

1. The proposal for secondary school studies requires pupils to have a clear idea of the path they would like to pursue as early as S3 by suggesting that pupils who, to take one example, may want to take Economics in S6-S7, should also take it also in S4-S5. What measures will be taken to ensure that pupils will be able to take subjects they may not have chosen in S4-S5, if this becomes necessary once they have a clearer idea of the path they would like to take in S6-S7? Keeping in mind that young pupils do not always have enough maturity to make decisions concerning their future, will appropriate safeguards be put in place to avoid that they get misled and oriented towards sectors which may not be the right ones for them?
2. Parents are worried about the fact that the reform will narrow choices and options, particularly in the final cycle leading to the EB. Can the Deputy SG clearly demonstrate that such a narrowing of options is really necessary and that it will really achieve the results it is intended to achieve? Is it not opportune for an independent impact assessment be carried to ensure that irreversible changes are made to a programme of studies which is crucial to the acceptance or otherwise of the EB as an entry qualification into tertiary level education? 3. can you confirm that no science subject will have to be learnt in L3?
3. What has been the response of the relevant boards to the reservations expressed by the Maths inspector and several teachers about the "modular" approach to the teaching of and Maths+ in S4? Shouldn't a syllabus be designed and piloted before any decisions on this matter are taken? What are the advantages for the pupils? (The Maths6 syllabus can't be adapted to become a Maths+ syllabus.) The Report from the Budgetary Committee of 5/6 November says "The pedagogical advantages of such a structure have been indicated.". How exactly have such advantages been indicated, and is any report on the "simulation" which the Report says was carried out available?
4. GENSCI and HUMSCI courses don't seem compatible with the level pupils should attain in S6-S7. Even the careers guidance working group expressed well-founded doubts. Once again, syllabi and practical implementation are still to be developed. Given this vacuum, wouldn't it be better to continue with the 2-period subjects at least in Bio, Geo, His and Philo, at least until a fully-fledged proposal is available for discussion? Moreover, can you please provide us with feedback from teachers on this part of the proposal?
5. While the Cross-Curricular Project (CCP) seems to be an interesting addition to the programme of studies, shouldn't a syllabus be developed before a decision on including this in the programme is taken? Is it really necessary to give this CCP the status of a subject in its own right, in so doing, taking one period away from L1? Couldn't it be developed in the context of other lessons instead, as is done in most member states who have anything of this sort in their programmes of study?
6. Some important combinations (ICT/CHI in the scientific stream, ICT/HIS in the economic stream) may become impossible if the proposal for S6-S7 were to go through. Given that ICT is likely to be an attractive option, and that neither class sizes nor language of instruction is likely to be an issue, could ICT be placed outside the streams so that students can take this option regardless of what stream specialise in? I AGREE!
7. Why are professional and external assessments of such important changes not carried out before being proposed to the Board of Governors, which is not a panel of technicians, but of political representatives? How can these judge the proposal without also being presented with a fair and independent evaluation?
9. Have Universities in different members states been sounded out on whether any aspects of the proposed programme of studies could pose problems for pupils applying for University courses?