislation. In the meantime, schools should continue to assess pupils not engaged in subject-specific learning using the P scales.

The pilot will explore whether the 7 areas of engagement is an appropriate model to assess cognition and learning, and whether the model is appropriate for use in statutory assessment. The pilot will also consider whether schools are able to adapt the 7 areas of engagement into an assessment model that is relevant and useful to them and to others, including parents, governors, local authorities, inspectors and regional schools commissioners. This will allow us to consider whether it is proportionate and effective to provide schools with greater freedoms in assessing pupils not engaged in subject-specific learning. The pilot will also explore what support schools require to be able to assess pupils against the 7 areas, so that the department is in a position to provide effective support to schools to adopt this approach, should it be introduced. This will be particularly important given that a substantial number of consultation respondents said that they would benefit from additional information on good practice and examples of assessing against the 7 areas of engagement.

## Reporting assessment data

The government collects assessment data from schools in order to provide a picture of standards at a national level, to provide parents and others with useful information about a school, to recognise and celebrate the progress that schools make with their pupils, and in some cases, to begin a conversation about any further support that a school may benefit from. We only collect assessment data from schools when it is useful, robust and – most importantly in this case – nationally consistent.

As we set out earlier in this document, we will consider whether schools should have a greater degree of flexibility over how they assess pupils who are not engaged in subject-specific learning against the 7 areas of engagement for cognition and learning through the pilot in the 2017 to 2018 academic year. We will take a final decision on whether or not to accept the Review's recommended approach to assessing these pupils following this pilot. This pilot will also consider the extent to which the Review's recommended approach provides information that is able to robustly evidence pupil progress, and the extent to which assessment data can be collected. Following this pilot, we will also determine what, if any, assessment data will be collected by the department.

Were we to fully accept the Review's recommended approach, we would not be able to collect nationally-consistent data for pupils not engaged in subject-specific learning. This is because a specific format for reporting would presuppose a specific form of assessment result, which would undermine the freedom to assess against the 7 areas of engagement in a way that is most suited to the needs of individual pupils. Were recommendation 9 to be accepted, schools would have to report that these pupils have not demonstrated evidence at 'entry to the expected standard' on the pre-key stage standards, and are therefore being assessed against the 7 areas of engagement for cognition and learning, but would not have to provide any more detailed information about their progress against the areas of engagement.

Despite not producing nationally-consistent data, assessment against the 7 areas of engagement would provide further information to support accountability for the work schools do with these pupils. Not having nationally-consistent data would not mean that schools' accountability for this group of pupils would be any less; it is simply the case that schools would be held to account in a way that was slightly different. Schools would have to be able to evidence pupil attainment and progress through discussion, including with parents, governors, local authorities, Ofsted and regional schools commissioners. These discussions would cover the variety of ways in which pupils with the most severe or profound and multiple needs make progress and would be supported by a range of evidence that underpins teachers' judgements about their pupils. There would, however, be no expectation that performance and pupil-tracking information should be presented in a particular format.

It should be noted that, if they were to be accepted following piloting, the Rochford Review recommendations on the assessment of pupils not engaged in subject-specific learning would only take effect from the 2019 to 2020 academic year onwards. In the 2017 to 2018 and 2018 to 2019 academic years, schools should continue to report assessment outcomes using P scales for this group of pupils.

## Implementation

We agree that ITT and CPD must support teachers and school leaders to develop their understanding of assessment for pupils working below the standard of national curriculum tests.

The government is committed to ensuring that the education system can recruit, train, develop and retain the best possible teachers. Key to this ambition is strengthening the quality and content of ITT programmes so that new teachers enter the classroom fully equipped for success with a depth of subject knowledge, practical behaviour management strategies, a sound understanding of special educational needs, and an ability to use the most up-to-date research on how pupils learn.

As part of our commitment to strengthen how new teachers are trained, in July 2016 we published the new framework of core content for ITT. Standard 5 within this framework details how to '*adapt teaching to respond to the strengths and needs of all pupils*' and therefore contributes towards taking forward the Review's recommendations regarding ITT. To build on this work, key stakeholders including the Universities' Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET) and the National Association of School-Based Teacher Trainers (NASBTT) are developing more detailed 'toolkits' for ITT providers to use alongside the framework, which will include training and other resources. As part of this, UCET and NASBTT are working with SEND organisations to develop specific SEND resources for teacher training in line with the new framework.

While strengthening how teachers are trained through the new ITT framework, we also understand the importance of ongoing professional development throughout a teacher's career. That is why we are promoting a culture of high-quality professional development in schools and helping

teachers and school leaders to identify and participate in the most effective activities, for example through our publication of the Standard for Teachers' Professional Development and the Teaching and Leadership Innovation Fund. Published in 2016, and developed by an independent expert group, the Standard helps schools, teachers and professional development providers to identify and deliver the best opportunities for teachers. The Teaching and Leadership Innovation Fund provides around £75 M for evidence-based and high-quality professional development in areas of the country where it is most needed. We will explore the training materials and additional support that could be offered to schools to help teachers to have a greater understanding of assessing pupils working below the standard of national curriculum tests. Furthermore, we are giving schools the freedom to work together to identify and participate in high-quality development opportunities that respond to teachers' needs.

We fully agree with the Review that schools should actively seek to collaborate and share their expertise and practice on assessing pupils working below the standard of national curriculum tests with others. There should be a sense of a responsibility to share knowledge and experience where possible, both from those schools where there is already demonstrable good practice, by sharing the work they are doing, and from those schools who are less confident in their approach, by seeking out opportunities to learn from others. The government's role in this collaboration is to empower schools by promoting and supporting a culture within the profession that constantly seeks to improve, uses evidence, and stays ahead of the curve by supporting developments such as the Chartered College of Teaching. Through the Chartered College, the teaching profession will drive its own improvements in practice. The College will focus on helping teachers to access high-quality professional development and to use the available evidence base on effective teaching to inform their own practice.

We will continue to consider how we can further support and encourage this collaboration. For example, should, following piloting in the 2017 to 2018 academic year, peer-to-peer moderation be introduced as a system for formally moderating teachers' judgements against the pre-key stage standards, we believe this quality assurance process will support effective collaboration, by bringing together schools in local clusters.

### **Pupils with English as an additional language (EAL)**

We agree that further work should be done to consider the best way to support schools to assess pupils with English as an additional language (EAL) who are working below the standard of national curriculum tests.

