



University
of Glasgow

CURRICULUM FOR EXCELLENCE
DRAFT EXPERIENCES AND OUTCOMES

Collection, analysis and reporting of data

Interim Report

August 2008

The research team/acknowledgements

The University of Glasgow research team responsible for producing this report consists of:

Co-directors:

Prof Vivienne Baumfield
Prof Ian Menter

Co-ordinator:

Dr Moira Hulme

Data manager:

Dr Alison Devlin

SCRE Centre Researchers:

Dr Julia Davidson
Dr Dely Elliot
Dr John Hall
Stuart Hall
Kevin Lowden

Contact:

i.menter@educ.gla.ac.uk

0141 330 3480

or

m.hulme@educ.gla.ac.uk

0141 330 3411

Our colleague Prof Kay Livingston, who is seconded to Learning and Teaching Scotland, has played a key role in liaising between the University and LTS.

The research team gratefully acknowledges the support of many colleagues at LTS in steering our work and in providing much of the data for analysis.

The greatest thanks of all go to the many individuals, groups and organisations that have provided the data on which this report is based, whether through reporting on trials, completing questionnaires, taking part in focus groups or undertaking interviews.

Contents

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| Executive summary | 10 |
| Introduction | 15 |
| SUMMARY OF METHODOLOGY | 18 |
| Introduction..... | 18 |
| Focus Groups | 18 |
| Trialling Feedback | 19 |
| Online Questionnaire | 19 |
| Data analysis..... | 20 |
| SCIENCE | 22 |
| Introduction | 22 |
| Focus Group | 22 |
| CPD requirement..... | 22 |
| Exemplification | 23 |
| Elaboration | 24 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 24 |
| Trialling Feedback..... | 24 |
| CPD requirement..... | 24 |
| Exemplification | 25 |
| Further elaboration | 25 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 27 |
| Online questionnaire | 27 |
| CPD requirement..... | 27 |
| Exemplification | 28 |
| Further elaboration | 29 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 30 |
| Summary points | 31 |
| NUMERACY | 32 |
| Introduction | 32 |
| Focus Group | 32 |
| CPD requirement..... | 32 |
| Exemplification | 33 |
| Elaboration | 34 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 35 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| Trialling feedback | 35 |
| CPD requirement | 35 |
| Exemplification | 36 |
| Further elaboration | 36 |
| Re-write/edit as required..... | 37 |
| Online questionnaire | 38 |
| CPD requirement | 38 |
| Exemplification | 39 |
| Further elaboration | 40 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 41 |
| Summary points | 42 |
| MODERN LANGUAGES..... | 43 |
| Introduction | 43 |
| Focus Group | 43 |
| CPD requirement..... | 43 |
| Exemplification | 44 |
| Elaboration | 44 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 45 |
| Trialling | 45 |
| CPD requirement..... | 46 |
| Exemplification | 47 |
| Elaboration | 47 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 47 |
| Online questionnaire | 48 |
| CPD requirement..... | 48 |
| Exemplification | 48 |
| Elaboration | 49 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 50 |
| Summary points | 51 |
| MATHEMATICS..... | 53 |
| Introduction | 53 |
| Focus Group | 53 |
| CPD requirement..... | 53 |
| Exemplification | 54 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| Elaboration | 55 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 55 |
| Trialling feedback | 55 |
| CPD requirement | 55 |
| Exemplification | 56 |
| Further elaboration | 56 |
| Re-write/edit as required..... | 57 |
| Online questionnaire | 58 |
| CPD requirement..... | 58 |
| Exemplification | 58 |
| Further elaboration | 59 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 60 |
| Summary points | 61 |
| CLASSICAL LANGUAGES..... | 62 |
| Introduction | 62 |
| Focus Group | 62 |
| CPD requirement..... | 62 |
| Exemplification | 62 |
| Elaboration | 63 |
| Re-write/ edit as required..... | 63 |
| Trialling Feedback..... | 64 |
| CPD requirement..... | 64 |
| Exemplification | 64 |
| Further elaboration | 65 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 65 |
| Online Questionnaire..... | 65 |
| CPD requirement..... | 65 |
| Exemplification | 66 |
| Further elaboration | 66 |
| Re-write/edit | 67 |
| Summary points | 67 |
| GAELIC LEARNERS | 68 |
| Introduction | 68 |
| Focus Group | 68 |

