



Advanced Mathematics  
Support Programme

Request to tender for the external evaluation of  
the **Advanced Mathematics Support Programme**,  
managed by MEI working in partnership with Tribal for  
the Department for Education

# Contents

- 1 Introduction ..... 3
  - 1.1 The Requirement ..... 3
  - 1.2 Evaluation overview ..... 3
  - 1.3 Research design and methodologies ..... 4
  - 1.4 Key evaluation questions for 2018-20 ..... 4
  
- 2 Process ..... 7
  - 2.1 Requirements ..... 7
  - 2.2 Tendering process and timescales ..... 8
  - 2.3 Instructions to Bidders ..... 9
  
- 3 Business Background ..... 12
  - 3.1 Mathematics in Education and Industry (MEI) ..... 12
  - 3.2 The Advanced Mathematics Support Programme (AMSP) ..... 12
  
- Annex 1 Areas covered by AMSP Key Performance Indicators 2018-20 ..... 14
- Annex 2 Contents of previous FMSP Evaluation Reports ..... 15

# 1 Introduction

Mathematics in Education and Industry (MEI), as contract holder for the Advanced Mathematics Support Programme (AMSP), funded by the Department for Education (DfE), is seeking to commission an organisation or consortium to manage and oversee delivery of an external evaluation of the AMSP programme for the period from October 2018 until April 2020. This shall be known as the Phase 1 Evaluation of the AMSP.

The principal contact for this tender is:

Dr Stephen Lee, Impact and Evaluation Lead, MEI

Mobile: 07447 444549

Email: [stephen.lee@mei.org.uk](mailto:stephen.lee@mei.org.uk)

The contact address is:

MEI Office, Monckton House, Epsom Centre, White Horse Business Park, Trowbridge, Wiltshire, BA14 0XG

## 1.1 The Requirement

This specification seeks contractors to conduct an external evaluation of the new AMSP. The evaluation will seek to:

- consider how the AMSP is operating at both a national and local level
- inform planning in order to achieve high standards
- measure impact of the AMSP support activities
- assess value for money of the programme
- identify lessons which can be learned for future Departmental programmes

The evaluation will run from October 2018 to April 2020. It is anticipated that the contractor will:

- have substantial experience of evaluation in an educational context, preferably including in mathematics
- ensure that all the personnel involved in direct contact with schools and colleges have relevant Data and Barring Service (DBS) clearance and awareness of Safeguarding
- ensure work undertaken is in line with GDPR requirements

## 1.2 Evaluation overview

The project should provide a robust external evaluation that includes both qualitative and quantitative processes. Tenders should build upon the methodology suggested against the specified key evaluation questions for 2018-20 given in section 1.4. This should fall within the allotted overall project budget.

The contractor will work closely with AMSP staff, who will assist the contractor in their research. In particular, the contractor will be expected to work with a small steering group comprising the Programme Leader and the Impact and Evaluation Lead.

The Phase 1 evaluation will require regular reporting to be made to the AMSP and payment milestones will be tied to these. It is anticipated that interim reports will be short in nature and act as updates on work carried out in the given time period. A comprehensive 'Final report' will be required at the end of the project. Payments will be

scheduled for: October 2018, December 2018, February 2019, June 2019, September 2019, December 2019 and March 2020.

Meetings between the evaluators and the AMSP will be required on a mutually agreed timetable, anticipated to be of the order of four or five across the lifetime of the project. In addition, regular communication is expected via email and telephone calls.

### 1.3 Research design and methodologies

Proposals should consider the best methods and measures for the evaluation and the limitations of any one method or data source. Data collection and analysis plans should reflect the requisite timeframe for the detection and presentation of outcomes.

To aid in production of proposals, suggestions for main sources of evidence, along with possible scheduling dates, are included in the table in section 1.4 on key evaluation questions for 2018-20. Also given are prospective outputs. **Whilst suggestions are provided, the contractor should feel free to utilise their own expertise and give innovative or alternate methods within their proposal to answer the key evaluation questions as they see fit.**

The primary audiences for the evaluation will be the AMSP, to aid in their on-going programme development, and the DfE, to help assess the impact of the programme.

### 1.4 Key evaluation questions for 2018-20

The AMSP already collects evidence to measure progress against Key Performance Indicators (see Annex 1 for outline KPIs). The evaluator will be required to independently validate and comment upon some of the evidence gathered by the AMSP.

