



British Philosophical Association

BPA HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS MEETING
Thursday 29th January 2015
Wolfson Room, Senate House

Present: Marije Altorf (St Mary's), Maria Rosa Antognazza (KCL), Sorin Baisu (Keele), Alex Barber (Open University), Alexander Bird (Bristol), Luc Bovens (LSE), Julian Dodd (Manchester), Edward Harcourt (Oxford), Marthe Kerkwijk (BPA), Hallvard Lillehammer (Birkbeck), John Lippitt (Hertfordshire), Fiona Macpherson (Glasgow), Russell Re Manning (Bath Spa), Peter Milne (Stirling), Joe Morrison (QUB, BPA), Matthew Nudds (Warwick), Aaron Ridley (Southampton), Stella Sandford (Kingston), Tanja Staehler (Sussex), Bob Stern (Sheffield, BPA), Jonathan Tallant (Nottingham), Alison Wood (AQA) José Zalabardo (UCL).

Item 1. REF2014

Below is a bullet-point summary from the REF discussion session. There are many more details recorded later in this document, but this summary can perhaps be useful to people needing a quick overview. There were other items on the meeting's agenda, but the REF discussion occupied a large part of the session.

- REF2020 is almost certainly going to happen.
- Impact isn't going to go away, but nor has there been any recent discussion about increasing it to 25% of the overall assessment.
- Metrics (journal rankings, bibliometric data) were not used at all by the philosophy subpanel. There will probably be some moves towards incorporating more metrics (at least in the form of evidence) in the next REF.
 - ▶ The philosophy subpanel found that, once compiled, the results show that there is at best only a weak correlation between where a journal article was published and what score it got.
- Main Panel D gave feedback to HEFCE about the assessment processes:
 - ▶ They have asked HEFCE to revisit the advice/guidelines given about fractional contracts (0.2FTE professorships who can make the same submission as a full time appointment). It was a bigger practice in philosophy than in other subjects in group D. HEFCE will certainly take this seriously.
 - ▶ Double-weighting items and how panels are permitted to score these. In RAE2008, double-weighted items were given 2 separate scores, in REF2014 they were given one. There is talk about enabling panels to give 2 scores again in future, in case a monograph merits one 4* but isn't considered to be worth two 4*s.
 - ▶ There has been talk about reducing the number of required outputs from 4 to 3.
- There is likely to be some movement in future towards including Research Assistants alongside category a/c staff.
- HEFCE will explore some recommendations to change the number of Impact Case Studies required by smaller departments (~ 5 people FTE).

Presentation

Alexander Bird gave a presentation about REF2014 which is available on the BPA website. Below is a summary of things he drew attention to during the presentation, followed by notes from the discussion/Q&A between HoDs and Alexander Bird and Bob Stern.

While there were 40 philosophy submissions compared with 42 in RAE2008, there were more FTE staff submitted in philosophy (nearly 5% more category a/c staff). Nearly every other subject had a drop in numbers of staff, so by this measure **philosophy is growing relative to other subjects**.

Interdisciplinary research in philosophy came out as being just as good as non-interdisciplinary work. Note that not all interdisciplinary work was flagged as such. While this doesn't provide an argument for doing more interdisciplinary work, it does suggest that the fact that a philosophy output is interdisciplinary isn't a reason to be hesitant about including it in a submission.

Outputs

62% were journal articles, 24% were book chapters, and 12% were books. Only one or two 'double weighting' requests were rejected, very few indeed. Around 30 items were cross-referred to other subpanels, more were cross-referred *into* the philosophy subpanel. The panel made no use of bibliometric data, while other panels allowed themselves to be influenced by it. A follow-up study by the panel revealed that **there are only weak correlations between the prestige of a journal/publisher and the output scores awarded**. In general, Top Famous Journals were reasonably good at avoiding 1* publications, but it is by no means the case that everything they publish was ranked 4*, and lots of 4* outputs were published in non-highly ranked journals as well as edited collections.

Environment

The best Environment statements were those which were able to say and substantiate claims along the following lines:

- People (staff): clear commitment to their career development as researchers; clear and effective actions or policies in place to increase equality and diversity; clear and substantial undertakings to support early career & fixed term staff.
- People (PGRs): strategies to support their future careers; including placement data; an account of how they are included / integrated in departmental / research activities;
- Infrastructure: not only statement of grant income, but also giving an account of how it is being put to good use (money well spent).
- Collaboration / contribution: while RAE2008 asked for 'esteem factors' etc., the best statements here were not about not the professional role that individuals have maintained, but rather focused on what the unit is able to achieve as a whole (including internationalisation, collaboration with other institutions).
- Good submissions said something distinctive about their environment rather than repeating platitudes or management verbiage.

