

Minutes of the Meeting of the Steering Committee held on Saturday 15 November 2014 at the Institute of Historical Research – 11 a.m.

Present: Keith McLay, Co-Convenor (Chester); Andrew Dilley Co-convenor (Aberdeen); Glenn Richardson, Secretary (St Mary's); Marcus Collins (Loughborough) Co-convenor elect; Daniel Grey (Plymouth) Secretary elect; Bill Aird (Edinburgh); Chris Aldous (Winchester); Sarah Bastow (Huddersfield); Stuart Burch (Nottingham Trent); Mark Clapson (Westminster); Paul Corthorn (Queen's Belfast); Karin Dannehl (EHS); Virginia Davis (QMUL); Peter D'Sena (IHR/UCL); Daniel Gordon (Edge Hill); Jackie Eales (Canterbury Christ Church); Susan Mary Grant (Newcastle); Richard Hawkins (Wolverhampton); Ariel Hessayon (Goldsmiths); Kate Hill (Lincoln); Ann Hughes (Keele); Charles Insley (Manchester); Rachel Lock-Lewis (South Wales); Peter Mandler (RHistS); Phil McLuskey (Sheffield); Robert McNamara (Ulster); Philip Ollerenshaw (West of England, Bristol); Daniel Power (Swansea); Rebecca Rist (Reading); Andrew Roach (Glasgow); John Stuart (Kingston); Melanie Tebbutt (Manchester Met); Sara Wolfson (Canterbury Christ Church)

1. Apologies

Rainer Schultz, Treasurer (Essex); Joan Allen (Newcastle); Richard Allen (South Wales); Meg Arnot (Roehampton); Rachel Bright (Keele); Rosalind Crone (Open); Cath Feely (History Lab+); Lucy Matthews-Jones (Liverpool John Mores); James McConnell (Northumbria); Jason Peacey (UCL); Lori-Ann Rees (Bangor); Vivienne Richmond (Goldsmiths); Kay Shiller (Durham); Claudia Stein (Warwick); Christopher Storrs (Dundee); William Whyte (Oxford); John Young (Strathclyde)

2. Minutes of the Plenary meeting of 16 November 2013

Accepted subject to a few minor corrections

3. Matters arising from the Minutes

There were no matters arising not otherwise dealt with on the Agenda.

4. Convenors' Reports

AD: Steering Committee Meetings

1. Subject Assn meetings and History Forum: History UK now attending liaison group between the Research Councils and History Subject Associations, a meeting now superceding autumn history subject association.
2. **Open-Access Publishing:** Policy published in April and broadly welcome as being as reasonable a model as could realistically be achieved. Thanks to Chris Wickham and Peter Mandler who led the case on behalf of the humanities. A two page summary was circulated by HUK highlighting key features. A key issue is how the guidelines are being interpreted at institutional level. Some misunderstanding of HEFCE policy at institutional level. HUK will monitor how the policy is being implemented and clarify any misunderstanding.

Questions followed as to the status of the green route and pre-publication outputs often stored on HEI research depositories as opposed to the final published version. General agreement that the version submitted to REF2020 should be the final published version. Some room for manoeuvre with HEFCE on these issues before the finalisation of plans for REF 2020. RHistS has produced a one page summary guide to the issues raised by OA on its website.

5. History Benchmarking Statements:

HUK was represented on the review of Benchmarking statements. There were no significant changes to existing ones although some updating of terminology and clarifying of emphasis were incorporated. The amended statements were sent HEIs for consultation and the QAA has now received the feedback and it is expected that the new Benchmarking statements will be published in the spring of 2015.

6. Update on website Issues:

AD gave a brief summary of the situation. New website created and now operational. Rachel Bright had joined the Executive as Media Officer. Craig Doughty, a PhD student at Keele is the new webmaster and is making progress. IHR web hosting expenses are more modest than feared a year ago at £360.00 per annum. Rachel has been unwell and this understandably slowed progress but Marcus Collins

and Jamie Wood from Uni Lincoln have agreed to maintain the site to make it as attractive and useful as possible.

6. Treasurer's Report.

In the absence of the Treasurer, the Convenor introduced the accounts for 2013-14 financial year. Thanks to Sue Davison for her efforts in securing subscriptions and arrears through the summer. There is now a surplus but this is slightly deceptive as HUK will no longer receive an HEA subvention. Travel expenses of executive members will have to be covered especially if HUK steering Committee is now meeting on occasions outside London. Accordingly, the annual subscription has now been raised to £130 per year. This remains modest but will give greater resources and will allow investment on the website and will help HUK to play a fuller role in national history HE agenda in collaboration with other associations.

