



Department  
for Education

# **Grants to pilot curriculum programmes in science, history and geography**

**Specification of requirements**

**July 2018**

# Contents

Table of figures	3
Background	4
Reducing unnecessary workload	4
Supporting teachers to deliver the National Curriculum	4
About the curriculum programme pilot grants	6
The curriculum programme pilot	6
Funding and eligibility	7
Monitoring and evaluation	7
The application process	9
Overview	9
Stage 1: Eligibility criteria	13
Stage 2: Minimum requirements	13
Minimum programme requirements	13
Minimum delivery requirements	14
Stages 3 and 4: Assessment of programmes	16
Stage 5: Due diligence	18
Further information	19
Key dates	19
Terms and conditions of grant funding	20
Contact details	20

## Table of figures

Table 1: Overview of the assessment process .....	12
Table 2: Minimum requirements for programmes .....	13
Table 3: Minimum requirements for delivery proposals .....	15
Table 4: Criteria against which the quality of programmes will be assessed .....	18
Table 5: Key dates in the application process.....	19

## Background

1. In January 2018, the Department for Education committed £7.7 million over five years to the Curriculum Fund, to help teachers **deliver the more challenging National Curriculum** introduced in 2014, while **reducing the unnecessary workload burden** associated with curriculum planning and resourcing.

## Reducing unnecessary workload

2. The Department has engaged with school leaders, teachers, publishers and other stakeholders to understand how teachers plan the curriculum for different subjects and use resources such as textbooks. [The Use and Perceptions of Curriculum Resources in Schools research \(July 2018\)](#) reported that the current working culture **continues to result in a significant planning-related workload burden for teachers**.

3. In his first major [speech at the Association of School and College Leaders' conference](#) in March 2018, the Secretary of State for Education highlighted his intention to use the Curriculum Fund to make it easier for schools and teachers to share and access high quality teaching resources.

4. The Department plans to use the Curriculum Fund to build on the principles set out in the [Independent Planning and Resources Review Group report](#) (2016) to improve curriculum planning while reducing unnecessary workload. The principles included the importance of planning a sequence of lessons rather than focusing on individual lesson plans, making use of existing high quality resources such as textbooks, and that fully-resourced schemes of work should be in place for all teachers.

## Supporting teachers to deliver the National Curriculum

5. As part of the last review of the National Curriculum, we benchmarked our curriculum against those of high performing jurisdictions, and found that they set higher expectations<sup>1</sup> without compromising curriculum breadth.<sup>2</sup> The Department therefore reformed the National Curriculum in 2014, and subsequently the GCSE qualifications, so that we set world-class standards across all subjects. With these changes come three

---

<sup>1</sup> Department for Education, Review of the national curriculum in England: what can we learn from the English, mathematics and science curricula of high-performing jurisdictions? (2011)

<sup>2</sup> Department for Education, Review of the national curriculum in England: report on subject breadth in international jurisdictions (2011)

important pedagogic considerations: a 'knowledge-rich' curriculum, whole-class teaching and teacher-led instruction:

- a) **A knowledge-rich curriculum:** ED Hirsch argues that “only a well-rounded, knowledge-specific curriculum can impart needed knowledge to all children and overcome inequality of opportunity.”<sup>3</sup> A knowledge-rich curriculum requires careful consideration of the sequence of knowledge so that it is pedagogically coherent and reflects the specific ideas and language in each discipline being taught. It emphasises knowledge to be remembered and constantly built upon, not merely encountered and fleetingly experienced.
- b) **Whole-class teaching:** Whole-class teaching ensures that each and every child is taught all of the core curriculum content, in contrast to some differentiated teaching that can narrow the curriculum for lower attaining pupils and work against social mobility. Whole-class teaching continues to be successful in achieving both high standards and high equity in jurisdictions in the far east, including the mastery approach in mathematics where all pupils master key content before they move on to more complex material. Mastery teaching approaches appear to be a promising strategy for narrowing the attainment gap, with low attaining pupils gaining one or two more months of additional progress from this strategy than high-attaining students.
- c) **Teacher-led instruction:** Studies have shown that students who have been taught through teacher-led instruction perform at least as well or outperform their peers who were taught using an enquiry-based approach<sup>4</sup>. This is also highlighted in the PISA 2015 study<sup>5</sup>, where researchers found that teacher-led approaches in science were associated strongly with pupil success in contrast with more enquiry-based or 'child-centred' approaches.