Pupils with EAL can fit a wide range of profiles. Some may be newly-arrived to the country and may have come from difficult circumstances in their home country. Others may always have lived in the UK, but may come from homes where English is not spoken. Others may already be bilingual or multilingual. The right approach to supporting assessment for all these pupils may be different. Whilst it is important that these pupils can be assessed within wider statutory assessment arrangements, additional advice or guidance may be required to help teachers with making their assessments accurately and effectively.

The statutory assessment and reporting arrangements (ARA) set out the process to be followed if a pupil's limited ability to communicate in English means that he or she is unable to access the test and should not take them. We plan to update this statutory assessment guidance to provide further information on assessing pupils with EAL to support teachers in making these judgements. We will also consider whether there is any further guidance that it would be appropriate for us to provide.

We also support the work of the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) who are working in partnership with The Bell Foundation and Philanthropy Unbound to fund trials of different approaches to raising the attainment of pupils who are classed as having EAL and are from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds. All of the projects will be evaluated rigorously by EEF-appointed independent researchers, and individual evaluation reports will be published from spring 2018 onwards.

In addition, The Bell Foundation is separately funding and running a five-year programme focused on improving outcomes for disadvantaged EAL pupils. The programme includes a project led by EAL experts to develop a dedicated national framework for assessing pupils from linguistically-diverse backgrounds when they enter school, and activities which aim to build capacity of the EAL teachers in ITT and in schools.

### **Reducing burdens within the assessment system for pupils working below the standard of national curriculum tests**

We believe that the approach to the assessment of pupils working below the standard of national curriculum tests set out in this document will work to reduce the burdens placed on teachers and schools. In terms of those pupils not engaged in subject-specific learning, if the recommendations were to be accepted following trialling, providing schools with a greater degree of freedom over how they assess pupils against the 7 areas of engagement could reduce burdens by allowing schools to develop a system that suits the individual needs of their pupils. Whilst schools would still have to demonstrate pupils' attainment and progress, through discussions with parents, inspectors, local authorities, school governors and regional schools commissioners, there would be no expectation that performance and pupil-tracking information should be presented in any particular format.

As part of the pilot on assessing pupils against the 7 areas of engagement for cognition and learning, we will consider how schools can best be supported to move to this model. This will enable us to provide the appropriate support and guidance, so that schools face minimal burdens in this change of approach.

In terms of pupils engaged in subject-specific learning, we believe that the simplified pre-key stage standards will reduce burdens in terms of the evidence that teachers have to collect about each pupil. The full review of the interim pre-key stage standards that will commence this autumn will also consider the guidance to accompany the standards, to ensure that it is as clear, concise and as helpful as possible. To further support schools to assess pupils against the pre-key stage standards, we will produce supporting exemplification materials. This will aim to reduce burdens by providing further clarity on what a pupil must demonstrate in order to be working at a particular standard.

## Government actions following the Primary Consultation

### Preparing children to succeed at school

#### *The early years foundation stage and profile*

We know that the EYFSP is rightly trusted by practitioners as a valued assessment tool which allows them to use their professional judgement, and that there is support for the EYFS' holistic view of child development. The seven areas of learning and development specified in the EYFS will remain unchanged, as will the number of ELGs underpinning this framework. However, we will explore the feasibility of reducing the number of ELGs assessed and reported upon at the end of the reception year. In addition, in light of what we have heard, we will make the descriptors for a typical level of development against the ELGs clearer, and bring the ELGs in line with Key Stage 1. To achieve this, we will continue to work with experts and practitioners and assess the latest child development evidence, with the aim of ensuring that all descriptors are clear and focused on the right age-appropriate outcomes. We will ensure that the ELGs are appropriately aligned with the year 1 curriculum, particularly the ELGs for literacy and mathematics. We will also ensure that the ELGs reflect the latest evidence on child development and predictors of future attainment, and we will undertake work to strengthen the teaching of literacy and numeracy in the early years.

We believe that the ELGs in need of the most significant revisions are those relating to the following areas:

**Communication and language:** we will revise the communication and language ELGs to ensure that there is sufficient focus on increasing depth and breadth of vocabulary.

**Physical development:** we will ensure that there is sufficient focus on both fine and gross motor skills, given the research evidence around links between physical activity and cognitive development.

**Personal, social and emotional development:** we will bring the PSED ELGs into line with the latest evidence on self-regulation and executive functioning, given the evidence that it is a predictor of future attainment.

**Mathematics and literacy:** we will review and revise the mathematics and literacy ELGs to ensure that they support children to develop the right building blocks for learning at Key Stage 1.

We will also refine and clarify the ELGs in **understanding the world** and **expressive arts and design**, and bring these up to date with the evidence on child development.

We will also explore further whether it is feasible to reduce the number of ELGs that are assessed and limit this to the 3 prime areas (communication and language development, physical development and personal, social and emotional development) and the specific areas of mathematics and literacy. This could potentially reduce the assessment burden and ensure that we are focusing on those areas that have the strongest correlation with future attainment, whilst retaining the breadth of the EYFS curriculum. In light of the consultation feedback, we recognise that this is a sensitive issue, and therefore we will conduct further analysis, working with our stakeholders and our advisory panel in securing the right approach to take forward.

The purpose of the EYFSP has never been to hold individual schools to account for their performance and this will not change. The EYFSP will continue to assess each child's individual progress and development throughout the reception year. It will give a year 1 teacher accurate information about which individual children will need more attention in specific areas of learning as they move through Key Stage 1. The EYFSP will continue to provide national data to government and local authorities, to provide a picture of provision across the country.

We will retain the existing assessment scales ('emerging', 'expected' and 'exceeding'), but we will review whether it is right to introduce an additional band within the 'emerging' scale and we will clarify the descriptors underpinning these scales (particularly for 'emerging' and 'exceeding'). We will also retain the same scale approach for children with SEND, but as set out below, we will explore ways in which reception teachers can share more nuanced information with year 1 teachers and parents about individual progress and future development needs.

We will also explore ways in which individual information on a child's progress and development needs can be captured accurately and efficiently in order for year 1 teachers to be able to make a diagnosis of whether a child needs more focussed attention on particular areas of the curriculum. This should minimise the risk of some children, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds, falling behind and not being able to catch up with their peers in Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2.