The independent evaluation will supplement the internal analysis with further quantitative and qualitative data to provide evidence of project impact. The focus of the external evaluation for 2018-2020 will be on the following AMSP activities:

- (a) The effectiveness and impact of AMSP support in improving provision and increasing participation in level 3 mathematics;
- (b) Support for 16-19 students in the form of tuition for AS/A level Further Mathematics and support for university maths entrance tests;
- (c) Professional Development for A level Mathematics and Further Mathematics
- (d) Support for teaching and learning Core Maths.

The table below details the overarching key evaluation questions, the prospective main source(s) of evidence and timing, and prospective outputs. It also indicates where independent external validation and commentary on internal evidence gathered by the AMSP is needed.

Activity	Key evaluation question	Suggested main source(s) of evidence and timing	Suggested output
Effectiveness and impact of AMSP support	[A1] What aspects of AMSP's national, regional and local support for schools and colleges are most effective at improving level 3 maths provision?	National survey of schools/colleges. An online survey may be the most suitable mechanism, but it would be expected that a hard mailing would be sent to schools inviting participation, in addition to an email contact, to maximize response rate. <b>[May – July 2019]</b>  Feedback from key stakeholders about the AMSP. <b>[April 2019]</b>	Analysis of survey responses from schools and colleges.  Summary document on stakeholder views.
	[A2] What impact has the AMSP had on increasing participation in level 3 mathematics, both overall and for boys and girls respectively?	JCQ national level entry data <b>[available annually in August]</b>  School/college participation data provided by DfE for previous academic year and school census data provided by DfE for current academic year <b>[available annually in January]</b>  Detailed case studies of schools/ colleges that meet different circumstances (within Low Participation Areas, outside of Priority Areas etc.). This could include tracking changes in provision for level 3 maths, engagement with the AMSP, views of senior leaders, student feedback, and analysis of entry and attainment data. <b>[August 2019 – March 2020]</b>	Commentary on national statistics of level 3 maths participation.  Investigation of level 3 maths provision within a selection of schools/colleges, including detailed case studies. <i>[Number to be proposed by evaluator.]</i>
AMSP support for 16-19 students	[B1] Is AMSP tuition for AS/A level Further Maths and its support for university maths entrance tests relevant, effective and of a high standard?	<b>[Evidence collection by AMSP]</b>	Comment/verification/validation of evidence gathered by the AMSP

AMSP Professional Development	[C1] Has AMSP sustained Professional Development increased the capacity in schools/colleges for teaching A level Maths/Further Maths?	Review of professional development programme and numbers of teachers participating. Feedback from participating teachers. <b>[Evidence collection by AMSP]</b>  Case studies of schools/ colleges who have had teachers on sustained PD, views of senior leaders, student feedback, and analysis of entry and attainment data. <b>[October – December 2019]</b>	Commentary on AMSP provision and uptake.  Research investigation of schools/colleges with teachers participating in sustained PD, including production of detailed case studies. <i>[Number to be proposed by evaluator.]</i>
	[C2] How effective are on-demand PD courses, compared with live online PD courses and courses which are delivered face-to-face?	Feedback from participating teachers at the end of courses. <b>[Evidence collection by AMSP]</b>  Interviews with teachers on AMSP PD programmes. <b>[March 2019 onwards]</b>  <i>Note. On-demand PD is a relatively new aspect and so uptake may be low – in the tens of participants, rather than hundreds or thousands as for other delivery mechanisms for PD.</i>	Comment/validation of evidence gathered by the AMSP  Commentary on the relative effectiveness of the different PD programmes offered by the AMSP.
AMSP Core Maths Support	[D1] Does the AMSP Core Maths online platform provide effective support for teaching and learning of Core Maths?	Review of information gathered from the trial of the Platform. <b>[Evidence collection by AMSP]</b>  Interviews with focus groups of teachers and students who have used the online platform <b>[January – March 2020]</b>	Summary and analysis of interviews with focus groups from teachers and their students who have used the online platform.
	[D2] Has AMSP Core Mathematics professional development increased the capacity in schools/colleges for teaching level 3 Core Maths?	Review of Core Maths professional development programme and numbers of teachers participating. Feedback from participating teachers. <b>[Evidence collection by AMSP]</b>	Comment/validation of evidence gathered by the AMSP

## 2 Process

### 2.1 Requirements

Your response to this tender should be presented in a single Word or PDF document that has two parts:

#### **PART 1 – Background Information (No more than 2 pages in length)**

- Please provide a high-level overview of your organisation, its services and its capabilities.