6. Secretary's report

Membership

Keith McClay as Co-convenor and Glenn Richardson as Secretary were standing down. At its last meeting the SC accepted nominations to the Executive of

Dr Marcus Collins (Loughborough) (Co-convenor)

Dr Daniel Grey (Plymouth) (Secretary)

The Plenary endorsed these elections:

The following Members of the SC were standing down after a variety of terms:

Dr Richard Allen

Dr Rebecca Rist

Dr Alex Drace-Francis

Dr Di Drummond

Dr Jason Peacey

Dr Christopher Storrs

Dr James McConnel

Mr Simon Lambe as Post grad student representative

Accordingly there are, with these and a number of unfilled places and inactive members, eight vacancies on the Committee:

The following nominations had been received after the Steering Committee meeting of 18 October 2014.

Dr Karin Dannehl (Economic History Society)

Dr Cath Feely (History Lab+)

Dr Heather Shore (Leeds Beckett)

Professor Matthew Hughes (Brunel)

Dr Rachel Lock-Lewis (South Wales)

Professor Maureen Meikle (LeedsTrinity)

Dr Charlotte Alston (Northumbria)

Dr Andrew Roach (Glasgow)

Dr Sara Wolfson (Canterbury Christ Church)

Dr Ariel Hessayon (Goldsmiths)

The eight nominations were accepted by the Plenary Meeting and the nominees were declared elected to the Steering Committee with effect from the first meeting of 2015. There are no current vacancies on the SC.

Dr Paul Corthorn had agreed to act at HUK's representative on the RHistS Education Policy Committee.

AD thanked Keith and Glenn on behalf of the SC for their work over their years as members of HUK and their work on the SC.

7. Any other business

There was no other business.

8. Presentations and discussions

In addition to the business of the Annual Plenary Meeting, there were four presentations.

9. History 2020 at the IHR – Professor Lawrence Goldman (Institute of Historical Research)

Professor Goldman noted that with the centenary of the Institute coming up in 2021, reflecting on its foundation provided an excellent opportunity to take stock of where the Institute is now in relation to academic history, and where it is headed. The inaugural lecture in 1904 of A.F. Pollard, professor of constitutional history at UCL, set out some of the basic themes and principles which eventually led to the foundation of the IHR in 1921. Two sorts of imperialism were foregrounded in this lecture – one was disciplinary, presenting history as the queen of arts and social sciences, and arguing that it needed a proper institutionalisation, and it was time historians came together to build a profession. The second was that an imperial capital like London should be the centre of an historical profession – many examples from British naval history were cited in Pollard's talk to support this idea. Pollard's experiences of working on the *Dictionary of National Biography* led him to make another point – the *DNB* would have been impossible in the late 19th century, as would the sort of work we do as historians now, without the national and local categorisation of archives that happened in the late Victorian period. It has been touched on, but this subject lacks its own special monograph, and the people who wrote the *DNB* in the 1880s were very aware they owed this to the centralisation of archives, and that this was very London-based too. There was a strong sense of the official basis of historical records, and this would form the basis of the profession. Pollard had a strong commitment to research, and the date of his inaugural is significant because Oxford University was suffering at this time a war between professors and tutors that had provoked when Charles Firth, the regius professor of history, accused tutors of being uninterested in research (probably true but not tactful). Pollard's inaugural was also a bleak reflection on that debate and the idea that historians need to research, and that there needs to be a base for them to do so from.

The IHR was a vital locus for historians between the 1920s and 1960s... but Goldman noted that interest/focus/action moved elsewhere after that point. The new universities of the 1960s – Sussex, York, Essex, Kent, Lancaster, UEA, Warwick – their expansion, and a new focus (especially cultural and social history, women's history and intellectual history) moved the centre of gravity away from the IHR if not necessarily from London entirely. The IHR began to look rather antiquated after this point. Part of Goldman's remit as the new Director is thus to try and catch up with other departments around the country. The good news, too, is that if we reflect on the state of the discipline, there are many good news items and good news to think about. Thinking about undergraduates, it is notable that the number of history A-level candidates has remained stable if not actually grown in recent years, it is obviously still a very well respected A-level, applications to read history are buoyant, history degrees are well respected not only in universities but by employers. Some years ago it was thought the media interest in history had peaked and that was the end of it, but instead history has become almost a staple, a theme TV does as a matter of course, and publishers are clearly still publishing history (though we all still complain not the sort of books we write sometimes). There is clearly a market for popular, well presented history that people will enjoy. Goldman doubts that the move to Open Access will dent that particular market, though it will change the ways we think about historical monographs.