#### **Workload**

We will review all guidance for administering the EYFSP, to ensure that the assessment process and outcomes are adding maximum value to teaching, and that they are proportionate to classroom time. Guidance in scope for revision includes the EYFS profile handbook and supporting exemplification materials. We will also make clear the requirements for evidence and how this should be collected and shared, and aim to dispel myths that have emerged over time. We will work with Ofsted and local authorities to ensure that guidance and messages around evidence-gathering are clear and consistent.

We will explore ways in which we can support the wider use of online tools to collect and share evidence, thus reducing burdens and releasing capacity for teachers to focus on what they do best. We believe that this would also support sharing of information with year 1 teachers and parents, increasing the value of the EYFSP.

#### **Moderation**

We will review guidance relating to the moderation of the EYFSP to ensure that it better supports those involved in the moderation process to make professional judgments. We will work with Ofsted, local authorities and the wider sector to dispel myths about moderation and evidence requirements.

We will review the current approach to moderation, to investigate whether alternative models to local authority-led moderation, such as moderating within school clusters, would reduce burdens without compromising the rigour of the moderation process. This will link to the pilot of peer-to-peer moderation at the end of key stages 1 and 2 described below. We will also explore ways to better align internal and external moderation, to make the system more efficient.

We will also explore the feasibility of moderating a limited number of ELGs, working closely with the sector and with local authorities to determine whether this approach would be appropriate.

Over the coming months, we will work with a range of experts and practitioners, and we will establish an advisory panel to review and analyse the body of academic literature in child development to inform the specific changes we will make to the EYFSP, including the descriptors underpinning the ELGs, the assessment and the processes needed to administer and maintain standards of the EYFSP. We will approach this in the clear context that we do not wish to increase workload or burden or compromise the integrity of the EYFS learning and development framework. Any changes to the ELGs will come into effect from the 2020 to 2021 academic year.

### **The best starting point for measuring progress in primary school**

In light of the support in the consultation for the principle of a new assessment in reception, we intend to develop a new baseline as a statutory assessment and to test and evaluate it so that it is ready for introduction in reception by autumn 2020.

We agree that the content, format and uses of the assessment are critical issues to get right in order to ensure the success of the new assessment and progress measures. The Standards and Testing Agency will shortly start the process of engaging a commercial partner to work with them to design and deliver the assessment. Learning from the previous multi-supplier model used for the optional baseline assessments in the 2015 to 2016 academic year, there will be a single supplier for this new assessment. We will continue to engage with stakeholders throughout the design process, and at key sign-off points in the development of the assessment.

As we develop the baseline, we will continue to discuss the detail of the assessment with a wide range of stakeholders, and we will conduct a large-scale pilot and evaluation in the 2019 to 2020 academic year. We are committed to ensuring that the baseline is of a high quality, appropriate for the age of the children taking it, that schools have the necessary training, guidance and support to implement it and that the experience for the child is positive. We understand that this means two statutory assessments will be administered in reception, albeit for different purposes, and we will work with the sector to minimise burdens as far as possible, including by making the new baseline part of existing on-entry assessments. We will also carefully consider how to make the assessment as accessible to as many children as possible, including those with special educational needs and disabilities, and English as an additional language. In addition, we will work with analytical experts to develop the rules around the new progress measures, for example the minimum cohort size required and the minimum proportion of pupils that need to have been in the same school between reception and Key Stage 2.

The prime focus of the new assessment will be on skills which can be reliably assessed and which correlate with attainment in English and mathematics at the end of Key Stage 2, most notably early literacy and numeracy. This was the most frequent suggestion in the consultation responses and is supported by evidence. We will also ask the potential suppliers to explore ways in which it would be possible to assess some form of 'self-regulation' in their bids, for example persistence with a task or following multi-step instructions.

We intend that the pupil's regular teacher or teaching assistant would carry out the assessment, and we are clear that the assessment should not feel like a 'test' or be any different from many of the existing on-entry assessments that schools already undertake with their pupils. Pupils' teachers, or teaching assistants, will mediate the assessment. We do not intend this to be an observational assessment which is carried out over time, like the EYFSP. As described, however, we will pilot the format of the new assessment, including the experience for the child and how well the assessment works.

We want to be very clear about the limited purpose and use of data from the new baseline assessment. Its purpose will be to establish pupils' prior attainment as the starting point for calculating progress measures when pupils reach the end of Key Stage 2. As now, the progress measures and the results of the new assessment would need to have a correlation with end of Key Stage 2 assessments at a cohort level. They would not be used to judge, label, or track individual pupil progress, to set targets for them to reach, to 'predict' the Key Stage 2 results of individual pupils, or assume that they make linear progress. Furthermore, the data would not be used in any way to measure performance in early years or to hold early years practitioners to account. Ofsted will continue to look at EYFSP information as a rounded judgement of child development as part of their inspections of early years provision in schools, including nurseries.

The new reception baseline will only be used seven years later to make the progress measure at the end of primary school. As now, this information will be published at school and local authority level on performance tables to inform parental choice. We recognise that no single piece of data or measure can be used alone to judge a school's performance and are therefore clear that no decision regarding intervention can be based on one piece of information alone.

We are clear that the results of the new baseline assessment will not be used to determine inspection outcomes or to determine what improvement action needs to take place in schools. It has been suggested that some teachers and head teachers may like to know what their cohort-level data looks like ahead of receiving their progress scores seven years later. Therefore, through the trial and pilot of the baseline assessment we will explore whether, and what, numerical data to share with headteachers at cohort level only, in order to be clear that data should not be used to judge individual pupils, teachers or schools.

We have listened to the feedback that if a new assessment in reception is to be introduced, then it would be useful if it could also provide some formative information to help teachers to identify pupils' needs and inform their on-entry assessments. We will ask the supplier to ensure that the assessment can provide a narrative summary of the pupil's strengths and weaknesses to inform teaching. This narrative information would not indicate how well a child was likely to do in future, or suggest their future progress score.

Given the broad consensus amongst respondents that moving the baseline for measuring progress to the reception year is the favoured choice, this is what we are pursuing, as described above, rather than trying to improve the Key Stage 1 assessments.

We agree that in order for the new measure to give credit for as much of the progress made by pupils as possible in the reception year, the new assessment should be undertaken early in the school year, allowing for time for pupils to settle in. We have reached a view based on the consultation responses that the first half-term (autumn term) of reception is most appropriate, particularly as this enables the new assessment to supplement existing practice of on-entry assessments.