You may wish to include information on areas such as the following:

- Organisation, skills, numbers, locations, points of presence etc.
- Accreditations, standards, awards, capabilities etc., including those related to programme management.
- Major customers, coverage in the UK and abroad, including examples of previous work relevant to this proposal with indicative contract value.

With a very small page limit it is permissible for you to provide links, for example to specific pages on your website, to further evidence points made in this part of the proposal. However, this should not detract from the readability of the proposal.

#### **PART 2 – Evaluation Proposal (No more than 10 pages in length)**

- Please provide your response to the requirements of the evaluation, which should include:
  - **Management Summary** - no more than 1 page, containing a brief account of the proposal, highlighting what you consider to be the most important and salient features of the tender.
  - An outline of your **proposed methodology**, including a timeline for proposed activity and the key milestones.
  - Detail of input or support that is required from the AMSP.
  - **CVs of key staff**. (No more than one page per person which can be supplied as an annex to the 10 page section)
  - **Two customer references** with contact numbers and e-mail addresses that MEI could follow up on (contact would only take place with prior permission from the Bidder, at the appropriate stage of the tendering process).
  - A **breakdown of costs**: total budget including any VAT costs. Please present costs against key activities and milestones but also provide a separate breakdown of day rates used for staff working on the contract and the expected numbers of days.

The indicative budget for this project is of value of **up to £139,000** (inclusive of VAT).

Note. It is highly unlikely that tenders that exceed this amount by any significant amount will be successful due to budgetary restraints of the overall project.

The payment schedule will be assigned within the following limits:  
 Financial year 2018-19: 10/2018 (up to £25k), 12/2018 (up to £25k), 02/2019 (up to £25k)  
 Financial year 2019-20: 06/2019 (up to £16k), 09/2019 (up to £16k), 12/2019 (up to £16k), 03/2020 (up to £16k).

## 2.2 Tendering process and timescales

The table below describes the timeline for the evaluation tender, **including the requirement for Bidders to formally signify their intention to participate in the procurement, by Friday 7<sup>th</sup> September**. This is 7 days ahead of the proposal submission deadline.

Tenders will be reviewed by members of the AMSP's Management Committee and other senior MEI/Tribal staff. DfE representatives will also be involved in the process.

Date	Activity
Week commencing: Monday 20 <sup>th</sup> August 2018	Tender released.
Friday 7 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	12 noon. <b>Final deadline to email and confirm intention to participate</b> in the procurement and to receive email answers to any clarifications submitted.
<b>Friday 14<sup>th</sup> September 2018</b>	<b>12 noon. Deadline for submission of proposal.</b> (An electronic copy is sufficient)
Friday 14 <sup>th</sup> September – Thursday 20 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	Review and evaluation period for submissions. Clarification questions may be sought from the Bidders by MEI during this period if further information is deemed necessary.
Thursday 20 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	MEI may choose to invite some of the Bidders to make a short presentation and discuss their proposal on 20 <sup>th</sup> September 2018. Travel expenses would be provided.
Friday 21 <sup>st</sup> September 2018	<b>MEI will determine the preferred Bidder by 21<sup>st</sup> September 2018.</b> Those that are not selected will be informed by 28 <sup>th</sup> September 2018.
Monday 1 <sup>st</sup> October 2018	It is intended that <b>the contract will start on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2018</b> . The period between 21 <sup>st</sup> September and 1 <sup>st</sup> October 2018 shall be used to finalise the legal contract with the preferred Bidder.

	MEI reserves the right to negotiate terms with any of the unsuccessful Bidders in such circumstances that a contract cannot be agreed with the preferred Bidder.
October 2018	<b>An inception meeting</b> for the project, between MEI and the successful bidder, shall take place as soon as possible once the contract has started on a date determined convenient for both parties.

Any change to the timetable shall be notified as a news item on the MEI website.

## 2.3 Instructions to Bidders

Responses are welcomed from individual organisations or from consortia. In the case of consortium bids, please ensure that your proposal names all consortium members and the lead organisation and is submitted on behalf of all consortium members and offerings.