So what is the contemporary IHR? What are the challenges it faces? Clearly it is a physical space for holding meetings, but it is also a virtual space which helps hold historians together, not only with news of what we are doing but news of what you are doing, and the Institutes actively wants people to pass them information. The IHR also hosts vital resources such as the Bibliography of British and Irish History, and of course hosts seminars with up to 150 people attending each evening. There are currently more than 50 seminars that meet a year and 2 new groups have recently inquired about becoming affiliated. The IHR is also a centre for training postgraduates. At any one time there are more than 20 Junior Research Fellows attached to the IHR, and it makes for a critical mass of young scholars who meet weekly who use the IHR as a base for their research and indeed for finishing off their doctorates or getting their first publications out. This is one of the best bits of the IHR: that we can refresh the profession with the best young minds. The looking up of references is also germane to what the IHR is about – it does not collect monographs, it is a resource for historians, with a bibliographical focus. When you are planning a research campaign, where the sources are and what you might need to read, this is intended to be a

place to come and plan that campaign, to help people find info and become a base for operations.

The IHR would ideally like to make the IHR a place to collect historians' papers, and although the Institute does have space, at the moment we do not have an archivist or budget to do so. It is hoped that as the centenary comes, the IHR will have the opportunity to build an archive which can be a tribute to its mission over the century and trying to be a centre for the profession. That the IHR is unique makes it precious and special – but also vulnerable, maybe even expendable, because it does not fit into any obvious category or model for funding. That the IHR is like this is both a strength and a weakness. You need to defend those little bits off the beaten track because they add diversity, but funders often think via the media and forget professional organisations. Professor Goldman also noted that the IHR is also not as visible as it should be – academic historians know of it, but it is surprising how little the public does. Visibility is something that must be worked towards. Another factor is the reduction of the Institute's income from public sources – 35 per cent of its income comes from HEFCE, although many universities are now on less than 30 per cent from HEFCE. But the IHR has shrunk in the past generation. The total number of staff is now less than 30, a reduction from over 50 in the 1980s, and an indication of the problem of lacking core funding. The post of IHR librarian cannot be filled for the second year in a row because of funding constraints. The future is to become more independent by fundraising, building endowments etc., and the need for the IHR to shift from building-orientated fundraising to academic posts and programmes. People will give to have their names on buildings but it is harder to do this with jobs.

10. Research Funding and History 2020 – Professor Ann Hughes (Keele)

Drawing on her experiences as former Director of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences at Keele, and serving on the History REF panel, Professor Hughes noted that is a very interesting and difficult time to talk about the research funding environment for history, because it is very complex, perhaps even contradictory, and moreover that this is all about to change. Partly that is because of REF, but more important is next year's general election. It is important to start with moderate optimism: in the current funding arrangements the cash budget for science (in the Germanic sense which includes history) has been a flat cash one. Obviously this is going down and STEM gets more than the humanities, but if one thinks about what it would be in other sectors like archives and local government, or creative industries, these years could have been much worse for research funding. But Professor Hughes believes this

will not continue after the election, or that the REF will bring us money. The REF will reveal that historical research is pretty good, but whether that will lead to money is another matter. Research rated as 2* will not be funded. It is likely that 4* research will be very much focused on the funding, and yet 3* research is still rated as internationally excellent. There may be many departments who have good grades but no money. The 'golden age' for history research funding was thus 2001-8.

As a manager, especially in the humanities and social sciences, the pressure is on to apply for grants. Yet the research councils are under pressure to stop people applying. More money is coming into departments, but the councils simply don't want too many grants. How few people are applying to these is really interesting. There was a time when an applicant to the British Academy had a better than 50 per cent chance of getting a small grant, and likewise had a decent chance at a Leverhulme award. The competition for a £5000 archive grant is now huge – and there were 800 applications last year for a Leverhulme fellowship in humanities and social sciences. It is now much more competitive than even 5 years ago. So this is a major contradiction. The best grant applications are usually the product of planning, long term commitment, established expertise and partnerships in and outside your institutions. But agility, the rapid deadlines and need to respond fast are also key. Deadlines are now frequently just two months from advertising of the awards. There is real tension between planning and responding to unreasonable deadlines. Information and support is crucial here. That makes it much harder for small institutions than larger ones. You need people who point to these deadlines, who help with applications, and internally supportive peer review and banks of exemplars. Smaller institutions will be more generic, but support is really important.