We know that there are a number of pupils who start reception later in the academic year (often in January), and therefore the assessment should be completed for those pupils within the first 6 weeks of them starting reception, to give them time to settle in.

As stated above, we intend to work closely with the sector as the assessment is designed and developed, and to pilot it before introduction. This will include testing whether, to ensure pupils have more time to settle in, we should provide guidance to schools on when in the first half-term the assessment should normally take place and the window that we envisage for this.

### **Interim years**

In the interim years, we intend to continue using Key Stage 1 teacher assessment as the baseline for progress measures. As now, these progress measures will continue to have the downside of not covering the first three years of primary school, but we agree with feedback that keeping Key Stage 1 as the baseline for this interim period is important for stability as we put reception to Key Stage 2 measures in place. We are also clear that any data is just the starting point for a conversation about how to improve a school, and no single piece of data will determine any intervention action.

We have also taken a number of steps to improve the moderation of statutory teacher assessment, including introducing mandatory training and standardisation for all local authority moderators.

### ***The role of statutory assessments at the end of Key Stage 1***

We will make assessments at the end of Key Stage 1 (both national curriculum tests and statutory teacher assessment) non-statutory as soon as the reception baseline assessment has become fully established. If possible, we intend to make this change from the 2022 to 2023 academic year onwards. We want to remove the assessments at the end of Key Stage 1 once possible; however, we would be unable to remove the statutory requirement before this point, as we will still need to use end-of-Key Stage 1 teacher assessment data to calculate primary progress measures. Before 2023, there will be cohorts progressing through Key Stage 1 who started school before 2020 and have therefore not taken the reception baseline assessment, and we will need their Key Stage 1 data to calculate progress measures. This is set out in the table on page 18.

In the summer of 2022, the first cohort of pupils to have sat the new reception baseline assessment will reach the end of Key Stage 1. Having data from a cohort of pupils who have sat both reception and Key Stage 1 assessments will enable us to evaluate the correlation between the two assessments and provide assurance that the new reception baseline provides a sufficiently strong correlation to Key Stage 2. After this point, we would be in a position to make end-of-Key Stage 1 assessments non-statutory from the academic year 2022 to 2023.

To ensure that parents continue to receive good information about their child's attainment and progress at the midway point in primary school, we will retain the current requirement for schools to report on pupil performance and attainment to parents in more detail at the end of Key Stage 1. To support schools with this, we will make optional end-of-Key Stage 1 tests available for schools to use as they see fit. These optional test materials will enable schools to benchmark pupil performance against national expectations at the end of Key Stage 1, supporting them to achieve well in Key Stage 2. We will explore making these tests available through a national assessment bank, which could contain other materials to support schools' ongoing assessment, as recommended by the Commission for Assessment Without Levels and the Independent Assessment Review Group convened by the NAHT.

Despite not having statutory assessment at the end-of-Key Stage 1 in the future, we recognise that it will be important that we continue to have an accurate and ongoing picture of standards nationally at the end-of-Key Stage 1. To achieve this, we will periodically sample Key Stage 1 assessment data from a small, representative sample of primary schools. This data will be anonymised and will not be attributable to specific schools, or be used to hold schools to account.

### ***School types and assessment***

We have considered the range of issues raised in relation to the two options and recognise the lack of consensus on this issue. We agree with ASCL that there is no obvious simple answer and that it is right that we take some more time to consider the best approach. As set out above, Key Stage 1 tests will remain in place until 2023 for all-through schools, so there is some time to create alternative ways to assess progress in these other schools. We recognise the need to give schools clarity as soon as possible and we will, therefore, work with sector representatives to fully consider the options in order to have a settled position before the new reception baseline has been through its initial first-year design phase – by January 2018.

## **A proportionate assessment system**

### ***Collection of teacher assessment data at the end of Key Stage 2***

We will remove the statutory requirement for schools to report teacher assessment judgements in English reading and mathematics at the end of Key Stage 2 from the 2018 to 2019 academic year onwards, once the relevant legislation has been amended. We believe that removing this duty to report judgements against the statutory teacher assessment frameworks will reduce burdens for teachers. We are clear, however, that this does not undermine the fundamental importance of the ongoing teacher assessment that takes place in the classroom throughout a pupil's time at primary school. Formative teacher assessment informs teaching and has a crucial role in supporting pupils to progress and achieve their full potential. In addition, the statutory requirement on schools to report pupils' attainment and progress to parents remains, as it is important that parents receive regular information on how their children are doing. We will work with partners to consider how the department can best support and promote good quality, ongoing teacher assessment in the future.

Where pupils are working below the standard of national curriculum tests, teachers will continue to have a statutory requirement to assess pupils using the interim pre-key stage standards and to report these judgements. Further details about the future arrangements for assessing pupils working below the standard can be found in the parallel response to the Rochford Review consultation.

### ***Key stage 1 English grammar, punctuation and spelling test***

Given the broad support for this proposal, we will keep the Key Stage 1 grammar, punctuation and spelling test non-statutory in future years. We will continue to make optional test materials available for schools to use as they see fit.

Grammar, punctuation and spelling remain important elements of the English national curriculum programme of study at Key Stage 1, and pupils will continue to be assessed in these areas using the teacher assessment frameworks in writing. We anticipate that the optional Key Stage 1 grammar, punctuation and spelling test materials will remain a useful resource for teachers in supporting all of their pupils to achieve well in writing and to prepare for success at Key Stage 2.

### ***Multiplication tables check***

We announced in 2016 that the multiplication tables check would be introduced. It will support all pupils to master their times tables, a crucial foundation for success in more complex mathematics. The check will be designed in a way so as to be as non-burdensome as possible (see below also), and in recognition of the introduction of an additional assessment, we have taken a number of steps to make the overall statutory assessment system more proportionate.

The multiplication tables check will take place at the end of year 4. This means that the check will correspond with the point in the national curriculum by which pupils are expected to know their times tables, and will not add to the existing assessments taken by pupils in later years of Key Stage 2. As

consultation responses have highlighted, having the check at this point will ensure that schools have adequate time to support pupils to catch up if necessary, following the check.

