"High achievement always takes place within a framework of high expectation"

The Calderstones Curriculum

Philosophy		
Teacher	Teacher 1 (Mr Jones)	Teacher 2 (Mrs Carney)
Unit of Study	Moral Philosophy: Normative Ethical Theories – Utilitarianism (Act and Rule)	Epistemology: Perception – Direct Realism, Indirect Realism and Idealism
Why? What are we trying to achieve?	To build AO1 knowledge of utilitarian ethical theory and AO2 skills analysing and evaluating its strengths and weaknesses as a normative theory, forming reasoned judgements about its plausibility.	To build AO1 knowledge of theories of perception and AO2 skills analysing and evaluating arguments for and against each theory.
Key Content / Knowledge	• Bentham's classical/hedonic utilitarianism: the hedonic calculus and quantitative pleasure. • Mill's utilitarianism: qualitative hedonism and higher/lower pleasures. • Act utilitarianism vs. rule utilitarianism (strong and weak rule utilitarianism). • Psychological hedonism and its role in utilitarian theory. • Preference utilitarianism and its strengths/weaknesses as an alternative formulation.	• Direct realism: naive/common-sense realism and issues (e.g. perceptual variation, illusion, hallucination, time-lag argument). • Indirect realism: representative realism, sense-data, and Locke's primary/secondary quality distinction. • Berkeley's idealism: 'esse est percipi' and arguments against direct/indirect realism. • Issues with idealism (e.g. the role of God, the 'many minds' problem).
Key Language / Vocabulary	Hedonic calculus, Act utilitarianism, Rule utilitarianism, Psychological hedonism, Preference utilitarianism	Direct realism, Indirect realism, Sense-data, Idealism, Primary/secondary qualities, Perceptual variation
Numeracy link	Applying the hedonic calculus to calculate net 'utility' scores for competing actions in ethical dilemmas; interpreting AO1/AO2 mark weightings for essay questions.	Constructing and evaluating truth tables/validity checks for key arguments in the perception debate (e.g. the argument from illusion).

Philosophy

Teacher	Teacher 1 (Mr Jones)	Teacher 2 (Mrs Carney)
Unit of Study	Moral Philosophy: Evaluating Utilitarianism; Introduction to Kantian Deontological Ethics	Epistemology: Definitions of Knowledge – The Tripartite View and Responses to Gettier
Why? What are we trying to achieve?	To consolidate AO2 evaluation of utilitarianism through applied case studies, before building AO1 knowledge of Kantian ethics as a contrasting deontological theory.	To build AO1 knowledge of the tripartite (JTB) definition of knowledge and AO2 skills evaluating responses to the Gettier problem.
Key Content / Knowledge	• Strengths and weaknesses of utilitarianism, including issues calculating utility and predicting consequences. • Applied utilitarianism: using case studies (e.g. eating animals, simulated killing, eugenics) to test the theory. • Introduction to Kantian deontological ethics: duty, the good will, and acting from duty vs. in accordance with duty. • The categorical imperative: the first formulation (universal law).	• The tripartite view of knowledge: justified true belief (JTB) and whether each condition is necessary. • Gettier's counter-examples to the tripartite view. • Responses to Gettier: infallibilism, the 'no false lemmas' condition, reliabilism, virtue epistemology. • Strengths and weaknesses of each response.
Key Language / Vocabulary	Utility, Applied ethics, Deontology, Good will, Categorical imperative, Universalisability	Tripartite view, Justified true belief, Gettier problem, Infallibilism, Reliabilism, Virtue epistemology
Numeracy link	Interpreting statistics/case-study data used in applied ethical debates (e.g. animal welfare, medical ethics) to assess consequences.	Analysing the logical structure/probability of Gettier-style scenarios to assess whether belief counts as 'lucky' true belief.

Philosophy		
Teacher	Teacher 1 (Mr Jones)	Teacher 2 (Mrs Carney)
Unit of Study	Moral Philosophy: Kantian Deontological Ethics – The Second Formulation, Application and Evaluation; Introduction to Virtue Ethics	Epistemology: Reason and Experience – Innatism vs. Empiricism (Leibniz, Locke, Hume)
Why? What are we trying to achieve?	To complete AO1/AO2 work on Kantian ethics through a mock examination and applied case studies, and to begin building AO1 knowledge of virtue ethics as a third normative theory.	To build AO1 knowledge of the innatism vs. empiricism debate and AO2 skills evaluating each position, consolidated through exam-style review questions.
Key Content / Knowledge	• Mock examination covering Utilitarianism and the first formulation of Kantian ethics. • Applied Kantian ethics: using case studies to test the theory; summary and comparison with utilitarianism. • Introduction to virtue ethics: eudaimonia as the ultimate good, and the function argument (ergon).	• Leibniz's arguments for innatism (necessary truths, the 'marble' analogy). • The empiricist response: Locke's tabula rasa and concept empiricism; Hume's Copy Principle. • Criticisms of the empiricist response; review of the Innatism topic through exam-style questions.
Key Language / Vocabulary	Categorical imperative, Hypothetical imperative, Ends in themselves, Eudaimonia, Function argument (ergon)	Innatism, Tabula rasa, Concept empiricism, Copy Principle
Numeracy link	Reviewing mock exam results to calculate percentage marks achieved by AO1 vs. AO2 on the Moral Philosophy paper.	Sequencing key rationalist and empiricist philosophers on a timeline to track the development of the debate.