The AHRC has moved to thematic in a massive way – this now accounts for 35 per cent of grants. Only 33 per cent of awards are responsive.^[1] Success rates are now about 1 in 3 over the UK, and the increasing thematic emphasis is worth noting. The other issue that Hughes noted is the increasing stress in the AHRC on closed or semi-closed applications. If you get one grant you are likely to be the only people who can apply for another. 'Sandpits' are now appearing for funding in humanities. There are follow up grants, invited meetings where you get to meet other people who have already got grants. In some of those the success rates are very high because they are closed. Professor Hughes noted that she knew one academic who had got 5 grants through these connected communities – this may be a worrying issue. Small grants then let you into the pool of people who can be allowed to apply for big ones. The AHRC are

raising the bar all the time. Fellowships have now morphed into 'Leadership Fellowships' – you cannot just be doing the work, you have to do something that can count as leadership as well. Each programme for the AHRC last year awarded just 3 large grants: 4 million for each programme.

Few people in History applied to the ESRC. You have to have a strong social science basis for this – it needs to account for half or more of the project, but there may be more opportunities there. The urgency grants might be useful if you can do a fast turnaround. There is also 'transformative research' – smallish grants assessed by peer to peer meetings, where everyone who gets through the first round pitches their project to everyone in the same position. There is more scope for historians in the ESRC, but again, as with the AHRC, not a high success rate. European funding can be very complex and the forms are horrendous. But they are also formulaic, and regional support might be available if you can't get it institutionally. There is scope, especially with Horizon 2020. European research grants with one researcher leading a team is worth looking into, these work at early/mid/senior levels. These are responsive and history has not yet exploited these sufficiently. One possible avenue might be the "societal challenges" which are equivalent to the AHRC, but there are themes historians could indeed fit into. HERA (Humanities in European Research Area) has specific programmes, one at the moment is on uses of the past. European partnerships are complex and not easy, but if you have these then they are worth going for.

Professor Hughes noted that historians need to be enterprising – local charities, lottery funding, constantly on the lookout for things that might be suitable. Applications are going down to research councils, the small grants and ways we get time from work are becoming more and more competitive. There is a lot of pressure on people to apply for grants. Grants are a good thing, if they enable you to do something you want to do and wouldn't otherwise be able to – and they build capacity. A young researcher gets a chance to stay in the career for example. But they are *not* a good thing for applying for just for the sake of it. It needs to be something that you want to do, and for most people it takes time to build up these networks and establish a focus.

We really need to stress the importance of research in the humanities and in history specifically. With the election coming and a funding situation that won't be any better, it is essential to argue the case for history research. Perhaps controversially, we need to remember that most of our funding comes from teaching revenue. A nice result in the REF is good, but won't replace student numbers!! We thus need to argue for the value of our research for students – that being

taught by high quality research active staff is essential for the student experience. This is a hard argument to make, but an important one. That is going to be how most of us support our research from now on.

Professor Hughes (AH) and Professor Goldman (LG) then jointly responded to questions from the audience

Susan-Mary Grant (Newcastle) noted that institutional expertise in getting that EU funding is often less, but if you get it things don't necessarily go to the institution. This then makes things messy for the individual researcher!! How can this work better?

AH: We have had that problem with German research council grants. The unpaid leave that results need to 1) be giving someone a job and 2) leading to high quality outputs. It ought to be in universities' interests to have EU funding, because in terms of a job market or similar these are opportunities for other people and it gets you outputs. Almost nobody who applies is getting grants from the AHRC: eventually institutions will wake up to that.

Daniel Gordon (Edge Hill) asked if there is any evidence that publications based on large grants are higher in quality than self-funded ones?