The check has been designed to place minimal burdens on pupils and teachers. Schools will have a window in which they can administer the assessment, and there will be no requirement for a class to take the check at the same time. The check will be brief, and will be administered online, with an off-line option available for schools without suitable internet connectivity. The online nature of the check will mean that results are available to teachers instantly, and with no additional data submission burdens. To ensure that the check is suitable for all schools, we are undertaking extensive trialling and will run a large-scale pilot in the 2018 to 2019 academic year, before the check is introduced on a statutory basis in the 2019 to 2020 academic year. Importantly, this extensive trialling will support us to design the check to be as robust and non-burdensome as possible, with a system that is easy for teachers to access and navigate. This pilot will also enable schools to familiarise themselves with the check before it becomes statutory, should they wish to.

It is important to note the way that we intend to use data arising from the check. Whilst we will collect assessment data from the check, this will be published at national and local authority level only, and not at school level. We will make clear to relevant parties, including regional school commissioners and governing bodies, that data from the check should be used only as a starting point for a discussion on how best to help and support schools to raise standards in numeracy. As we said in the consultation, the data will not be used to trigger inspection or intervention.

### ***Reducing burdens within the primary assessment system***

We believe that the statutory assessment system that we have outlined in this response document effectively balances the burdens associated with assessment with the need to maintain standards and to recognise the progress that schools make with their pupils. We have taken a number of steps to make the assessment system as proportionate as possible. These include removing the statutory requirement to carry out teacher assessment in reading and mathematics at the end of Key Stage 2; keeping the Key Stage 1 grammar, punctuation and spelling test non-statutory; and making assessments at the end of Key Stage 1 non-statutory at the earliest possible point.

Many respondents shared views on the burdens associated with the teacher assessment of writing. A number felt that adopting a more flexible approach would reduce burdens to some extent. This was proposed in the consultation document, and our intention to move to a more flexible approach in assessing writing from the 2017 to 2018 academic year onwards is confirmed later in this document. We are publishing revised teacher assessment frameworks for writing alongside this document. Improved statutory guidance and updated exemplification materials will be published later in the autumn term, to support teachers to make judgements against these frameworks.

Some respondents also suggested that the frameworks, guidance and exemplification materials used in other areas of statutory teacher assessment could be improved. We have undertaken a comprehensive review of the other interim teacher assessment frameworks. Revised frameworks for reading and mathematics at Key Stage 1, and science at key stages 1 and 2, along with updated guidance and exemplification materials, will be published in due course, for first use in the 2018 to 2019 academic year. Based on feedback to this consultation, we will look to provide additional exemplification materials in future years, to ensure that teachers are fully supported in exercising their professional judgement.

A number of respondents suggested that increased use of online testing could reduce burdens. Moving to online testing would require significant lead-in times and resource. The multiplication tables check, which will be an online and onscreen check, is our first online assessment. We will look to build on the development of this check, as we consider how technology could be utilised to reduce burdens associated with assessment in the future.

Some respondents said that government providing longer lead-in times before introducing changes would reduce burdens on schools. We agree, and we will seek to provide schools with as much notice of future changes to statutory assessment as we are able to. The department's workload protocol commits to a year's lead in time for significant changes to curriculum, accountability or qualifications (including formal assessments). We see an exception to this in the case of changes to the teacher assessment of writing, which we will implement from the 2017 to 2018 academic year, due to strong feedback from the sector that they would like this change to be made as soon as possible (see below also). Some respondents commented on the clarity of guidance and communications around assessment. We will ensure that all communications are clear, timely and as concise as possible.

A number of respondents suggested that schools could be given a longer time window within which they can administer the tests, whilst others suggested that tests could be taken later in the year, to allow more time for pupils to prepare. Schools have a month-long window in which to administer the Key Stage 1 tests; however, the Key Stage 2 test window is restricted to a week (with a further week where the test can be sat by pupils who were unable to sit the test in the designated test week, for example due to absence). Due to the need to keep the test materials secure in order to avoid the assessments being compromised, we are unable to extend these test windows. Similarly, we require the tests to be taken in May so that pupil scripts can be collected, marked and results returned to schools in a timely manner.

We will continue to evaluate whether there are additional changes we can make to the administration of statutory assessments at primary school to minimise burdens, particularly as recent reforms continue to bed in.

In addition, we are continuing to consider how we can improve pupils' experience of the tests. Some respondents suggested that the Key Stage 2 reading test could be moved from the first day of test week, to be taken later in test week instead. Given that pupils' attainment in reading forms part of the school-level published data, we agree that there is merit in the test being taken later in the week, when pupils have settled in. From the 2017 to 2018 academic year we will change the day that the reading test paper is sat so that it is no longer the first test that they undertake. As part of our work to improve the test experience, we will also consider how the texts included in the reading test can better incorporate content from the broader curriculum, so that they draw from a rich knowledge base.

### **Improving end-of-key stage statutory teacher assessment**

#### ***Teacher assessment of English writing***

Given the overwhelmingly positive response to this proposal, we will move to a more flexible approach for assessing English writing from the 2017 to 2018 academic year onwards. Over the past few months we have been conducting a comprehensive evaluation of the existing interim teacher assessment frameworks in all subjects. This review has involved assessment and curriculum experts, teachers, school leaders, local authority representatives and inclusion specialists.

Whilst the reading, mathematics and science frameworks will continue to use the previous approach, teachers will have more flexibility in how they make judgements using the teacher assessment frameworks for writing. Throughout the consultation document we have been clear that we are committed to creating a stable, sustainable primary assessment system, and providing schools with the necessary lead-in times to manage change is an important part of this. However, in this instance we have heard strong feedback from the sector that they would like changes to the statutory

teacher assessment of writing to be made as soon as possible, but for a longer lead-in time to be provided for changes to the other statutory teacher assessment frameworks. We have engaged a variety of stakeholder groups in this process, including Ofqual and the teaching unions, and trialled the revised versions in schools. On this basis, we are responding to this call and the revised statutory teacher assessment frameworks for writing will be used for the first time in the 2017 to 2018 academic year, and are published alongside this document. Updated frameworks in reading and mathematics at Key Stage 1, and science at key stages 1 and 2, will be introduced from the 2018 to 2019 academic year onwards.

To support the moderation of statutory teacher assessment of writing throughout this change in approach, we will once again run mandatory standardisation training for local authority moderators in the 2017 to 2018 academic year.