### LANGUAGE

The proposal, and all correspondence and documents relating to the proposal which are exchanged between the Bidder and MEI shall be written in the English language. Any printed literature furnished by the Bidder which is in another language must be accompanied by an English translation and for the purposes of interpretation of the proposal, the English translation shall prevail.

### FORMAT AND DELIVERY OF SUBMISSION

The deadline for submission is **12 noon** on **14<sup>th</sup> September 2018**. Final submissions should be sent electronically to both [stephen.lee@mei.org.uk](mailto:stephen.lee@mei.org.uk) and [lynn.lloyd@mei.org.uk](mailto:lynn.lloyd@mei.org.uk).

If you wish to submit a hard copy then please send for the attention of Lynn Lloyd at the address on page 2. The outside of the package should be marked with the reference "AMSP evaluation ITT response".

Proposals received after this time will be rejected, unless clear evidence of sending is available (i.e. clear postmark and/or certificate of posting) that show the submission should have reached MEI by the stated deadline. Proposals delivered to a location other than that specified will not constitute a receipt. It is the Bidder's sole responsibility to ensure that proposals are received by the specified time.

MEI accepts no liability for any losses suffered by the Bidder as a result of computer viruses. It is the Bidder's responsibility to ensure that:

- files are free from viruses; MEI may reject a Tender which is submitted in a file or files which are, or which MEI reasonably suspects are, infected with a virus and may also delete such file or files.
- files are complete and fully accessible by MEI and are not corrupted; MEI accepts no liability for corrupted files or data. MEI may reject a proposal that consists of or contains corrupted or inaccessible files.

### CONTACT WITH MEI PROCUREMENT TEAM

Bidders are invited to raise any queries on the terms of this Invitation to Tender (ITT) by no later than 7<sup>th</sup> September 2018. All queries and communications regarding this ITT should be sent to [stephen.lee@mei.org.uk](mailto:stephen.lee@mei.org.uk) and [lynn.lloyd@mei.org.uk](mailto:lynn.lloyd@mei.org.uk) with the email subject line "Clarification AMSP evaluation ITT".

No queries will be responded to via telephone.

Any contact by a Bidder (about this tender) with any MEI staff member other than the above named persons subsequent to ITT release and prior to proposal ranking and selection shall be grounds for disqualification.

#### INDUCEMENTS

Offering an inducement of any kind in relation to obtaining this contact will automatically disqualify your proposal and may constitute a criminal offence.

#### PROPOSAL EXPENSES

Bidders will not be entitled to claim from MEI any costs that are incurred in preparing proposals, whether or not they are successful. The only exception will be the cost of Bidders travel expenses should they be requested to attend an interview on 20<sup>th</sup> September 2018.

#### CONFIDENTIALITY OF PROPOSALS

All documents, specifications and other such information provided to the Bidder by MEI in relation to the ITT shall be treated as confidential.

Such information concerning the ITT shall under no circumstances be disclosed or released by the Bidder to any third party (including but not limited to any company, government, organisation or news agency) without the prior written consent of MEI other than to have a third party prepare a quotation or technical proposal for the Bidder specifically for this ITT. The Bidder should ensure that such third party treats any information disclosed to it concerning the ITT as similarly confidential. Any disclosure, release or handling of information deemed improper by MEI may result in disqualification of the Bidder.

All documents, specifications and other such information provided by the Bidder to MEI in response to the ITT shall be treated as confidential.

#### ADDENDA AND REVISIONS TO THE ITT

For the purpose of addressing clarification questions, MEI will use all reasonable endeavours not to issue further Addenda and Revisions to the ITT Document (although it reserves the right to do so at any time prior to the closing date if it deems necessary). Addenda will be issued to provide new information, interpretation or clarification which might assist the Bidder in preparing its proposal whilst Revisions will be issued to correct any errors or omissions in the ITT Document.

Only written Addenda and Revisions issued officially by MEI shall be considered part of the ITT Document. MEI shall not be bound by and the Bidder shall not rely on any oral statement, answer, clarification or interpretation given by any employee of MEI or any third party.

Bidders must email by the marked deadline date to confirm their intention to submit a proposal in order to directly receive any addenda or clarifications related to the ITT. These would otherwise ordinarily be posted as a news item on the MEI website.

#### VALIDITY OF PROPOSALS

Each Bidder must state the validity of its proposal, i.e. the period during which MEI's acceptance shall become and remain binding, and shall be a minimum of 180 days from posting.