AH: I think it would be very hard to say that, but from my career experience I don't think there is any evidence individual scholarship is lower quality. What may be true is that for people who cannot get time off from their institution or a grant that good second books are hard to do. I wish I had done this when I wasn't retired, but for many people major projects are evidently a burden and how this gets negotiated is a problem. It is important to thinking again within the context of a department whether everyone should be applying all the time. How many times does a historian want to do this over their career?

Melanie Tebbut (Manchester Metropolitan): What about the HLF?

AH: not much experience of this, though have worked with Staffordshire archives.

MT: We have done this but does it count for REF? Impact, yes, but not sure about anything else. Maybe more a problem in terms of what HLF is willing to fund?

AH: There are different categories, but mostly it is about how much you have that goes through the books for REF, American fellowships don't go through the books for example – but are not to be rejected.

Robert McNamara (Ulster): There seems to be a definite move from small individual pots with the AHRC to big grants. What is the reason for that?

AH: The old matched scheme was fabulous, but the success rate was high and I think they found it hard to justify to government. Big grants make life easier for them – lots of international stuff, greater harmonisation between different RCUKs. Networks are good, but the Doctoral Training Centres and so on show they can make a big PR statement about 'allocating millions of pounds to the North West', for example.

Andrew Roach (Glasgow): To put a colleague's question, what use is the IHR to us in Scotland?

LG: Well, there are a couple of points. Even Scottish historians in Glasgow need to come to London sometimes. We want to act as a base. I wouldn't presume to say we are one of the centres of historical profession, but we want to be supportive and act as a base. Also, if not us – then what? Where does the profession go for coordinating and negotiating our field? While we have not been great about this historically, it is something the IHR would like to do.

Charles Isnley (Manchester): Thanks for the most realistic thing I have heard about research funding in quite a while! Talk to students, and what matters to them is contact hours. They don't really have much appreciation for us *as historians*.

AH: We need to argue against the contact hours issue. It is connected to what we think a history degree to be, not just listening to someone drone on in a room. Most people who are not in research are not good teachers. Explain how we recruit staff – our selection procedures are about communication, but that without research time/support a field of applicants would not be very good. The notion of being taught by people who have actually done it is crucial.

Karin Dannehl (Economic History Society): The training offered by the IHR, what scope is there for new tech and training for people who are NOT PG research students?

LG: This is a really important thing. Although doctoral students are the IHR's main clients, these training courses are open to anyone, though unfortunately they always cost! But there is absolutely no bar on anyone taking them. Please check the website and see what we offer- this is what we really want people to do.

11. History Beyond Universities – Professor Justin Champion (RHUL and President of the Historical Association)

This is a series of reflections in one sense on a centenary: a century of connections beyond university walls. And as incoming president of the HA, I want to stress the investment in serious research activity and importance and the massive range that supports history in schools. An average email through the HA can communicate with 30000 members of the public – a sort of historical militia, which we don't think about enough, to ponder how we might mobilise and connect. There is a profound interest in all sorts of history and collectively we need to engage with this.

I think in one sense reflecting on the almost joint birth of the university and school disciplines of history in the early 20th Century gives us a chance to reflect on those opportunities and challenges. All of the serious academic players in history in the UK were involved in the foundation of the HA. A hundred years ago it was regarded as an opportune moment for thinking about links between schools, universities, and the wider public with regard to history. In one sense, WW1 drove this forward. I think we've forgotten to value that relationship. One of the points I really want to underscore is that the fiction that universities are businesses is wrong – they are charities, and they hold this status because they are meant to serve a public good. One of the problems which faces schools at the moment, not just the ongoing problems relating to Michael Gove's curriculum reforms, or the fact 40 per cent do not need to follow a curriculum at all, is the fact of history specialist training being provided by universities for schools. We need to take this stuff really, really seriously, and not argue that an article for the REF is more important than helping another generation of young people to understand history. So the current changes in teacher training are threatening the future of history teaching in many, many schools. It is severing and compromising the relationship between schools and universities and decimating the specialist knowledge that relationship is supposed to nurture. The HA is publishing a very serious analysis of these challenges, and we may be facing in one sense a crisis. It is complex enough already in some schools for kids from deprived backgrounds to even be allowed to do history because it is regarded as challenging, and we are cutting off our own blood supply if we don't challenge that. That schools want in house training is a fallacy – they have too much work already and don't have the subject expertise. How can we think about creating structures that will create regional training things, to facilitate this in other ways? I am not suggesting we take over training schemes but how can we help provide content. There is also an interest for us as academic historians. A colleague who is able to help a lot of pupils encounter new sorts of history could

potentially count this as impact, if this was properly done and properly monitored.