6. The Department is therefore committed to using the Curriculum Fund to support the development and sharing of curriculum materials that will not only **reduce unnecessary teacher workload**, but also are **knowledge-rich**, and have **teacher-led instruction** and **whole-class teaching** at their core.

---

<sup>3</sup> Hirsch, ED, *Why Knowledge Matters* (2016)

<sup>4</sup> Kroesbergen, E.H., Van Luit, J.E.H. & Maas, C.J.M., Effectiveness of Explicit and Constructivist Mathematics Instruction for Low-Achieving Students in the Netherlands (2004); and Khlar, D. & Nigam, M., The Equivalence of Learning Paths in Early Science Instruction. (2004)

<sup>5</sup> OECD (2016), *PISA 2015 Results (Volume II): Policies and Practices for Successful Schools*, PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264267510-en>

# About the curriculum programme pilot grants

## The curriculum programme pilot

7. **Complete curriculum programmes** are complete packages of resources that teachers need to deliver a National Curriculum subject across a key stage. They include a long-term plan, with content and knowledge sequenced carefully, as well as all the resources and training required for teachers to deliver individual lessons. Crucially, these curriculum programmes are knowledge-rich, and have teacher-led instruction and whole-class teaching approaches at their core.

8. Some schools have developed complete curriculum programmes, and have noted the positive impacts their use has had on reducing teacher workload and improving pupil outcomes. [John Blake's Policy Exchange report, Completing the Revolution](#) (2018), similarly notes the use of what he terms 'coherent curriculum programmes' and the benefits they can have on improving the quality of teaching and reducing the workload for many teachers.

9. The Department for Education wants to build on this evidence base, to understand the benefits that these programmes have in more detail, and how they can be effectively shared and implemented between schools. The curriculum programme pilot will therefore fund schools to work with other schools to test and refine their existing curriculum programmes, and will look to gather evidence on:

- a) How using the programmes can improve the pupil outcomes and reduce teacher workload;
- b) The frameworks or specifications for programmes that allow for the greatest benefits to pupil outcomes and teacher workload;
- c) How the programmes are shared or implemented effectively in a wide range of schools, including the level of high quality training and guidance required to ensure teachers are empowered to deliver the programmes effectively.

10. Schools may pilot more than one programme in different subjects and/or key stages, and we will fund this testing for two consecutive terms. We anticipate that the majority of pilots will begin this testing in January 2019.

11. In addition to this testing, the curriculum programme pilot will require schools to gather feedback from teachers and schools to inform the refinement and improvement of their existing complete curriculum programmes.

## Funding and eligibility

12. Up to £2.4 million is available for a small number of these pilots to take place in academic year 2018/19. A maximum of £150,000 of funding will be awarded to pilot one programme, and up to £100,000 will be awarded for each additional programme tested by the same school. This is based on the expectation that successful applicants may incur the costs equivalent to two full-time members of staff to test and refine the programmes. Funding will be released on the delivery of key milestones, to be set out in the grant agreement with successful applicants.

13. To be eligible to apply the applicant must:

- Have been rated as good or outstanding for overall effectiveness in their most recent Ofsted Inspection;
- Not be below the national average in the relevant data listed below, as published in 2017, or can provide sufficient explanation and reassurance that these measures will be improved to at least the national average in the next two years. Note that provisional 2018 data may be considered as it becomes available as part of this explanation and reassurance.
  - Pupils meeting the expected standard in reading, writing and maths (primary);
  - Pupils meeting the expected standard in the Phonics Screening Check (primary);
  - Achieving EBacc at grade 5/C or above (secondary);
  - Entering EBacc (secondary).