#### MEI'S RIGHTS & ACCEPTANCE OF PROPOSALS

This ITT is merely a request to formulate an offer to MEI to provide the specified Services if you wish to do so. By issuing this invitation MEI is not bound in any way and does not have to accept the lowest proposal or any at all and reserves the right to accept a portion of any proposal unless the Bidder expressly stipulates otherwise in their proposal. MEI may re-issue this ITT; postpone or cancel at any time this ITT process.

#### REJECTION OF PROPOSALS

MEI may, at its sole discretion, reject a proposal for any reason (or for no reason) including, but not limited to, the following:

- If the Bidder includes any terms or conditions unacceptable to MEI.
- If the Bidder includes any offer to conditionally or automatically discount, reduce or modify his proposal.

Failure to comply with the above conditions may disqualify your Proposal.

## 3 Business Background

### 3.1 Mathematics in Education and Industry (MEI)

Mathematics in Education and Industry (MEI) is a registered charity (No 1058911). It is managed by a board of directors and staff. MEI is governed as according to its Memorandum and Articles of Association that also lists MEI's charitable purposes. Since the 1960s, MEI has worked to support mathematics teaching and learning.

MEI offers teachers of all GCSE and A level specifications a range of continuing professional development (CPD) courses, provides specialist tuition for students and works to enhance mathematical skills in the workplace. MEI also pioneers the development of innovative mathematics curricula and resources to support teaching and learning, including extensive online materials to support all major examination syllabuses.

MEI's popular A level specification is administered by OCR, with MEI taking responsibility for the curriculum, and providing course textbooks published by Hodder Education.

### 3.2 The Advanced Mathematics Support Programme (AMSP)

The AMSP began in May 2018. It follows on from the government funded Further Mathematics Support Programme (2009-2018), which followed on from the Further Mathematics Network (both managed by MEI). It will also provide support for Core Maths. The AMSP is managed by MEI in partnership with Tribal; it is funded by the DfE.

The aims of the Advanced Mathematics Support Programme for 2018-20 are to:

- increase participation in AS/A level Further Mathematics, AS/A level Mathematics and Core Maths
- improve the quality of maths teaching
- increase the number of students studying STEM degrees

These aims support the principle that all state-educated students throughout England should be able to access the mathematics education they need to fulfil their aspirations.

The support provided by the AMSP is extensive and includes:

- Sustained Professional Development courses for teachers of AS/A level Mathematics and Further Mathematics
- Professional development for:
  - Core Maths
  - Higher Tier GCSE Mathematics
  - support for university mathematics entrance tests
  - higher level problem solving
  - AS/A level Mathematics and Further Mathematics

- Professional development is provided in a variety of ways, one-day and two-day events, twilight meetings and via online classrooms, in order to provide as much flexibility as possible for teachers to participate
- Resources for teaching AS/A level Further Mathematics and new resources to support the teaching of Core Maths
- Enrichment events and materials for 11-16 students to promote the study of mathematics post-16, including the Year 10 Maths Feast
- Enrichment events and materials for 16-19 students to promote the study of mathematics and other STEM degrees, and to support the development of higher level problem solving skills, including the Senior Team Maths Challenge
- Tuition support for students studying Further Mathematics
- Regular support for students preparing for university mathematics entrance tests

The AMSP works through a regional structure, with Area Coordinators, Regional Leads and National Coordinators. It provides access to resources and organises many teacher and student events.

The outline areas of the Phase 6 of the external FMSP evaluation, along with the contents pages of the Phase 5 (part i and ii) and Phase 4 reports, can be seen in Annex 2. The complete final reports for these and Phase 2 and Phase 3 can be seen on the FMSP website on the Aims and Impact page, see: [www.furthermaths.org.uk/?section=aboutus&page=aims](http://www.furthermaths.org.uk/?section=aboutus&page=aims)

### **Partnership Working**

The AMSP is managed by MEI working in partnership with Tribal.