I want to return to 100 years ago. These great and the good of the HA outlined 5 points:

1. We should pursue collection of info as to existing history teaching at home and abroad.
2. Distribution of info as to methods of teaching and aids to teaching within the membership
3. We need to think about encouraging local centres for discussing questions relating to teaching history
4. Representation of the needs and interests of the study of history
5. Their ambition was to connect with other associations – English, Geographical, the Modern Languages Association, the Classical Association.

All of these are important and have implications for what we can do today. Immediately after the First World War the group reconvened, and there was a real sense of urgency evident from their reports in the wake of the conflict. The principle that having an historical perspective is part of what would make us a more tolerant and diverse community is really essential. So in one sense if we listen to the origins of the HA and what it is trying to say – it is a charity reliant on volunteers from all backgrounds, including academics; that in terms of cultural capital this is one ready to be mobilised – this terrible moment in the history of universities where we have given in to business and funding issues, and those over public good that are made manifest most clearly in Scotland we just ignore. But the combination of the other buzzwords – impact, widening participation – in this sense, there may be a funding stream, something that will benefit the broader historical community.

There is a fierce competition in universities and peoples livelihoods are at stake. But perhaps if we think collectively, and regionally, we can all benefit. What other things can we do? My personal commitment is thinking hard about how to bring in marginal communities – due to gender, race, whatever – into mainstream conversation. This is not just good for them, but good for all of us. And we know out there in the communities, normal people are interested in the historical past, but we often don't connect. I want to leave you with one thought. Next year is the 800th anniversary of Magna Carta, and some of us are now embroiled in preparation and the public history issues around whether this is an opportunity for something more corporate, or a chance to engage young people in what might be important for them. There is currently a project for creating a new Magna Carta by teenagers that will be presented to

the Queen at Runnymede. Parliament has currently invited everyone over 16 to contribute to the question “Do we need a written constitution” – charities, schools, individuals all invited to submit with a deadline of 1 January 2015. This is online but has been little publicised, and shows how ahistorical the thinking about these issues has become. Surely, collectively historians are the best placed to give an historical perspective on this question, not a group of lawyers? The only historian involved in this Select Committee is Tristram Hunt, who has refused to comment on his contribution.

12. The Changing Landscape in History in Schools – Dr Michael Maddison (Ofsted, national lead for History)

My job is to draw together all inspection evidence for Ofsted about history teaching in schools and to disseminate it as much as possible. Some of the issues around ITE and the impact of the curriculum will be raised. I spend much time talking to children in schools and a group of year 5 (8-9 year olds) were recently discussing symbolism in the portraits of Elizabeth 1 – one child announced that gaudy was the same as ‘all chavved up’.

1. Primary and secondary schools through the new curriculum
2. What do we want students at the end of their courses to have experienced in history?
3. Teacher training in history

What about the curriculum? Starting this September 2014, KS1-3, there is a particular statement and aims. Teachers tend to rush to the content, but this is a mistake – the aims are really important. The sentiments behind the statements are what we should be discussing. We might disagree with how these sentiments are expressed, but not with the actual message here.

It is useful for teachers to start using terms like civilisation and empire early. Children are expected to understand historical concepts, historical methodology, and gain an historical perspective. This is actually a big ask for getting young people to be able to do by the age of 14. How this should be assessed is down to the teachers – one impact of this is a huge interest now in primary schools now in how they are supposed to assess history. These aims are also important over and above the specificities of content.

Ages 5 & 6 we are beginning to take these children on a journey, getting a base line built up for them. Children from age 7 to 10 (also a point when teachers will generally be nonspecialists) are moving to chronologically secure understanding, helping them devise their own valid questions. Deepening knowledge and understanding – in the last

couple of years, more primary teachers have turned up to my events than in the entire 8 I have held this post. There are gaps in the actual subject knowledge that needs to be transmitted. I still see six weeks into Year 9 they are sinking Titanic and there are some very invalid inquiries being made. By the age of 14 the students should be able to tackle some quite difficult aspects of our subject.