14. If a school is applying with partner schools as part of an alliance, including applications involving a multi-academy trust, local authority or relevant religious authorities with a role in school improvement, a lead school must be nominated to lead the delivery of the project. This school must meet the eligibility criteria described in paragraph 13.

15. Applications are limited to one per school and partners, although two or more programmes can be submitted as part of a single application.

## Monitoring and evaluation

16. Grant recipients will nominate a named individual to act as the main point of contact with the Department. This individual will be required to be in regular contact with the Department's grant manager. Grant recipients will need to provide:

- Regular updates and will attend regular meetings to report on progress against the overall programme objectives. Additional detailed reports may be requested to outline future project activity.
- Management information to meet the needs of the Department. This will be subject to further negotiation, but may include monthly written progress reports; monthly financial expenditure reports outlining expenditure against income/invoices; and regular meetings with the department to set and review key performance indicators (KPIs).

17. The Department is currently assessing options for appointing an independent evaluator. Grant recipients will be expected to participate in evaluation activity, including any final reporting that may take place after the grant funding has ceased, to feed into final reporting.



# The application process

## Overview

18. Applications will need to provide evidence to show how their **curriculum programmes** are knowledge-rich, and support whole-class teaching and teacher-led instruction in line with paragraph 5 of this guidance; and also how their **delivery** proposals will allow for these programmes to be implemented, tested and refined effectively. Schools may submit more than one programme in their application; in these cases each programme will be considered separately.

19. Applications will be assessed in four stages. Stage 1 will assess the lead school's eligibility to apply. Stage 2 will assess whether the applicant's programme and delivery proposals have met the minimum requirements listed in tables 2 and 3 respectively. Stage 3 will assess the content and quality of the programmes by examining sample materials and accompanying explanations. Stage 4 requires applicants to submit their complete programmes for assessment by an expert panel and an interview. Stage 5 includes standard due diligence.

20. While Stages 1 and 2 assess applications to ensure that they have the minimum content and requirements to be successful (for example, that they contain assessment materials, and demonstrate the pedagogies described in paragraph 5), Stages 3 and 4 assess the quality of these requirements (for example, how well the assessment materials support progression).

21. Further information on this assessment process is provided in table 1 below.

Stage	Outcome	Assessment	Scoring
<p><b>Stage 1:</b> Check for eligibility</p>	<p>Pass / Fail</p>	<p>Each lead school will be assessed to ensure that they have been rated good or outstanding in overall effectiveness in its latest Ofsted inspection. If they have not been, the application will not be taken forward.</p> <p>Each school will also be assessed to ensure that they are not below the national average in the relevant published data listed in paragraph 13. If a lead school is below the national average for any measure, they must provide a clear explanation as to how performance will be improved to at least the national average in the next two years. This will be judged in the round as pass or fail, and applications that fail will not be taken forward.</p>	<p>In terms of the relevant published data, an application will <b>pass</b> if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All applicable measures are greater than or equal to the national average; <b>or</b></li> <li>- Not all applicable measures are greater than or equal to the national average, but sufficient evidence and reassurance has been provided to explain how the measures will be improved to at least the national average in the next two years.</li> </ul> <p>An application will <b>fail</b> if it is below the national average in any of the applicable measures, and there is insufficient evidence has been provided to show how this will be improved in the next two years.</p>
<p><b>Stage 2:</b> Check that minimum requirements are met for programmes and delivery proposals</p>	<p>Pass / Fail</p>	<p>Each <b>programme</b> and <b>delivery</b> will be judged as pass or fail in meeting the respective minimum requirements listed in the guidance in tables 2 and 3.</p> <p>An application will be taken forward if it <b>passes all delivery requirements</b>, and at least one of the programmes within the application <b>passes all programme requirements</b>. Only programmes that pass all minimum requirements will be considered in stage 3.</p> <p>If 30 or fewer applications are successful stage 2, we reserve the</p>	<p>Each requirement detailed in tables 2 and 3 will be judged to pass or fail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Pass:</b> Good evidence has been provided to demonstrate how the application meets the minimum requirement, though there may be some minor omissions.</li> <li>- <b>Fail:</b> Insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate how the programme meets the</li> </ul>