Impact

There were many impressive (and diverse) Impact Case Studies (ICSs). It was very important to give good evidence of impact, and it was important that the impact had a basis in research (as opposed to be just being 'in the field of philosophy' generally). Good ICSs were able to make a strong link between the research and the claimed impact: the stronger the link / the more plausible the story, the better. For example, a weak example of how an ICS might have its basis in research would be, say, a philosopher of science who said that their research was relevant to an ICS about a series of 6th form sessions on introductory issues in ethics because both their research and the ICS were 'about philosophy'. (More details on this issue came up in the discussion, below).

'Public engagement' ICSs were rather common; those who decide to make these kinds of submissions should note the previous two points: the need for evidence, and the need for a strong basis in research. The better examples of evidence of 'public engagement' would not just gather numbers of

people present at a public event, but would rather record how the public event influenced or changed people who were present, perhaps by recording repeat attendance at such events (growing ongoing involvement with philosophy) and richer feedback from attendees.

'Impact on HEI teaching' (outside your own institution) ICS are acceptable, but are challenging to score really highly. That is: lots of people write textbooks or articles that show up on lots of reading lists, so a better story needs to be told. Given what kind of work is plausible, feasible and good within our subject, textbooks are relatively easy to achieve, so something more needs to be put together to support ICSs that could be described under this heading.

Impact advice: start early (don't hang around). Do something you believe in (rather than 'have we got to do this for the next REF?', 'shall we reluctantly spend some time in schools for the sake of the REF?'), something that is worthwhile in its own right. Look through the ICSs that were submitted this time, they're all public (and while the scores for each one aren't available, the REF results indicate places which put in some good ones, and it's possible to get a sense of the differences involved), get an idea of the whole range of things that you could submit. Also: don't neglect to collect evidence and record everything that you do - better to cut out from an abundance of data than to have too little to support your case.

The Future

There will probably be a REF2020. HEFCE and other funding councils are planning on that basis. Open Access requirements will certainly be in place, so keep your eyes on the details about those as they come out. Impact assessment is not going to go away. There hasn't been any recent discussion about increasing it to 25% of the overall assessment, but nothing's been said that rules it out. [In the draft consultation for REF2014, Impact was due to be weighted at 25% of the overall assessment, but was argued down to 20%. While there was talk (when it was announced) that it would be moved back up to 25% after 2014, that has not resurfaced in any recent discussions]. It seems many people found it difficult to work with the Impact template, so that might be rethought / redesigned. There are some discussions of its being incorporated into the Environment template (though there has been some whispering about the future of the latter altogether).

Some discussion of metrics (journal rankings, citation counts & more) will probably be raised again, and will probably be dismissed again (there is an abundance of evidence to show that it can't be used either as a proxy or a replacement for the kind of reviewing that the subpanel do). It may be that more explicit data requirements are brought in under Environment and Impact; that is, evidence and data requirements might become more structured (partly to help those smaller UoAs who do not have a lot of support with preparing their submissions).

There may be some greater clarity about the ability to submit Research Assistants in future, whereby some subjects in Arts & Humanities may be permitted for RAs' outputs to be included (even where they're doing 'research on someone else's project'). There may be people who weren't submitted in REF2014 who might be such that they would have been, had this more inclusive line been taken.

There have been discussions about the suggestions / advice for improvements that had come forward during the process, which is being fed back to HEFCE:

- Double-weighting items and how panels are permitted to score these. In RAE2008, double-weighted items were given 2 separate scores, in REF2014 the subpanel were only allowed to give one. They have suggested enabling panels to give 2 scores again in future, in case a monograph merits one 4* but isn't considered to be worth two 4*s.
- Staff on fractional contracts (with particular reference to 0.2 FTE professors) can still submit 4 items. There was a suggestion that funding councils might want to look again at the consequences of this policy and evaluate whether the outcome is in line with the kind of thing that what they wanted. There seems to be room for options in-between permitting such appointments to make a full submission, and preventing their inclusion (examples might include: weighting the outputs of such staff differently; a reduction in the number of outputs that can be submitted by such staff). The goal should not be to exclude such staff members from the REF, since arguably such

appointments are good for internationalisation and internationalisation might be a good thing, such that UoAs should be permitted to pursue it, but rather the goal should be to ensure that it doesn't have a distorting effect on the process

- Number of outputs generally. Under discussion is whether it be possible to conduct REF2020 along similar lines while only requiring three outputs per staff member instead of four.