There's not actually a lot of change in what schools have been asked to do for many years, except for the focus on *comparative perspectives*, which is new. Comparing across periods means that people have to start linking them across timelines. For example, comparing Rosa Parks with Emily Davison; or William Caxton with Tim Berners-Lee. This opens students up to much broader thinking and the ways they go about it. British history pre-1066 is taught in primary schools; British history after 1066 is taught secondary schools. The curriculum thus has a British history spine through it. Please bear in mind there is nothing to say the world history etc elements of the curriculum or British history or similar are required to be of equal weight, this is down to the individual teacher. We want in history to revisit things not to repeat. There is an emphasis on possible change over time – and a requirement of doing some British history which links the before and after 1066 point. The only historical event listed which children HAVE to study is the Holocaust. So if this is the curriculum, what does an inspection throw up for Ofsted? Actually, historical knowledge matters for itself. We have to do much more to strengthen chronological understanding, and discursive writing. The worst example I have seen is 'Can you write a love letter to Henry VIII as Anne Boleyn?' being passed through. From all our evidence, though this is not a message which goes down well in primary schools, is that history does best in primary schools when taught as a discrete discipline. When it gets merged with geography, etc., then knowledge is poor.

There are two key questions especially for trainee teachers: why are we teaching and what are we teaching? What do we want pupils to know at the end that they didn't know at the start?

So what is going on in schools at the present time? The new national curriculum will reach GCSE in 2018, but there are massive overall changes in schools starting from this year and continuing for the next 4 years. Primary school teachers will only get to the end of their first cycle in the summer of 2018. Big criticism of GCSE was formulaic answers allowed teaching to test and demanded students respond in a particular way. There is going to be a massive change with all this from 2016 onwards. They will have to cover medieval, early modern, and modern; at least one British AND one European or wider world

depth study, a period depth study; a particular site in its historic context.

There will be a major reduction in GCSE coursework because of the perceived taint and tendency for parents to help. A-level history will require covering at least 200 years, a minimum 20 per cent of the course must be British history, and 20 per cent is a historical inquiry. What are we aiming for students to have by the end of all this? What is the impact of this teaching? One student when asked why he liked history responded that it had taught him not to accept things at face value.

Schools Direct and Teach First have now replaced the Graduate Teacher Programme. There are 942 places allocated for secondary history in 2015/16 in recognition of the large number of teachers who will be approaching retirement age. HEIs have had their places for next year in secondary history cut by a third. Schools Direct has massively increased – marking a real shift in where teachers are going to be trained in future. The DfE is saying they estimate 326 schools have been allocated teacher training.... but an overall Ofsted excellent rating does not equate with excellent subject specialism. Over 80 per cent of SD entrants are the ONLY trainee in that school! What is the experience for that person going to be like? Is this going to prepare them for teaching across the system? Secondary history at HEIs is very good, but they are not getting the allocations now. Diversity is good, but will we have enough trainees coming through in the next few years with excellent curriculum knowledge who can move between a range of different settings? Will we get quality teachers in disadvantaged settings? The most crucial thing is that children enjoy and enthuse about the subject we enjoy and enthuse about as well.

Professor Champion (JC) and Dr Maddison (MM) then jointly responded to questions from the audience

Andrew Dilley (Aberdeen) Justin – how far does the HA reach out into Wales, Scotland, and NI? Mike – in terms of the English curriculum, how truly British is this?

JC: Haven't got full branch memberships, but there are still ones in Wales and Scotland. The connection with primary and secondary schools across the UK, partially because it is a web resource, but there are even members in the States and Australia.

MM: Each year I meet with counterparts in Scotland, NI, Eire and we pay lip service in England to British history but what pupils end up knowing is when parts of the British Isles were pains to the English and we sorted them out. Beyond that their knowledge is extremely poor, and it is something I have hammered on about for years.

Unidentified Questioner: I am a school governor and the school complains about examination stats – that is the one that people complain and worry about most for GCSE and A-level, that students do worst in that.

MM: Please can everyone be a school governor! But the issue the awarding bodies face is having a suitable number of markers each year- and with the removal of modules this is now packaged into the summer. About 40% have to be recruited each year. In that case, the mark schemes have to be very clear about what is acceptable and what is not – therefore individuals don't necessarily get the reward they sometimes deserve. This has been a concern for some years. Changes that are coming in examination and a need to ensure a different approach – the need to avoid being formulaic- means there needs to be greater flexibility and I am arguing that mark schemes should give people due reward for their ideas.

Stuart Birch (Nottingham Trent University): Inspired by the idea of historical comparison – how would you compare being a teacher 25 years ago with now? What might it be like in 25 years?