		right to remove stage 3 and take these applications straight to stage 4.	minimum requirement.
<b>Stage 3:</b> Initial programme scoring	Total score out of 24	<p>Each <b>programme</b> will be judged 0-3 according to <u>how well</u> the evidence the applicant provides demonstrates each of the programme criteria detailed in table 4.</p> <p>Programmes need to score a <b>minimum of 2</b> in each programme criterion to be considered in stage 4.</p> <p>Scores will be given out of 3 for each criterion. The score for criteria A and B will be doubled so that the maximum scores for each criteria will be:</p> <p>A: 6 B: 6 C: 3 D: 3 E: 3 F: 3</p> <p>If we assess more than 30 programmes to pass this minimum threshold, we will take the 30 highest scoring programmes, aiming where possible to achieve an even spread across both key stages 2 and 3, and science and the humanities (history and geography), to stage 4.</p>	<p>Each answer will be scored 0-3 against the extent to which it meets each of the programme criterion detailed in table 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 0: No evidence has been provided, or the evidence does not address the specific criterion.</li> <li>- 1: Although evidence has been provided, it does not meet the criterion and overall the examples and/or evidence is limited or weak.</li> <li>- 2: Good evidence has been provided against the criterion, but there are minor omissions or there is insufficient clarity in places.</li> <li>- 3: There is strong evidence that every element of the criterion has been met and the evidence is clear and comprehensive.</li> </ul>
<b>Stage 4:</b> A panel with independent experts scores evidence	Score out of 24	<p>If the application and programme(s) are successful and taken to stage 4, we will ask applicants to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. submit any successful programme(s) in their entirety; and</li> </ol>	Programmes will be scored for each programme criterion using the 0-3 descriptors above.

provided by complete programmes and interview applicants		<p>2. prepare for an interview or discussion to support their programme.</p> <p>Evidence from both the complete programme and the interview will be used to score each programme 0-3 against each of the criterion used in stage 3, detailed in table 4. The panel may also view the application and any scoring completed in earlier stages.</p> <p>The panel will compile a ranked list of the highest scoring programmes, ensuring balance across key stages and both science and humanities, and will make their recommendations for grant funding based on these ranked lists.</p> <p>We plan to request the full submission of applicants' programmes in early October 2018, and interviews will take place soon after.</p>	
<b>Stage 5:</b> Due diligence	Pass / fail	We reserve the right to undertake financial viability checks, and may contact Regional Schools Commissioners, local authorities, Ofsted, the Education and Skills Funding Agency and the Teaching Regulation Agency to do so.	

**Please note:**

**Schools will be informed if their applications and programmes will be taken to stage 4 or not.**

**Schools will be informed if they have been successful at stage 5. Written feedback will be provided for all applications.**

**Table 1: Overview of the assessment process**

## Stage 1: Eligibility criteria

22. Stage 1 requires applicants to demonstrate that the lead school meets the minimum eligibility criteria described in paragraph 13.

## Stage 2: Minimum requirements

23. Curriculum Programmes will need to meet a set of minimum requirements for stage 2. Applications that do not meet the minimum requirements will not be considered beyond the stage 2 of the assessment process. These minimum requirements include **programme** and **delivery** requirements, noted in tables 2 and 3 respectively.