Alongside reviewing the mainstream frameworks, we have evaluated the interim pre-key stage standards, to ensure that any changes in the frameworks are reflected in the standards, so that they continue to support progression. We have today also published revised interim pre-key stage standards for writing. As is the case with the mainstream teacher assessment frameworks, teachers will have more flexibility in how they make judgements using the frameworks in the case of writing only. Further information about the interim pre-key stage standards can be found in the government's response to the parallel consultation on the recommendations made by the Rochford Review.

The sector will appreciate that, having made changes to the statutory writing teacher assessment frameworks sooner rather than later, we have had limited time to make the necessary changes to the supporting exemplification materials in order to reflect these changes. This process is underway and updated exemplification materials in writing will be published later in the autumn term.

Engagement with the sector during this review period has identified a number of areas where we could go even further to improve and strengthen exemplification materials to support statutory teacher assessment, for example by publishing more materials in some subjects. To further support schools, we will look to do this for the 2018 to 2019 academic year; however, we are clear that the exemplification materials that will be available for the 2017 to 2018 academic year will be sufficient to support teachers to make judgements against the frameworks in the summer of 2018.

### ***Supporting and strengthening the assessment of English writing***

A significant number of respondents were interested in the potential of comparative judgement as a method for assessing writing. We know that there is promising work taking place amongst the sector to explore the use of comparative judgement in the assessment of writing, notably the Sharing Standards pilot run by No More Marking. We were encouraged by the results of this year's pilot, which involved 199 schools. We will work with No More Marking to evaluate larger pilots in the near future, to explore the potential of comparative judgement in the assessment system.

Were we to look to make any significant change to the current system of assessing writing in the longer term, we are clear that any alternative model would have to be proven to be robust and reliable through appropriate trialling. Schools would need to be supported to implement any change, with appropriate notice and guidance.

A number of respondents commented that long-term approaches should be more flexible in how they assess writing, with references made to a 'best fit' approach. As set out above, we will move to a more flexible approach of assessing writing from the 2017 to 2018 academic year onwards.

### ***Alternative approaches to moderation***

We are clear that we would not make any change to the system of moderation unless an alternative model had been proven to be robust and reliable, and had undergone appropriate trialling. We also recognise that schools would need to be supported with any change of approach, with appropriate lead-in times given for any change, and appropriate training and guidance provided.

Many respondents expressed interest in a peer-to-peer model of moderation that would involve schools working together in local clusters, overseen by a local moderator. It was felt that this approach could further encourage the sharing of best practice, and support teachers' professional development on moderation. To explore this model, we intend to run a small-scale pilot in the 2017 to 2018 academic year. Further details on this, including how schools can express an interest in participating, will be made available in due course.

Many respondents suggested ways that the existing local authority moderation system could be made more reliable. We have taken a number of steps to improve the moderation of teacher assessment judgements in recent years, including working with the NAHT to update guidance, and introducing training for local authority moderators. We will continue to consider how the current system of external local authority moderation can be improved, to ensure that data from statutory teacher assessments is as robust as possible.

## Timescale for future assessment requirements

| Academic year | Entry to Reception Year, end of KS1, and end of KS2 assessment requirements   |
|---------------|---|
| 2017-18       | <p>There are no assessments on entry to KS1</p> <p>The current Year 2 finish KS1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pupils working at the standard of national curriculum tests are assessed against the revised interim teacher assessment framework</li> <li>pupils engaged in subject-specific learning but working below the standard of national curriculum tests are assessed against the P scale</li> <li>pupils not yet engaged in subject-specific learning are assessed against the P scale</li> </ul> <p>The current Year 6 finish KS2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pupils working at the standard of national curriculum tests undertake scaled score tests and teacher assessment of writing under revised framework</li> <li>pupils engaged in subject-specific learning but working below the standard of national curriculum tests are assessed against the P scale</li> <li>pupils not yet engaged in subject-specific learning are assessed against the P scale</li> </ul>  |
| 2018-19       | <p>There are no assessments on entry to KS1</p> <p>The current Year 1 finish KS1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pupils working at the standard of national curriculum tests are assessed against the interim teacher assessment framework</li> <li>pupils engaged in subject-specific learning but working below the standard of national curriculum tests are assessed against the revised interim pre-key stage standards</li> <li>pupils not yet engaged in subject-specific learning are assessed against the P scale</li> </ul> <p>The current Year 5 finish KS2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pupils working at the standard of national curriculum tests undertake scaled score tests and teacher assessment of writing</li> <li>pupils engaged in subject-specific learning but working below the standard of national curriculum tests are assessed against the revised pre-key stage standards</li> <li>pupils not yet engaged in subject-specific learning are assessed against the P scale</li> </ul>  |
| 2019-20       | <p>Some current 2 year-olds take part in new reception baseline pilot</p> <p>The current Reception finish KS1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pupils working at the standard of national curriculum tests are assessed against the interim teacher assessment framework</li> <li>pupils engaged in subject-specific learning but working below the standard of national curriculum tests are assessed against the interim pre-key stage standards</li> <li>pupils not yet engaged in subject-specific learning assessed against the 7 areas of engagement (subject to pilot)</li> </ul> <p>The current Year 4 finish KS2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pupils working at the standard of national curriculum tests undertake scaled score tests and teacher assessment of writing</li> <li>pupils engaged in subject-specific learning but working below the standard of national curriculum tests are assessed against the pre-key stage standards</li> <li>pupils not yet engaged in subject-specific learning assessed against the 7 areas of engagement (subject to pilot)</li> </ul> |
| 2020-21       | <p>All current 1 year-olds undertake new reception baseline</p> <p>The current 3 year-olds finish KS1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pupils working at the standard of national curriculum tests are assessed against the interim teacher assessment framework</li> <li>pupils engaged in subject-specific learning but working below the standard of national curriculum tests are assessed against the interim pre-key stage standards</li> <li>pupils not yet engaged in subject-specific learning assessed against the 7 areas of engagement</li> </ul> <p>The current Year 3 finish KS2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pupils working at the standard of national curriculum tests undertake scaled score tests and teacher assessment of writing</li> <li>pupils engaged in subject-specific learning but working below the standard of national curriculum tests are assessed against the pre-key stage standards</li> <li>pupils not yet engaged in subject-specific learning assessed against the 7 areas of engagement</li> </ul>   |
| 2021-22       | <p>This year's reception class undertake the baseline</p> <p>The current 2 year-olds finish KS1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pupils working at the standard of national curriculum tests are assessed against the interim teacher assessment framework</li> <li>pupils engaged in subject-specific learning but working below the standard of national curriculum tests are assessed against the interim pre-key stage standards</li> <li>pupils not yet engaged in subject-specific learning assessed against the 7 areas of engagement</li> </ul> <p>The current Year 2 finish KS2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pupils working at the standard of national curriculum tests undertake scaled score tests and teacher assessment of writing</li> <li>pupils engaged in subject-specific learning but working below the standard of national curriculum tests are assessed against the pre-key stage standards</li> <li>pupils not yet engaged in subject-specific learning assessed against the 7 areas of engagement</li> </ul>   |
| 2022-23       | <p>This year's reception class undertake the baseline</p> <p>There are no statutory assessments for pupil's finishing KS1</p> <p>The current Year 1 finish KS2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pupils working at the standard of national curriculum tests undertake scaled score tests and teacher assessment of writing</li> <li>pupils engaged in subject-specific learning but working below the standard of national curriculum tests are assessed against the pre-key stage standards</li> <li>pupils not yet engaged in subject-specific learning assessed against the 7 areas of engagement</li> </ul>  |
| 2023-24       | <p>This year's reception class undertake the baseline</p> <p>There are no statutory assessments for pupil's finishing KS1</p> <p>The current Reception class finish KS2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pupils working at the standard of national curriculum tests undertake scaled score tests and teacher assessment of writing</li> <li>pupils engaged in subject-specific learning but working below the standard of national curriculum tests are assessed against the pre-key stage standards</li> <li>pupils not yet engaged in subject-specific learning assessed against the 7 areas of engagement</li> </ul>   |