MM: I was teaching in the 1980s before the National Curriculum came in and you had to sit down and devise your own. That all changed after the National Curriculum came in. It is interesting that some of the older teachers in the system are this coping a bit better with the changes that are now being introduced. It wasn't all bad then – I look back at the textbooks we had then and the demands that we had for young people literacy and how much we expected them to read, that has been enormous and we are living with the legacy from that now.

Marcus Collins (Loughborough): A question which combines Justin's plea for more involvement in schools and Mike's notation of the isolation of people in the SD programme and problems for those who don't have the support of those on the PGCE course. What can historians do?

JC: We have started to have conversations with schools about what that relationship might look like, and whether one could apply for funding to develop a scheme that might be rolled out across the UK? To really think about these schemes of work and the content – if everyone has to do medieval history, both early career and

established historians might benefit from thinking about how to make their work accessible to school children. Maybe the challenge is shaping the academic knowledge into a form which is transferable and usable in schools? And for resources – original documents and so on.

MM: My strongest feeling about where academics can support teachers is about helping teachers in your local areas know what is the most up to date research about what they are doing in schools. They don't have access to the resources to do this themselves- the Princes Trust has amazing attendance rates for people coming in on Saturdays to hear academics deliver papers on their research.

Daniel Gordon (Edge Hill): You rightly talk about some of the problems with formulaic teaching, but spoke as if instrumentalism was nothing to do with Ofsted? Whereas isn't this at the root of this? A narrow desire for accountability that reduces further and further the space for professionals to do their job.

MM: It is fair to say the inspection pendulum has swung back again away, becoming perhaps more clinical in what it does, but there is a real desire to get in and look at the impact of the teaching, not so much a narrow focus on methods. Ofsted gets blamed for lots of things and I don't want to get into the rights or wrongs of it, but schools spend lots of public money and there needs to be scrutiny

Karin Dannehl (Economic History Society): What about teaching relating to around the world, teaching materials from abroad? One thing our 1st years are really difficult about is talking about history – my experience of school was that 50% of it was talking in class, including at A-level. I haven't immersed myself in the British school system, but my assumption is that there is little assessed participation.

JC: My sense is that the opening decades of the 20th C were more ambitious, and it was the start of professionalization, but we are now reasonably insular in a descriptive sense, and the pedagogy is very much focused on the teaching of history in the UK. The history of ideas is much more mainstream right down the age group in France. My sense of teaching undergraduates means that by the time they are 3rd years they are braver historians, and if we were a bit more ambitious in what we asked of our kids – an 8 year old can understand Magna Carta if it is described in the right way- then we could do more. There may be national characteristics to some of these. My daughter didn't do history and that was because she got told off for translating the German in posters at a good school, as she wouldn't get a mark for it.

Andrew Roach (Glasgow): I went to an impact workshop last month and we were very encouraged to produce things for Scotland, but that England shouldn't be touched because it was so rigid – is this right?

MM: I think it would only be of benefit to have historians from all over the UK contributing for this. The issue for schools of course is where to go on the web for these things – the HA can be of great benefit here.

AD: It would be really helpful if we could be told how to do this – who to contact in departments and so on, we'd be happy to pass on information.

MM: It isn't for me to hold a resource bank. It would make sense for the HA to hold this resource.

JC: We are hoping to improve the website on this.

Robert McNamara (Ulster): In most history curriculums there is a 50/50 balance with coursework and exams. What worries me about the removal of coursework is they will come to university and not be able to do a history essay?

MM: Coursework is retained at A-level and will have count for 20%. Certainly the students whose work I have seen over the last few years has been great.

Daniel Powers (Swansea): I have a question for Mike about figures with teacher training. Am I right in thinking there were only 242 places for training in HEIs?

MM: Schools Direct has to partner up with some sort of institution, although this is a complicated picture.

JC: Stats from July 2014 found an overwhelming lack of appetite for schools based provision – 80 per cent of respondents thought university links were essential.

At the close of the meeting, Andrew Dilley and Marcus Collins thanked the plenary speakers for their contributions on behalf of History UK.

The meeting ended at 4pm
Daniel Grey

Secretary

29 December 2014

[1] Note: Following the meeting Peter Mandler, President of the RHS, corresponded with the AHRC on this matter and the AHRC reaffirmed its commitment to allocating 70% of its funding to through responsive mode grants.