### Minimum programme requirements

Table 2: Minimum requirements for programmes
A. Programmes must be consistent with the stated aims of <a href="#">the national curriculum</a> , as given within each subject specific programme of study.
B. Programmes must contain the resources given below or be on track to contain them by the programme start date: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• An overview showing the curriculum content and how it is sequenced over the key stage, sometimes called a scheme of work.</li><li>• Medium term plans, which, may take the form of a more detailed curriculum content organised into a unit or topic to be taught over a period of time (e.g. term or year).</li><li>• Individual lesson materials which may take the form of a printed textbook, printed workbook, digital materials, presentation materials or lesson plans.</li><li>• Guidance and/or training for teachers, which may take the form of teacher guides, online guides and videos, or training materials and face-to-face sessions.</li><li>• Assessment materials, which may take the form of diagnostic tools, exemplar pupil work, approaches to questioning during lessons and summative tests.</li></ul>
C. Science programmes at Key Stage 3 must be structured into the disciplines of biology, chemistry and physics.
D. Programmes must be <b>knowledge-rich</b> , and have <b>whole-class teaching</b> and <b>teacher-led instruction</b> , as described in paragraph 5, at their core.

Table 2: Minimum requirements for programmes

## Minimum delivery requirements

<b>Table 3. Minimum requirements for delivery proposal</b>
<p><b>A. The objectives are clear and measurable</b> and reflect the aims of the pilot, which are to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Gather evidence on<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• How using the programmes can improve pupil outcomes and reduce teacher workload;</li><li>• The frameworks or specifications for programmes that allow for the greatest benefits to pupil outcomes and teacher workload; and</li><li>• How the programmes are shared or implemented effectively in a wide range of schools, including the level of high quality training and guidance required to ensure teachers can deliver the programmes effectively.</li></ul></li><li>2. Refine and improve the quality of applicants' existing programmes, informed by teacher and school feedback.</li></ol>
<p><b>B. The proposal demonstrates capacity to deliver</b> on the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a well-developed delivery plan with clear identification of tasks and timescales required to deliver successfully.</li><li>• There is an approach to identifying risks to delivery and mitigation strategies.</li><li>• The proposal sets out robust leadership and good quality governance.</li><li>• The proposal is realistic and achievable within the available time and funding.</li><li>• The plan makes clear that the applicant, if successful, will work with the Department for Education to collect management information, and to identify, collect and share the data required to evaluate the pilot's objectives. Applicants are not required to identify the data they will collect at this stage.</li></ul>
<p><b>C. There is a clear plan for selecting and recruiting schools</b> to participate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Applicants' plans will show how they will select and recruit at least 6 schools to participate in the pilot and, if applicable, how they will take into account of the capacity of each school to pilot more than one programme.</li><li>• The process will ensure that a range of school types are selected:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ At least a third of the participating primary schools, and at least a quarter of the participating secondary schools must have at least 40% of its pupils registered as eligible for free school meals (FSM) at any point in the last 6 years.</li><li>○ One of the participating schools must have been rated as Requires Improvement in its most recent Ofsted inspection.</li></ul></li></ul>

<b>Table 3. Minimum requirements for delivery proposal</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If a school is leading an application for a multi-academy trust, more than half of the participating schools must be outside the multi-academy trust.</li> <li>● The participating schools must not have used or been involved with the production of programmes before the pilot.</li> </ul>
<p><b>D. There is a well-developed plan to <b>implement and refine the programmes</b>:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There is a clear methodology for introducing the programme(s) into schools, and considerations have been made for the time and costs incurred to applicants' and to the participating schools for the appropriate training for teachers.</li> <li>● There is a clear strategy to engage and support teachers and school leaders, and generate enthusiasm for the programmes.</li> <li>● There is a systematic approach to how feedback from headteachers, teachers and other staff in applicants' schools and participating schools will be sought, and how this will feed into the refinement and improvement of programmes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>E. The proposal demonstrates <b>value for money</b>:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There is a convincing breakdown of costs to the value of the bid, including the number of programmes applicants will pilot, and the number of schools and teachers they anticipate participating.</li> <li>● The proposals sets out how costs have been kept to a minimum.</li> <li>● There is no overlap between this project and another department-funded project that applicants' deliver.</li> </ul>
<p><b>F. There are clear <b>contingency plans</b> which consider how applicants will deliver if only some of their programmes are successful:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There is a clear explanation for how the proposals will be amended if only a proportion of programmes submitted are successful, including the differences required to each requirement A-F listed above.</li> <li>● This strategy covers all possible outcomes of the application process.</li> </ul>