## Timescale for implications of the consultations

| Academic year | Implications of the Rochford Consultation and Primary Consultation   |
|---------------|--|
| 2017-18       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change the day that the reading test paper is sat.</li> <li>Conduct a small-scale, peer-to-peer moderation pilot.</li> <li>Conduct mandatory standardisation training for local authority writing moderators.</li> <li>Continue to assess these pupils using the P scale.</li> <li>Move to a more flexible approach of assessing English writing.</li> <li>Pilot a peer-to-peer approach to moderation.</li> <li>Pilot the Review's recommended approach to assessing pupils not engaged in subject-specific learning.</li> <li>Publish more materials in some subjects to support statutory teacher assessment.</li> <li>Publish reports on EEF research projects for pupils with EAL from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds.</li> <li>Publish revised interim pre-key stage standards in writing.</li> <li>Publish revised versions of the mainstream teacher assessment frameworks in writing.</li> </ul>   |
| 2018-19       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct a large-scale multiplication tables check pilot.</li> <li>Decide on effective accountability arrangements for infant, middle and junior schools' progress measures.</li> <li>Make permanent and extend the interim pre-key stage standards to cover all pupils engaged in subject-specific learning.</li> <li>Produce a suite of supporting exemplification materials to be used alongside the final pre-key stage standards.</li> <li>Publish revised frameworks for reading and mathematics at key stage 1, and science at key stages 1 and 2, along with updated guidance and exemplification materials.</li> <li>Remove the requirement to assess pupils engaged in subject-specific learning using the P scale.</li> <li>Remove the statutory requirement for schools to report teacher assessment judgements in English reading and mathematics at the end of key stage 2.</li> <li>Trial a peer-to-peer approach to moderation for the pre-key stage standards.</li> </ul> |
| 2019-20       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct a large-scale Reception Baseline pilot and evaluation.</li> <li>Implement the Review's recommended approach to assessing pupils not engaged in subject-specific learning on a statutory basis.</li> <li>Introduce multiplication tables check on a statutory basis.</li> </ul>  |
| 2020-21       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduce the Reception Baseline on a statutory basis.</li> <li>Publish changes to the ELGs.</li> </ul>   |
| 2021-22       |  |
| 2022-23       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make end-of-key stage 1 assessments non-statutory.</li> </ul>   |
| 2023-24       |  |

## Works Cited

- DfE & STA, 2014. *P scale: attainment targets for pupils with SEN (Statutory Guidance)*. [Online]  
Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/617033/Performance - P Scale - attainment targets for pupils with special educational needs June 2017.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/617033/Performance_-_P_Scale_-_attainment_targets_for_pupils_with_special_educational_needs_June_2017.pdf)  
[Accessed 25 September 2017].
- DfE, 2017. *Primary assessment in England (consultation)*. [Online]  
Available at: <https://consult.education.gov.uk/assessment-policy-and-development/primary-assessment/>  
[Accessed 25 September 2017].
- DfE, 2017. *Primary assessment in England (Government consultation response)*. [Online]  
Available at:  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/644871/Primary assessment consultation response.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/644871/Primary_assessment_consultation_response.pdf)  
[Accessed 25 September 2017].
- DfE, 2017. *Primary school pupil assessment: Rochford Review recommendations (consultation)*. [Online]  
Available at: <https://consult.education.gov.uk/assessment-policy-and-development/rochford-review/>  
[Accessed 25 September 2017].
- DfE, 2017. *Primary school pupil assessment: Rochford Review recommendations (Government consultation response)*. [Online]  
Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/644729/Rochford consultation response.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/644729/Rochford_consultation_response.pdf)  
[Accessed 25 September 2017].
- STA, 2015. *Expert review of statutory assessment arrangements for pupils working below the standard of national curriculum tests*. [Online]  
Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/477123/Rochford review - terms of reference.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/477123/Rochford_review_-_terms_of_reference.pdf)  
[Accessed 29 September 2017].
- STA, 2016. *Pre-Key Stage 2: Pupils Working Below the Test Standard*. [Online]  
Available at:  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/538422/2017 Interim Pre Key Stage Standards key stage 2\\_1\\_50716 PDFa.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/538422/2017_Interim_Pre_Key_Stage_Standards_key_stage_2_1_50716_PDFa.pdf)  
[Accessed 31 January 2017].
- STA, 2016. *The Rochford Review: Final Report*. [Online]  
Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/561411/Rochford Review Report v5 PFDA.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/561411/Rochford_Review_Report_v5_PFDA.pdf)  
[Accessed 31 January 2017].

