

Response of the LMS Education Committee to the ACME Level 3 Pathways Discussion.

The LMS Education Committee has had a careful look at the ACME Level 3 Pathways Discussion Document. Overall, the committee was positive about the suggestions in the paper, and **agreed that there should be a presumption that mathematics education in some form should be compulsory to the age of 18.**

Members of the committee made several comments on the paper.

- There was a strong feeling within the committee that pupils and their teachers would need **very strong briefing and probably career advice** so that they understood the distinction between each of the pathways and how they might enhance or constrain future choices. The Committee felt that **safeguards would need to be in place** to ensure that pathway 2 was a complement to, and not a replacement for pathway 3. For example, pathway 2 should never be taught unless there was provision in place for pathway 3.
- The Committee felt that different packages of maths education were appropriate, but ideally these should be differently titled, or made explicit on the face of any certification. The pathways as suggested in the ACME paper give credit at the same level for differing amounts of hours per week. The committee felt that it was important to recognise that different pathways should not carry the same credit and be certified accordingly.
- The Committee welcomed the idea of an all encompassing 14-18 structure, and acknowledged that the GCSE played a lesser role in the proposals as set out by ACME.
- The Committee recognised that it was important to consider the needs of the whole cohort of pupils

that thought should be given by ACME to the **target destination**