**Table 3: Minimum requirements for delivery proposals**

## Stages 3 and 4: Assessment of programmes

24. If the application and programmes have been assessed and judged to meet the minimum requirements listed above, programmes will be further assessed against the programme criteria below. While the minimum requirements focused on the content, this assessment will seek to judge the **quality** of the programmes, and how well each of the programmes meet the criterion below. For example, where the minimum requirements stipulate that schools must include assessment materials, this assessment will judge how well these assessment materials support progression. The quality of the programmes will be assessed against the six criteria below. This includes the extent to which programmes are knowledge-rich and have teacher-led instruction and whole-class teaching at its core.

25. Applications needs to provide both an explanation of how the programmes meet each of the six criteria below, and sample materials from applicants' programmes to provide further evidence. Applicants' responses and the sample materials will be assessed against the six criteria. Criteria A and B will be given twice the weighting of the other programme criteria during the assessment process.

26. The programme criteria against which each programme will be assessed are detailed in table 4 below.



<b>Table 4. Criteria against which the quality of programmes will be assessed</b>
<p><b>A. The programme is <b>coherent</b>:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The content of long term and medium term plans is sequenced to build on prior knowledge and ensure progression across a concept and from one unit of work to another.</li> <li>• There is a clear pedagogic rationale behind the sequence chosen and this aligns with the aims of the Curriculum Fund as set out in paragraph 5.</li> </ul>
<p><b>B. The content is <b>knowledge-rich</b>:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The content is rooted in the discipline of the academic subject; materials provide opportunities for retention, subject-appropriate application and re-use of knowledge.</li> <li>• Specialist vocabulary appropriate to the level being studied is used with precision.</li> <li>• Images and diagrams are relevant, accurate and support understanding.</li> <li>• Key teaching points has been reviewed against research evidence.</li> </ul>
<p><b>C. The programme includes <b>training or guidance</b> for teachers, which can:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the effective use of resources in line with the intended approach.</li> <li>• Enhance teacher subject knowledge.</li> <li>• Improve the quality of teaching.</li> </ul>
<p><b>D. <b>Assessment materials</b> support progression, so that:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formative assessment materials assess prior knowledge and acquisition of knowledge during teaching.</li> <li>• Content addresses common misconceptions.</li> <li>• Summative assessment materials are a reliable measure of a pupil's progress and their retention of knowledge.</li> </ul>
<p><b>E. The intended use of the materials drives the <b>presentation and structure</b>:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The format and design of the materials used in lessons is well matched to the content, enhances understanding and supports good teaching</li> <li>• The format and design of the curriculum overview materials including medium and long term planning supports the programme's coherence.</li> </ul>

**F. The programme is versatile:**

- There is content that can be used with pupils across the ability range, including approaches, which ensure the engagement of higher attaining pupils, and approaches for supporting pupils with SEND and EAL, whilst still placing the emphasis on **whole-class teaching, teacher-led instruction** and the entitlement of all pupils to see the most demanding materials.
- Individual lesson materials are adaptable at the same time as maintaining fidelity to the programme approach
- ..