Tribal employs the existing team for the National Centre for Excellence in the Teaching of Mathematics (NCETM), see: [www.furthermaths.org.uk/ncetm](http://www.furthermaths.org.uk/ncetm). The NCETM facilitates a national provision of Maths Hubs, see: [www.furthermaths.org.uk/maths-hubs](http://www.furthermaths.org.uk/maths-hubs)

## Annex 1

### **Areas covered by AMSP Key Performance Indicators 2018-20**

(to maintain confidentiality we have not listed the 'numbers' required by the KPIs)

A	Engage with schools and colleges in England in particular those in Opportunity Areas, Low-Participation Areas, and who are an AMSP Priority, to improve provision and participation in mathematics A levels and Level 3 Core Maths.
B	Provide further mathematics tuition and support to students.
C	Provide support for higher-level mathematics problem solving and preparation for university mathematics entrance tests.
D	Provide high quality mathematics enrichment events for students.
E	Provide high quality sustained ( $\geq 6$ months) Professional Development courses for A level Mathematics and Further Mathematics.
F	Provide high quality short ( $\geq 1$ day) Professional Development courses for A level Mathematics, Further Mathematics, higher-level problem-solving/university entrance tests, higher-tier GCSE and Level 3 Core Maths.
G	Create an online platform to support teachers for Level 3 Core Maths

## Annex 2

### **Phase 6 of the external FMSP evaluation**

(September 2017 – September 2018)

Evaluation during this phase concerned three distinct aspects:

**Student Support:** Baseline and follow-up surveys of FMSP tutored students and a comparative review of performance of tutored students and the national cohort.

**Teacher support:** Baseline and follow-up surveys of teachers on Sustained FMSP PD courses

**FMSP Support:** Telephone interviews and case studies of level 3 mathematics provision with a small sample of schools

=====

### **Contents of Phase 5 (part ii) of the FMSP Evaluation Report**

(April 2016 – March 2017)

- 1 Introduction and background**
  - 1.1 The Further Mathematics Support Programme (FMSP)
  - 1.2 Security status and the previous evaluation findings
  - 1.3 Current study
- 2 Methodology**
  - 2.1 Secondary analysis of previous data
  - 2.2 Survey of Post-16 centres
    - 2.2.1 Survey Design
    - 2.2.2 Survey Distribution and response rate
    - 2.2.3 Analysis
- 3 Secondary data analysis of change in security status by school characteristics**
- 4 Survey analysis: Centre's involvement with the FMSP**
  - 4.1 Engagement with FMSP
  - 4.2 Responses to open comments on engagement with the FMSP
- 5 Survey analysis: Patterns of entry and expectations**
  - 5.1 Number of A level Mathematics students and Further Maths students
  - 5.2 Increases and decrease in entry and expectations
  - 5.3 Relationship between FMSP involvement and reported change in numbers of Further Mathematics students
  - 5.4 Analysis of open comments on Further Mathematics entries
- 6 Survey analysis: Reasons for students' Further Mathematics choice**
- 7 Survey analysis: Further Mathematics and school capital**
  - 7.1 Mathematics staffing and organisational capital
- 8 Survey analysis: Impact of curriculum and funding changes**
  - 8.1 Responses to open comments regarding funding and curriculum changes
- 9 Implications**
- 10 Conclusion**

=====

## **Contents of Phase 5 of the FMSP Evaluation Report**

(April 2014 – March 2016)

- 1 Introduction**
- 2 A level Mathematics and Further Mathematics in England**
  - 2.1 AS and A level Mathematics and Further Mathematics qualifications in England
  - 2.2 Participation in A level Mathematics and Further Mathematics
  - 2.3 Patterns of participation
- 3 The Further Mathematics Support Programme**
  - 3.1 Overview
  - 3.2 Components of the FMSP programme
  - 3.3 Previous evidence of quality and impact of activities
- 4 Evaluation Methodology**
  - 4.1 Overview
  - 4.2 Design
  - 4.3 The initial FMSP theory of change
  - 4.4 Analysis of participation and engagement in Further Mathematics and FMSP
  - 4.5 Modelling the Further Mathematics landscape
  - 4.6 Qualitative evaluation of the FMSP
  - 4.7 Synthesis of evaluation data
- 5 Security of school participation in Further Mathematics**
  - 5.1 State establishments that offer Further Mathematics
  - 5.2 Developing the Further Mathematics secure construct
  - 5.3 School characteristics and Further Mathematics security
  - 5.4 Change in Further Mathematics security status
- 6 Modelling student participation and attainment in A level Mathematics, Further Mathematics and the FMSP**
  - 6.1 Measuring participation and attainment in A level Mathematics and Further Mathematics
  - 6.2 Modelling participation and attainment
  - 6.3 Modelling FMSP Engagement
  - 6.4 Summary of participation and attainment analyses
- 7 Reviewing participation in the FMSP activity**
  - 7.1 FMSP enrichment activity
  - 7.2 Teacher professional development
  - 7.3 FMSP Tuition
  - 7.4 Registered users
  - 7.5 School level engagement in different components
  - 7.6 Engagement with HEI departments
- 8 School engagement and teacher, and student perspectives on the FMSP**
  - 8.1 School engagement with the FMSP
  - 8.2 FMSP engagement and security status