Philosophy		
Teacher	Teacher 1 (Mr Jones)	Teacher 2 (Mrs Carney)
Unit of Study	Moral Philosophy: Aristotelian Virtue Ethics	Epistemology: Reason and Experience continued – The Intuition and Deduction Thesis
Why? What are we trying to achieve?	To build AO1 knowledge of virtue ethics as a third normative theory and AO2 skills comparing it with utilitarianism and Kantian ethics.	To complete AO1 knowledge of rationalism through Descartes' method and cogito, and AO2 skills evaluating empiricist responses.
Key Content / Knowledge	• Eudaimonia as the ultimate good and the function argument (ergon). • Virtue as a skill: the skill analogy and the acquisition of virtue through habituation. • The doctrine of the mean: virtues as a mean between two vices. • Comparing virtue ethics with utilitarian and Kantian approaches to moral decision-making.	• The intuition and deduction thesis: rationalist claims about a priori knowledge. • Descartes' method of doubt and the cogito ('I think, therefore I am'). • Criticisms of the cogito and of the intuition and deduction thesis. • Empiricist responses (Hume) to rationalist claims about a priori knowledge.
Key Language / Vocabulary	Eudaimonia, Function argument (ergon), Doctrine of the mean, Habituation, Phronesis (practical wisdom)	A priori/a posteriori, Intuition and deduction thesis, Cogito, Method of doubt
Numeracy link	Plotting virtues on a 'mean' scale between excess and deficiency vices to model Aristotle's doctrine visually.	Evaluating the logical validity of the cogito as a deductive argument, step by step.

Philosophy		
Teacher	Teacher 1 (Mr Jones)	Teacher 2 (Mrs Carney)
Unit of Study	Moral Philosophy: Virtue Ethics concluded; Metaethics – Cognitivism, Non-Cognitivism, Naturalism, Intuitionism and the Is-Ought Gap	Epistemology: The Limits of Knowledge – Descartes' Proofs and Responses to Philosophical Scepticism
Why? What are we trying to achieve?	To complete AO1/AO2 evaluation of virtue ethics, then build AO1 knowledge of the core metaethical positions (cognitivism, naturalism, intuitionism) and AO2 skills evaluating the is-ought gap as a challenge to moral naturalism.	To build AO1 knowledge of Descartes' rationalist proofs and empiricist responses to philosophical scepticism, and AO2 skills evaluating their success, completing the Limits of Knowledge topic.
Key Content / Knowledge	• Remaining issues with virtue ethics (e.g. can it give action guidance? circularity in defining virtue). • Introduction to metaethics: the distinction between normative ethics and metaethics; moral realism vs. anti-realism. • Cognitivism vs. non-cognitivism about moral language and judgements. • Moral naturalism (e.g. utilitarian and Kantian naturalist positions) and criticisms. • Intuitionism: Moore's non-naturalism and the open question argument. • The is-ought gap (Hume) and its implications for moral naturalism.	• Descartes' proof of the existence of God and of the external world, and criticisms of both; topic review and exam-question practice. • The Limits of Knowledge: the distinction between philosophical doubt and ordinary doubt; the nature of philosophical scepticism. • Descartes' own response to scepticism and criticisms of it. • Empiricist responses to scepticism (Locke, Hume, Russell, Berkeley).
Key Language / Vocabulary	Metaethics, Moral realism/anti-realism, Cognitivism, Non-cognitivism, Moral naturalism, Open question argument, Is-ought gap	Philosophical scepticism, Cartesian circle, Ordinary vs. philosophical doubt, Empiricist response
Numeracy link		Reviewing mock exam mark data to calculate percentage improvement needed on Epistemology essay questions.