Q&A

Questions were answered by both Alexander Bird and Bob Stern. Where several lines of questioning concerned the same topic, and where appropriate, those questions and answers have been merged in the following summary.

Q. You talk about ensuring that there is plenty of good evidence for Impact. Is the 'goodness' about the quality of the evidence (lots of detail, lots of angles) or, rather, about the quality of the *effect* that the Impact has, that's at stake?

A. Both, but certainly the goodness of the effect is significant. Anyone can claim that large numbers of people have received their outreach if they've been shouting from a good platform (or for a long time), but it doesn't count for much. If you've a smaller audience but you can show that the work you did with them lead to good discussions, that people kept coming back, that you gathered feedback forms with lots of insightful comments, that it made people buy philosophy books, then you've got evidence that people's intellectual lives were improved or enriched.

Q. You mentioned in passing that there's some suggestion that the number of ICSs required could be subject to change?

A. There will be some recommendations from HEFCE, since concerns were expressed about the whether it is fair on the smallest units (<5) as to whether they can come up with two case studies. However, suggesting that they should submit one (which will then represent 25% of their UoA's submission) might put too much focus on that one case study and the individual responsible for it. The future advice might be that smaller units get to choose between submitting either 1 or 2 Impact Case Studies. There's no strong reason for thinking that the required numbers of ICSs will change anywhere else, this is just about a possible change affecting the very smallest departments.

Q. Could you say something more about junior people / Research Assistants who assist other people, but are not self-assisting.

A. Currently, if you hire three postdocs on a project, their research contribution wouldn't have counted in the REF. The suggestion is that some of these sorts of researchers might be enterable in future. Currently, a lot of research-assistant positions are categorised more like PGRs than, say, postdocs. That is: they could be considered as contributing to a UoA's Environment, but their published outputs were not submissible, since it was thought that they would be simply conducting supplementary research towards the research outputs that are likely to be already listed by Principle Investigators. While this might be the right construal of the model used by STEM subjects (in which RAs are not doing 'original' work over-and-above the 'original' work that went into setting up a project), it is more often the case that RAs in Arts & Humanities subjects are doing original work as well as (and as part of) the research projects that they're Assistants to. So it looks like the situation could change, with no disadvantage to submissions.

Q. Impact statement: there seems to be some misinformation around about the need for a link between Research and Impact. What was the 'evidence' in the statement supposed to show? Are you saying that the statement was supposed to provide evidence that there is a link between published research and Impact?

A. The panel felt that this is a grey area, and so we were liberal about it. But we feel it would be better that, rather than just being liberal in our consideration of the statements that are submitted, it should be clearer in future. The principle that we were pursuing is that cases involving something like ‘philosophy in schools’ shouldn’t just involve an academic reading their paper in *Analysis* to some 6th formers; the reason they’re there is because they’re an expert in X, but at the same time they don’t need to be conveying the details of X. But it shouldn’t go too far the other way either, where anyone of us in the room could give a talk about an introductory subject unconnected to our research but where the ‘relevance’ is just that both involve philosophy. What’s wanted is the kind of cases in which there is some relevant connection. It’s not clear how this will play out for REF2020, but we are trying to provide a steer towards giving better advice. As it is, the experts from philosophy on the assessment panel are certainly going to be better at accepting this kind of stuff and taking a liberal line, but the more that you can show that there’s some interaction, the better. On this note, it’s worth pointing out and emphasising that pedagogical research counts as research, since not all departments or universities seem to acknowledge the point: not only are you thinking about pedagogical issues, about how to teach philosophy, alongside what you’re doing, but we want you to be intellectually engaging the public. Thinking (and publishing) about how best you to do that certainly counts as research.

Q. On that point – engaging the public – which public? Is an impact statement going to be given the same weight whether you’re talking to a government committee or to a school class? Our university is telling us that our impact case studies should be influencing influential people

A. There can be good and bad cases of either kind. The mere fact that you spoke to a room in which a famous or influential person was present doesn’t ensure that it’s a strong case study. Administrators don’t seem to believe that the school-class kind of model is going to be accepted or do as well, which is why we certainly hope that it can continue to be included as possible (if done well), and the plan is to try to get this enshrined in the guidance.