**Table 4: Criteria against which the quality of programmes will be assessed**

## **Stage 5: Due diligence**

27. Due diligence checks will be carried out as detailed in table 1.

## Further information

28. Please submit application forms alongside an appendix with sample materials from programmes (a maximum of 18 pages per programme). These sample materials should be annotated and referenced in responses in the application. Applications that do not submit sample materials will not be considered. A limit on the number of words is stated for each section in the text box provided, any text that exceeds the stated limit will not be assessed. Please include the total number of words for each section at the bottom of each box.

29. If the application includes more than one programme, applicants will need to complete sections 2.1 and 3.1 for each programme submitted. Please note that applicants will need to add additional rows if submitting more than 3 programmes. If an application reaches stage 4 in the application process, applicants will need to submit their entire curriculum programme, and attend an interview in early October.

30. Please email a single Word or pdf version of the completed application form to [curriculumfund.application@education.gov.uk](mailto:curriculumfund.application@education.gov.uk) by 11:45pm on Monday 17 September 2018. The words 'Curriculum programme pilot application' followed by the organisation name of the lead bidder should be included in the email 'subject' field when submitting the application.

### Key dates

31. The bidding round opened on Thursday 26 July and will close at 11:45pm on Monday 17 September 2018, giving applicants eight weeks to develop their applications. Key dates and deadlines for the application process are set out in the table 5 below.

Milestones	Dates
Bidding round opens	Thursday 26 July 2018
Pre-application webinars	Various dates in August/September 2018
Bidding round closes	Monday 17 September 2018
Assessment of applications	September – October 2018
DfE may contact prospective bidders for clarification and all programme materials.	Early October 2018
Outcomes announced	Early November 2018
Programme start	From January 2019
Programme ends	No earlier than August 2019

**Table 5: Key dates in the application process**

32. The Department is hosting webinar(s), including a Q&A session in August and September, for interested organisations to learn more about the grant. Please register interest for pre-application webinars by emailing [curriculum.fund@education.gov.uk](mailto:curriculum.fund@education.gov.uk).

## Terms and conditions of grant funding

33. The bid is not an agreement or grant. Meeting the selection criteria does not guarantee funding. Funding is limited and applications will be assessed and prioritised according to the extent to which they meet the selection criteria. Only high quality applications are likely to be considered for funding.

34. The department reserves the right to apply its discretion to the amount of funding that is to be awarded to the successful applicant. This may be in full accordance with the applicant's proposal. However, if the department deems that only part of the proposal is acceptable, in terms of the stated deliverables, then it reserves the right to award funding on that basis.

35. Applicants will not be entitled to claim from the department any costs or expenses, which they may incur in preparing their bid, whether or not the bid is successful.

36. The DfE reserves the right to reject all or any bids received and cancel the grant competition without assigning any reasons. Should the DfE decide to abandon this competition, the bidders are not entitled to claim from the DfE any costs or expenses which may be incurred in the preparation of their application.

37. Before submitting an application, please read and understand the [Department for Education grant funding agreement terms and conditions](#). In applying for the pilot grant, applicants will be agreeing to the Department for Education grant funding agreement terms and conditions.

38. In the event of an application being successful, the applicant will be required to sign a grant offer letter. This will set out the specific grant conditions, monitoring arrangements and payment details.

## Contact details

39. If applicants have any queries, they should contact the Department at [curriculum.fund@education.gov.uk](mailto:curriculum.fund@education.gov.uk) prior to submitting an application form. Pre-bid negotiations are not allowed.

40. We will endeavour to respond to all queries via the above mailbox within 2 working days.



Department  
for Education

© Crown copyright 2018

This publication (not including logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit [www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3)

email [psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk)

write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries [www.education.gov.uk/contactus](http://www.education.gov.uk/contactus)

download [www.gov.uk/government/publications](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications)

Reference: DFE-00229-2018



Follow us on Twitter:  
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:  
[facebook.com/educationgovuk](https://facebook.com/educationgovuk)