Philosophy		
Teacher	Teacher 1 (Mr Jones)	Teacher 2 (Mrs Carney)
Unit of Study	Moral Philosophy: Moral Anti-Realism – Mackie's Error Theory, Emotivism and Prescriptivism	Epistemology: The Limits of Knowledge concluded – Reliabilism as a Response to Scepticism; Mock Examination
Why? What are we trying to achieve?	To build AO1 knowledge of moral anti-realist positions and AO2 skills evaluating them, consolidated through a mock examination covering the full Moral Philosophy component.	To complete AO1/AO2 work on responses to scepticism and consolidate the full Epistemology component ahead of a mock examination.
Key Content / Knowledge	• Mackie's argument from relativity and argument from queerness against moral realism. • Mackie's error theory: the claim that all moral claims are false. • Ayer's emotivism and Hare's prescriptivism as non-cognitivist theories of moral language. • Issues with moral anti-realism (e.g. the problem of accounting for moral progress and moral disagreement). • Mock examination covering the full Moral Philosophy component.	• Reliabilism as a response to scepticism, and criticisms. • Full topic review and exam-question practice across the Epistemology component. • Mock examination covering the full Epistemology component.
Key Language / Vocabulary	Argument from queerness, Error theory, Emotivism, Prescriptivism, Moral anti-realism	Reliabilism, Scepticism
Numeracy link	Analysing mock exam results to calculate percentage marks achieved by AO across the full Moral Philosophy paper.	Interpreting mock/AP mark data by question type to prioritise any remaining revision across the whole Epistemology component.

Philosophy		
Teacher	Teacher 1 (Mr Jones)	Teacher 2 (Mrs Carney)
Unit of Study	Metaphysics of Mind: Substance Dualism	Metaphysics of God: The Concept and Attributes of God; the Problem of Evil; Teleological Arguments
Why? What are we trying to achieve?	To build AO1 knowledge of Cartesian substance dualism as the starting position for the Philosophy of Mind topic, and AO2 skills evaluating arguments for and against it.	To build AO1 knowledge of the traditional concept of God and the problem of evil, and AO2 skills evaluating theistic responses (theodicies) and the design argument.
Key Content / Knowledge	• Introduction to the mind-body problem and the concept of qualia. • Descartes' substance dualism: mind and body as distinct substances. • The indivisibility argument for substance dualism, and responses to it. • The conceivability argument (Descartes' formulation); the 'masked man' fallacy as a criticism; further responses.	• The concept and attributes of God: omniscience, omnipotence, omnibenevolence; timeless vs. everlasting; arguments for the incoherence of these attributes. • The problem of evil: natural and moral evil; the logical and evidential problems of evil. • Responses to the problem of evil: atheistic responses, alternative theologies, the afterlife defence, the free will defence, the soul-making defence. • Teleological (design) arguments: the argument from analogy (Hume, Aquinas), Paley's design argument, Swinburne's argument from temporal order.
Key Language / Vocabulary	Qualia, Substance dualism, Indivisibility argument, Conceivability argument, Masked man fallacy	Omniscience/omnipotence/omnibenevolence, Problem of evil, Theodicy, Free will defence, Soul-making defence, Teleological argument
Numeracy link	Mapping the logical structure (premises/conclusion) of the indivisibility and conceivability arguments to test their validity.	Comparing the logical structure of deductive (logical problem of evil) vs. inductive (evidential problem of evil) arguments.

Philosophy		
Teacher	Teacher 1 (Mr Jones)	Teacher 2 (Mrs Carney)
Unit of Study	Metaphysics of Mind: Property Dualism – The Zombie Argument and the Knowledge Argument	Metaphysics of God: Cosmological Arguments
Why? What are we trying to achieve?	To build AO1 knowledge of property dualism and its key arguments, and AO2 skills evaluating physicalist responses.	To build AO1 knowledge of cosmological arguments for God's existence and AO2 skills evaluating the objections raised against them.
Key Content / Knowledge	• Property dualism: mental properties as non-physical properties of a physical substance. • The conceivability/zombie argument (Chalmers) for property dualism, and responses to it. • Mock examination covering Dualism (substance and property). • The knowledge argument (Mary's Room) for property dualism, and responses to it (e.g. the ability hypothesis, the acquaintance hypothesis).	• The Kalam cosmological argument (argument from temporal causation). • Aquinas's Three Ways (motion, causation, contingency). • Descartes' cosmological argument and Leibniz's Principle of Sufficient Reason. • Objections: Hume, the Copleston/Russell debate, the fallacy of composition, the impossibility of a necessary being, issues with infinite series.
Key Language / Vocabulary	Property dualism, Zombie argument, Knowledge argument (Mary's Room), Ability hypothesis	Cosmological argument, Kalam, Contingency, Principle of Sufficient Reason, Necessary being
Numeracy link	Evaluating the logical validity of the zombie and knowledge arguments as deductive arguments against physicalism	Comparing inductive vs. deductive forms of cosmological arguments and assessing their logical soundness.