Q. Is there any comparative data about article length (short vs. long) or multiple authors vs. single author papers, and how they fared? People who are being strategic in selecting their outputs might decide on the basis that shorter / longer or single / multiple will fair better.

A. The case of multiple authors was easy – once we were satisfied that both authors had each made significant contributions to the output we ignored the fact that it had multiple authors in our appraisal of its quality. And length – the panel were not influenced by that; it wasn’t that shorter pieces are disadvantaged even though, in principle, a greater number of important things can be said in longer pieces, since the judgement of quality concerns the overall quality of that piece, which is a different thing. Having said that, in general monographs did do well. But that’s probably more because they’re monographs, with the particular features than monographs have, rather than being simply due to their length. We don’t have the data about the relationship between length and quality, and the panel didn’t do any analysis, but even if there’s a correlation, there’s probably no causation.

Q. You say that there is no correlation between the prestige of the journals where articles are published and the quality of the articles, and this non-correlation is worrying, or looks problematic, since it would appear that these bigger journals have more referees, better editorial processes etc.

A. There was a weak correlation, it wasn’t random, but it was not desperately strong. The conclusion seems to be that one shouldn’t read the journal name in order to get idea of the quality of the paper – the correlation was sufficiently weak for it to be no help.

Q. Is it OK to include the same ICSs year after year, if the activity and the impact it has is ongoing?

A. Yes, it is absolutely fine to do that. There is no reason why you shouldn’t use the same set of activities, so long as you’re clear that the impact benefits that you’re claiming happened within the new time period.

Q. You mentioned research outputs getting referred to other assessment panels - how did that happen? Were you requested or instructed to do so by other people? How did you score these outputs?

A. We made our own judgements about whether an output deserved to be considered by another panel or not, often prompted by a request in a unit's submission, but not always. The main reason that things get referred across panels is that it would seem perverse to cross refer an article by one unit but not for another similar article by another unit – that is, where some subjects or topics were already crossing over, but other outputs in the same topics weren't being considered in the same way. As much as possible we aimed for consistency for all of the outputs with the same category of material. The scoring involved: we used our scores, but we were given input/judgement from the other panel to which it had been cross referred; we had to have a comment from the other panel, and we had to come to agreement involving with what they had said. We were able to make some further judgement about such pieces too, for example where we can recognise an output's contribution to philosophy that perhaps the other panel wouldn't be able to spot.

On a slightly related topic about borderline cases, there is an overlap issue which has come up before. There has been an issue when there was work that was either repeating work that was done outside the period, or where two submissions had just too much common ground. In general, the panel were as liberal as possible, but some people seemed to have got it slightly wrong. For example, say the thing being submitted was a book, but that several chapters had appeared verbatim as articles that were either published before the REF period or were submitted as separate outputs to this REF – that's certainly disadvantage, and sometimes the book was only single-weighted as a result. It's a tricky process, in that it can't just be ignored, but we want a clear statement of what is new in such a book.

Q. For REF2014, ICSs could be submitted by institutions even if the primary investigator responsible for them had left or moved. Is there any suggestion that this will change?

A. There's no reason to think that ICSs will become portable, and that it'll remain possible for an ICS to stay with a department even if the person responsible hasn't.

Q. It seems that small departments will always score badly for Environment – without a large number of people, there just aren't enough people to sustain multiple reading-groups, workshops, conferences and so on. Environment seems to be something which rewards busy / active / thronging / populous places. Is there anything going to be done about the way that Environment disadvantages small UoAs?

A. While larger departments can do more and offer a richer environment, it is not inevitable that smaller units must score poorly. The strategy of successful environment statements from smaller departments was often to emphasise specialisation: "we do this one thing and we're incredibly good at it, so our environment for this one thing is better than it could ever be elsewhere." The advice is: if you're small, be strategic about your environment and emphasise how specialised it is.

Q. When we're talking about enhancing graduate career progression, you just said 'placement'. There's a wider move towards being more encouraging and supportive to PGRs in their search for careers outside of academia, but in the context of Environment is it just career placement within the academy that counts?