## Bibliography

- B Squared, 2017. *The Results of B Squared's "The Rochford Review: Final Report" Customer Questionnaire*. [Online]  
Available at:  
<https://www.bsquared.co.uk/Portals/0/Documents/Rochford%20Review/Results%20of%20Rochford%20Review%20Questionnaire.pdf?ver=2017-02-22-232846-557>  
[Accessed 02 October 2017].
- BESA, 2015. *Research report: Classroom Learning Resources 2015 – Assessment in Primary Schools*. [Online]  
Available at: <http://www.besa.org.uk/insights/11-05-2015-classroom-learning-resources-2015-assessment-in-primary-schools.pdf/>  
[Accessed 31 January 2017].
- DfE & DoH, 2015. *Special Educational Needs and Disability Code of Practice: 0 to 25 years*. [Online]  
Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/398815/SEND Code of Practice January 2015.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/398815/SEND_Code_of_Practice_January_2015.pdf)  
[Accessed 31 January 2017].
- DfE & STA, 2014. *P scale: attainment targets for pupils with SEN (Statutory Guidance)*. [Online]  
Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/617033/Performance - P Scale - attainment targets for pupils with special educational needs June 2017.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/617033/Performance_-_P_Scale_-_attainment_targets_for_pupils_with_special_educational_needs_June_2017.pdf)  
[Accessed 25 September 2017].
- DfE & STA, 2015. *Performance descriptors for key stage 1 and 2 statutory teacher assessment: Government consultation response*. [Online]  
Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/407178/Performance-descriptors-consultation-government-response.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/407178/Performance-descriptors-consultation-government-response.pdf)  
[Accessed 31 January 2017].
- DfE, 2014. *The National Curriculum in England: Framework Document*. [Online]  
Available at:  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/381344/Master final national curriculum 28 Nov.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/381344/Master_final_national_curriculum_28_Nov.pdf)  
[Accessed 31 January 2017].
- DfE, 2017. *Primary assessment in England (consultation)*. [Online]  
Available at: <https://consult.education.gov.uk/assessment-policy-and-development/primary-assessment/>  
[Accessed 25 September 2017].
- DfE, 2017. *Primary assessment in England (Government consultation response)*. [Online]  
Available at:  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/644871/Primary assessment consultation response.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/644871/Primary_assessment_consultation_response.pdf)  
[Accessed 25 September 2017].

- DfE, 2017. *Primary school pupil assessment: Rochford Review recommendations (consultation)*. [Online]  
Available at: <https://consult.education.gov.uk/assessment-policy-and-development/rochford-review/>  
[Accessed 25 September 2017].
- DfE, 2017. *Primary school pupil assessment: Rochford Review recommendations (Government consultation response)*. [Online]  
Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/644729/Rochford\\_consultation\\_response.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/644729/Rochford_consultation_response.pdf)  
[Accessed 25 September 2017].
- SSAT, 2011. *The Complex Learning Difficulties and Disabilities Research Project: Final Report*. [Online]  
Available at: [http://complexld.ssatrust.org.uk/uploads/CLDD\\_project\\_report\\_final.pdf](http://complexld.ssatrust.org.uk/uploads/CLDD_project_report_final.pdf)  
[Accessed 31 January 2017].
- STA, 2015. *Expert review of statutory assessment arrangements for pupils working below the standard of national curriculum tests*. [Online]  
Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/477123/Rochford\\_review\\_-\\_terms\\_of\\_reference.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/477123/Rochford_review_-_terms_of_reference.pdf)  
[Accessed 29 September 2017].
- STA, 2015. *Expert review of statutory assessment arrangements for pupils working below the standard of national curriculum tests (Terms of Reference)*. [Online]  
Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/477123/Rochford\\_review\\_-\\_terms\\_of\\_reference.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/477123/Rochford_review_-_terms_of_reference.pdf)  
[Accessed 29 September 2017].
- STA, 2016. *Pre-Key Stage 1: Pupils Working Below the Test Standard*. [Online]  
Available at:  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/538418/2017\\_Interim\\_Pre\\_Key\\_Stage\\_Standards\\_key\\_stage\\_1\\_1\\_50716\\_PDFa.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/538418/2017_Interim_Pre_Key_Stage_Standards_key_stage_1_1_50716_PDFa.pdf)  
[Accessed 31 January 2017].
- STA, 2016. *Pre-Key Stage 2: Pupils Working Below the Test Standard*. [Online]  
Available at:  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/538422/2017\\_Interim\\_Pre\\_Key\\_Stage\\_Standards\\_key\\_stage\\_2\\_1\\_50716\\_PDFa.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/538422/2017_Interim_Pre_Key_Stage_Standards_key_stage_2_1_50716_PDFa.pdf)  
[Accessed 31 January 2017].
- STA, 2016. *The Rochford Review: Final Report*. [Online]  
Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/561411/Rochford\\_Review\\_Report\\_v5\\_PFDA.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/561411/Rochford_Review_Report_v5_PFDA.pdf)  
[Accessed 31 January 2017].
- STA, 2017. *Interim Teacher Assessment Frameworks at the End of Key Stage 1*. [Online]  
Available at:  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/647105/2017\\_to\\_2018\\_teacher\\_assessment\\_frameworks\\_at\\_the\\_end\\_of\\_key\\_stage\\_1\\_PDFa.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/647105/2017_to_2018_teacher_assessment_frameworks_at_the_end_of_key_stage_1_PDFa.pdf)  
[Accessed 25 September 2017].
- STA, 2017. *Interim Teacher Assessment Frameworks at the End of Key Stage 2*. [Online]  
Available at:  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/647107/2017\\_to\\_2018\\_teacher\\_assessment\\_frameworks\\_at\\_the\\_end\\_of\\_key\\_stage\\_2\\_PDFa.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/647107/2017_to_2018_teacher_assessment_frameworks_at_the_end_of_key_stage_2_PDFa.pdf)  
[Accessed 25 September 2017].
- UCLES, 2010. *Could do better: Using international comparisons to refine the National Curriculum in England*. [Online]  
Available at: <http://www.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/Images/112281-could-do-better-using-international-comparisons-to-refine-the-national-curriculum-in-england.pdf>  
[Accessed 31 January 2017].

# BSquared

Registered Office:

B Squared Ltd

A2 Building

Cody Technology Park

Ively Road

Farnborough

Hampshire

GU14 0LX

Registered in England & Wales No: 04088829

For further information visit [www.bsquared.co.uk](http://www.bsquared.co.uk)

Or contact [dale@bsquared.co.uk](mailto:dale@bsquared.co.uk)