Philosophy		
Teacher	Teacher 1 (Mr Jones)	Teacher 2 (Mrs Carney)
Unit of Study	Metaphysics of Mind: The Problem of Other Minds and Logical Behaviourism	Metaphysics of God: Ontological Arguments and Religious Language
Why? What are we trying to achieve?	To build AO1 knowledge of the problem of other minds and behaviourist responses, and AO2 skills evaluating interactionist dualism.	To build AO1 knowledge of a priori arguments for God's existence and AO2 skills evaluating the cognitive status of religious language.
Key Content / Knowledge	• The problem of other minds: how can we know other minds exist? • Responses to the problem of other minds (e.g. the argument from analogy, the 'best explanation' response). • Ryle's logical/philosophical behaviourism and the 'category mistake'. • Issues with interactionist (substance) dualism, including the problem of causal interaction. • Mock examination covering the Metaphysics of Mind topic studied so far.	• St Anselm's ontological argument and Guanilo's 'perfect island' criticism. • Descartes' ontological argument; empiricist, Kantian and Russellian objections. • Norman Malcolm's reformulated ontological argument. • Religious language: the distinction between cognitivism and non-cognitivism about religious language. • Mock examination covering the Metaphysics of God topic studied so far.
Key Language / Vocabulary	Problem of other minds, Argument from analogy, Category mistake, Interactionist dualism	Ontological argument, A priori argument, Cognitivism/non-cognitivism (religious language)
Numeracy link	Assessing the strength (deductive vs. inductive) of the argument from analogy for other minds; reviewing mock exam performance.	Analysing the logical form of the ontological argument to assess whether 'existence' functions as a predicate; reviewing mock exam performance.

Philosophy		
Teacher	Teacher 1 (Mr Jones)	Teacher 2 (Mrs Carney)
Unit of Study	Metaphysics of Mind: Epiphenomenalism and Philosophical Behaviourism	Metaphysics of God: The Verification Principle, Falsification and Wittgenstein on Religious Language
Why? What are we trying to achieve?	To build AO1 knowledge of further physicalist and dualist positions and AO2 skills evaluating the interaction problem.	To complete AO1 knowledge of debates about the meaningfulness of religious language, and AO2 skills evaluating challenges and responses.
Key Content / Knowledge	• The interaction problem for dualism, and epiphenomenalist dualism as a response. • Issues with epiphenomenalism (e.g. does it make the existence of mental properties redundant?). • Philosophical (logical) behaviourism as a physicalist theory of mind; strengths and weaknesses.	• Ayer's verification principle and its challenge to the meaningfulness of religious/metaphysical language. • Hick's response: eschatological verification, and issues arising from it. • The 'University Debate': Flew's falsification challenge (Wisdom's 'Gardener'), Mitchell's response (the Partisan), Hare's response (bliks). • Wittgenstein's language games as an alternative account of religious language.
Key Language / Vocabulary	Epiphenomenalism, Interaction problem, Philosophical behaviourism	Verification principle, Falsification principle, Eschatological verification, Bliks, Language games
Numeracy link	Comparing the explanatory power of dualist vs. physicalist theories.	Reviewing mock exam mark data across the Metaphysics of God component to calculate percentage improvement needed.

Philosophy		
Teacher	Teacher 1 (Mr Jones)	Teacher 2 (Mrs Carney)
Unit of Study	Metaphysics of Mind concluded: Mind-Brain Type Identity Theory, Eliminative Materialism and Functionalism; A-Level Examinations	Metaphysics of God: Full-Topic Revision; A-Level Examinations
Why? What are we trying to achieve?	To complete AO1/AO2 knowledge of remaining physicalist theories of mind ahead of final revision and the start of A-level examinations.	To consolidate and interleave knowledge across the concept of God, the problem of evil, teleological, cosmological and ontological arguments, and religious language, ahead of the final examinations.
Key Content / Knowledge	• Mind-brain type identity theory and objections (e.g. multiple realisability). • Eliminative materialism: rejecting folk psychology in favour of neuroscience. • Functionalism as a response to the problems facing identity theory and behaviourism. • Final revision and past-paper practice across the full Philosophy of Mind topic; A-level examinations begin.	• Interleaved retrieval practice across all Metaphysics of God content studied across Year 13. • Timed past-paper practice under exam conditions, with mark-scheme analysis. • Final revision and exam-technique review; A-level examinations begin.
Key Language / Vocabulary	Type identity theory, Multiple realisability, Eliminative materialism, Functionalism	Full recap of key terms across the Metaphysics of God topic (see previous half-terms)
Numeracy link		Planning time allocation per mark for essay questions under exam conditions.