A. We as a profession need to have a debate about this. There is something slightly special about 'placement', as it says something particularly about research environment. But I would've thought that it would also play well (although we didn't get this much at all from the submissions we received) if you said 'we recognise that not all of our PGRS want academics careers, and this is how

we support them'. That would be a good thing to say, a very good point, and we would have not dismissed it.

Q. We thought that the individual feedback received was a little bit descriptive, that we could have written it ourselves. It wasn't very helpful, it didn't put us in a position to understand what we could do better.

A. The panels were hamstrung about what they can say in those comments, it's largely circumscribed by HEFCE guidelines, which try to prevent there being any negative comments (especially in smaller units, lest individual performances can be identified). There are some kinds of advice that can be given here. Impact submissions have now all been published, and you can compare your ICSs with others - it may seem laborious or longwinded, but it's a good thing to do, and a good way of getting started for the next one, by getting ideas of what kinds of things can count. Likewise for environment. You might find that there are friendly panelists who can give advice, not on the basis of your department's submission (which they won't remember in detail in any case), but because they are still knowledgeable in a general way about how the judgements were arrived at, and they could take a look afresh at, say, your environment statement and let you know what would have/wouldn't have gone across very well.

Q. The more that the REF appears like it's a game to be played (e.g. fractional appointments etc), the more the value of the exercise is diminished. The enormous cost, the huge amount of strategic game playing stuff, the huge amount of pressure from university administration: it all speaks in favour of scrapping the entire process.

A. Here are a couple of last things on this general issue. If we look back over the recent history of academic philosophy, it's more meritocratic than it used to be, and this is very positive. Whether this is directly because of things like the REF, and whether it could be continued without something like the REF, we don't know. But what is certain is that we'd have to think about how to give out public money, and what's also clear is that the research councils are much less transparent than this process has been. For example: the BPA played role in choosing REF panel members, and that's important; the judgement comes from within philosophy.

Item 2. BPA activities

1.

JM brought attention to the BPA's recent paper on the role of Metrics in evaluating research quality. This was written in response to a consultation by HEFCE on the use of metrics in different disciplines. The BPA are aware that many institutions are increasingly keen to use metrics in their internal review processes, of departments and faculty. We hope this resource will help to equip colleagues by providing a clear statement of some of the serious issues about using metrics in evaluating philosophical research. It is publicly available on our website here:

<http://www.bpa.ac.uk/uploads/2014/BPA%20Metrics%20Based%20Research%20Assessment.pdf>

2.

The BPA in collaboration with the APA are nearly ready to publish the results of a survey of over 40 leading philosophy journals. The survey asked editors and publishers to provide data about submission rates, acceptance/rejection rates, review processes (blind / double-blind, number of reviewers per piece, commenting policy), and turnaround times. There were also questions about the gender breakdown for papers submitted / accepted. The survey will be updated annually, and hopefully expand to include more journals.

3.

Heads of Departments were asked whether they would welcome a BPA repository of information about their graduate programmes, in which various details about those programmes (average number

of students enrolled annually, number of faculty in the department, statistics on diversity, areas of specialisation) were compiled. The resource would explicitly not attempt to rank or otherwise promote programmes; it would be intended as a useful tool to which might be interesting to graduate students making decisions about where to apply. A draft version of the survey which will be used to collect the information will be circulated for comments and suggestions.

4.

The BPA is keen to establish a panel that is roughly analogous to the BPA/SWIP working group, but which focusses on the issues faced by minorities in philosophy. The BPA/SWIP group have generated a number of useful policy documents, recommendations and guidelines for people and departments who wish to improve the representation of women in philosophy, and we hope that something similar can get underway in increasing diversity more generally in philosophy. We called upon HoDs present to spread the message more widely, to help to attract people who might be interested in contributing to such a panel. One further suggestion that was raised is for the BPA to contact MAP-UK, and JM is now in touch with them about this issue.

5.

We are keen to increase membership of the BPA among philosophy teachers in schools, and to have someone act as a representative for teachers to be involved with at the BPA executive committee meetings. We welcome suggestions / nominations from HoDs of any suitable teachers they might know of - please make contact with Joe j.morrison@qub.ac.uk about this.

Item 3. AQA's A-level Philosophy

Alison Wood, from the examinations board AQA, gave a brief presentation about their A-level philosophy, which she followed up by asking for philosophers from around the UK to please respond to a couple of requests.