- 8.3 Teacher views of the FMSP
- 8.4 Student views on FMSP activity
- 8.5 View of the FMSP as a whole
- 9 Engagement with Maths Hubs**
  - 9.1 MSP engagement with Hubs
  - 9.2 Hub and teacher views on priorities
  - 9.3 Enablers and Barriers to engagement with the FMSP by Maths Hubs
- 10 Further Mathematics capital and ecologies**
  - 10.1 Reasons for choosing and not choosing Further mathematics
  - 10.2 Further Mathematics capital
  - 10.3 Further Mathematics ecologies
- 11 Evaluation, priorities and recommendations for the Further Mathematics Support Programme**
- 12 Conclusion**

=====

## **Contents of Phase 4 of the FMSP Evaluation Report**

(September 2012 – March 2014)

- 1 Introduction and background**
  - 1.1 Introduction to this evaluation
  - 1.2 Background information about the FMSP
- 2 Area Coordinators and their perception of the role**
  - 2.1 Background
  - 2.2 Interviews with Area Coordinators
    - 2.3.1 Conclusions
- 3 Developments in FMSP Professional Development**
  - 3.1 Overview of FMSP Professional Development
  - 3.2 The Live Online Professional Development programme
    - 3.2.1 Observations of two sessions
    - 3.2.2 Feedback from teachers
    - 3.2.3 Conclusions
  - 3.3 Sixth Term Examination Paper / Advance Extension Award Professional development for teachers
    - 3.3.1 Observation of an event
    - 3.3.2 Feedback from teachers
    - 3.3.3 Conclusions
  - 3.4 Extension and Enrichment for Key Stage 4 students; Professional development for teachers
    - 3.4.1 Background and enrichment and enhancement events
    - 3.4.2 Observation of an Enrichment and Enhancement event
    - 3.4.3 Feedback from interviews with attendee teachers
    - 3.4.4 Summary of teacher feedback from event exit questionnaires
    - 3.4.5 Extension and Enrichment Conference
    - 3.4.6 Conclusions
- 4 Developments in FMSP Tuition**
  - 4.1 Overview of FMSP Tuition

- 4.2 Live Interactive Lectures for Further Mathematics
  - 4.2.1 Observation of two sessions
  - 4.2.2 Feedback from teachers
  - 4.2.3 Conclusions
- 5 Impact of the Further Mathematics Support Programme**
  - 5.1 Registrations with the FMSP
  - 5.2 Development of Further Mathematics in schools and colleges.
    - 5.2.1 Classification of schools and colleges by take up of Further Mathematics
    - 5.2.2 Survey of teachers
    - 5.2.3 Analysis of the impact of introducing Further Mathematics
    - 5.2.4 Impact from the perspective of the Area Coordinators
    - 5.2.5 Development of Further Mathematics in the Priority Schools
    - 5.2.6 The FMSP and Teaching Schools
    - 5.2.7 Further Mathematics and admission to university
  - 5.3 Stakeholders' views of the FMSP
- 6 Update and feedback on current FMSP services and events**
  - 6.1 The Senior Team Mathematics Challenge, The Year 10 Mathematics Competition
  - 6.2 Statistics and feedback on the take up of professional development
    - 6.2.1 Teaching Advanced Mathematics – The TAM course
    - 6.2.2 Teaching Further Mathematics – The TFM course
    - 6.2.3 Other professional development opportunities
    - 6.2.4 FMSP Associates conference
    - 6.2.5 The Access to Further Mathematics event
  - 6.3 Student tuition
    - 6.3.1 Data on students who received tuition through the FMSP
    - 6.3.2 Feedback from students
    - 6.3.3 Data on student revision sessions
  - 6.4 Data on the take up of Further Mathematics
    - 6.4.1 National data
    - 6.4.2 Change in status of schools and colleges registered with the FMSP
- 7 Conclusions and recommendations**