AW's update:

- The new A-level qualification now looks to be as safe as possible at this stage (within AQA's structures for retaining and reviewing qualifications), where previously the qualification was about to be axed. After a substantial overhaul, everything is now in place for a deliverable and gradable qualification for 16-19 year olds in philosophy. Most importantly, it has clear, accurate and reliable grade-boundaries. Chief Examiners have just been appointed, with the assistance of and consultation with the BPA – a huge number of applications for the post were received, and Tom Sorrell and Tom Stoneham helped with interviewing and selecting candidates.
- There was some consternation about the removal of political philosophy from the A-level, and the reduced optionality of the new A-level, but the overhaul was essential in ensuring that there could be an A-level at all. Central to the overhaul was coming up with a (necessarily) small but very well focussed range of modules which can be accurately and reliably delivered and marked.
- Wider reforms are also helping: there had been a concern about overlaps between philosophy and religious studies at A-level, but the new specification for religious studies keeps things separate. An upshot is that some school teachers are saying that it's clear that what they want in their schools is the A-level in philosophy. While the RS A-level has components on some parts of the philosophy of religion and on religious ethics, there's a demand and interest in covering material from the philosophy A-level: secular ethics, philosophy of religion, epistemology and the philosophy of mind.
- Since the rewrite, there has not been a collapse in entries. ~9000 candidates are turning up for the AS exams.
- Michael Lacewing has run several 'prepare to teach' workshop sessions for new teachers who are daunted by the content of the A-level. The BPA have helped to argue for and support this new A-level in many other ways.

Support for the A-level:

- **AW asked HoDs to approach their staff about helping school teachers with subject material / teacher training, and to volunteer to act as mentors to teachers who need support with parts of the A-level that are new to them.** The BPA are happy to take an organising role in this:
 - Departments who are happy to establish working links with schools in their area teaching the new A-level, and to help mentor, encourage or support teachers and their classes, can contact the BPA's Joe Morrison, j.morrison@qub.ac.uk , who is happy to act as a go-between with Alison at AQA to find suitable pairings.
 - The BPA will put together some guidelines or outlines for the envisaged format of resources and materials that philosophers / departments could produce to help support teachers and students (podcasts / video presentations / short introductory articles / discussion pieces)
 - We are happy to generate a list of topics for the content of such resources, and to assign them to philosophers (or departments) who volunteer to make some - by keeping track of who is creating what, we can prevent too much duplication, and also keep a centralised database of resources to share with teachers.
 - We note, in passing, that generating pedagogical resources of the form that AW is requesting can be a useful promotional activity for departments of philosophy (who are generally under pressure to generate more outward-facing introductory content), and can be tied in to an impact case study (see above!).
 - For more information on contributing, or to **express your department's willingness to be involved**, please contact the BPA by emailing Joe Morrison j.morrison@qub.ac.uk
- AW asked for more HE philosophers to get involved in the examination / assessment side of the A-level, by **expressing a willingness to provide academic input to the process, and to act as mentors to the Senior Examinations Team.** Again, please contact the BPA by emailing Joe Morrison to express your willingness.
- AW has asked the BPA to write a letter to Ofqual to explain why philosophy continues to be needed at A level, the suitability of the content and mark-scheme, how it's different from a qualification in critical thinking, and how it's different from RS: a general reassurance that the subject was no longer 'out of control,' but in the care of a highly respected community of professional philosophers.

END OF MEETING

Action points for HoDs

1. We will circulate a draft of the survey we'd like to use for gathering information about PG programmes around the UK. Please provide useful feedback about it!
2. Please spread awareness of the BPA's intention to set up a working-group (analogous to the BPA/SWIP group) to tackle issues which affect diversity in philosophy, and encourage people who might be interested in contributing to such a panel to contact us.
3. Please suggest or nominate school teachers in philosophy who could act as representatives on the BPA executive committee.
4. Please consider (and encourage your departmental members in) developing learning and teaching resources connected with the new A-level in philosophy: podcasts, videos, lesson plans, quizzes, sample papers, exercises sheets, other activities, resources lists. The BPA will make some guidelines, and coordinate some activities, so please get in contact with us.
5. If members of your department are willing to help mentor, encourage or support A-level teachers and their classes, please contact the BPA. Similarly, please consider volunteering to provide academic support to the Senior Examinations Team - again, contact BPA through Joe Morrison.
6. Is your department an institutional member of the BPA? Why not join, and help fund the work we do? Please encourage others to get involved and to become members!