| | |
|------------------------------------|----|
| CPD requirement | 68 |
| Exemplification | 69 |
| Elaboration | 69 |
| Re-write/ edit as required | 69 |
| Trialling Feedback | 70 |
| CPD requirement | 70 |
| Exemplification | 70 |
| Further elaboration | 71 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate | 71 |
| Online questionnaire | 71 |
| CPD requirement | 71 |
| Exemplification | 72 |
| Further elaboration | 72 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate | 72 |
| Summary points | 72 |
| EXPRESSIVE ARTS | 74 |
| Introduction | 74 |
| Focus Group | 74 |
| CPD requirement | 74 |
| Exemplification | 75 |
| Elaboration | 75 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate | 76 |
| Trialling feedback | 76 |
| CPD requirement | 76 |
| Exemplification | 77 |
| Further elaboration | 78 |
| Re-write/edit | 78 |
| Online Questionnaire | 79 |
| CPD requirement | 79 |
| Exemplification | 79 |
| Further elaboration | 80 |
| Re-write/edit | 80 |
| Summary | 81 |
| SOCIAL STUDIES | 82 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Introduction | 82 |
| Focus Group | 82 |
| CPD requirement..... | 82 |
| Exemplification | 83 |
| Elaboration | 84 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 85 |
| Trialling feedback | 85 |
| CPD requirement..... | 85 |
| Exemplification | 86 |
| Further elaboration | 86 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 86 |
| Online questionnaire | 87 |
| CPD requirement..... | 87 |
| Exemplification | 88 |
| Further elaboration | 88 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 89 |
| Summary..... | 90 |
| LITERACY AND ENGLISH | 92 |
| Introduction | 92 |
| Focus Group | 92 |
| CPD Requirement..... | 92 |
| Exemplification | 94 |
| Further Elaboration | 94 |
| Re-write or edit as required..... | 95 |
| Trialling Feedback..... | 96 |
| CPD requirement..... | 96 |
| Exemplification | 97 |
| Further elaboration | 97 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 98 |
| Online questionnaires..... | 99 |
| CPD requirement..... | 99 |
| Exemplification | 100 |
| Elaboration | 100 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 101 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Summary points | 102 |
| LITERACY AND GAIDHLIG..... | 104 |
| Introduction | 104 |
| Focus Group | 104 |
| CPD requirement..... | 104 |
| Exemplification | 105 |
| Elaboration | 105 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 106 |
| Trialling feedback..... | 106 |
| CPD requirement..... | 107 |
| Exemplification | 107 |
| Elaboration | 107 |
| Re-write edit as required..... | 107 |
| Online questionnaire | 107 |
| CPD requirement..... | 108 |
| Exemplification | 108 |
| Elaboration | 108 |
| Re-write/edit as appropriate..... | 108 |
| Summary points | 109 |
| COMMON THEMES ACROSS ALL THE CURRICULUM AREAS..... | 110 |
| CONCLUSIONS..... | 112 |
| Appendices | 115 |
| 1. Sources of data..... | 115 |
| Focus group: sample composition | 115 |
| Total responses to the curriculum area and trialling questionnaires..... | 116 |
| Log of documents submitted during the consultation process..... | 117 |
| 2. Frequency tables: online questionnaires by curriculum area..... | 121 |
| Science | 121 |
| Numeracy..... | 123 |
| Modern Languages | 126 |
| Mathematics..... | 129 |
| Classical Languages | 131 |
| Gaelic Learners..... | 133 |
| Social Studies | 138 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Literacy and English | 141 |
| Gaidhlig and Literacy..... | 144 |
| 3. Frequency tables: trialling questionnaires | 147 |
| Science | 147 |
| Numeracy..... | 149 |
| Modern Languages | 151 |
| Mathematics..... | 153 |
| Classical Languages | 155 |
| Gaelic Learners..... | 158 |
| Expressive Arts | 160 |
| Social Studies | 162 |
| English and Literacy | 164 |
| Gaidhlig and Literacy..... | 166 |
| 4. Focus group questions..... | 169 |
| 5. Feedback on Science: specific comments and questions | 171 |
| 6. Summary of cross-cutting themes..... | 178 |

Executive summary

1. This report contains the interim findings of research conducted by the University of Glasgow to collect, analyse and report data on the *Curriculum for Excellence* draft experiences and outcomes (January-July 2008). The main purposes of this interim report are to:
 - summarise the feedback gathered so far, in order to inform the ongoing engagement and consultation processes, and
 - provide insights for those charged with the responsibility of further developing the *Curriculum for Excellence* for its formal implementation from 2009 onwards.
2. Following the National Debate on Education (2002), the Scottish Executive Education Department (now the Scottish Government) convened a Curriculum Review Group (2003) to consider the aims and purposes of education for the 3-18 age range. The work of the Review Group culminated in the publication in November 2004 of a proposed *Curriculum for Excellence* offering a single curriculum throughout the early years, primary and secondary school (across the 3-18 age range).
3. A Curriculum Review Programme Board subsequently embarked on a three-year development programme (2004-07) to map the overall architecture of the revised curriculum. 'Draft Experiences and Outcomes' for each curriculum area were released in stages from November 2007 until May 2008, accompanied by an engagement strategy to afford opportunities for feedback from the main stakeholder groups – teachers, parents, employers and representatives from local authorities, colleges and universities (November 2007-December 2008).
4. This report draws on qualitative data gathered through the first eight months of the engagement strategy. Following the release of the draft experiences and outcomes for each individual curriculum area between November 2007 and June 2008 feedback was obtained via online questionnaires, school trialling proforma and stakeholder focus groups. A fuller description of the methodology is reported.
5. For each curriculum area the report provides a summary of data derived from each of these three sources and a brief summary overview for that curriculum area. At the end of the report, an overview is provided of common themes that emerged from the review of these ten areas. The final section of the report provides some conclusions that are intended to provide some guidance to those charged with the continuing development of *Curriculum for Excellence*. A range of further information is provided in several appendices, including tabular summaries of quantitative data derived from questionnaires.
6. Science: The feedback from the Science focus group was generally supportive of the aspirations for the Curriculum for Excellence but there were some significant misgivings about the implications for the greater emphasis on process on the development and progression of core curriculum area skills and knowledge. From the range of trialling feedback it is clear that the majority of

respondents were enthusiastic about the opportunities presented in the draft experiences and outcomes. To capitalise on these opportunities, teachers identified a need for dedicated time to support sustained planning discussions and resource development. Teachers identified a specific need for support in distinguishing between what is expected at different levels. Teachers raised a number of issues in their open responses to the questionnaire. Chief amongst these is the tension between increasing flexibility in the curriculum and the request for greater direction. Moreover there is also a strong indication that teachers are awaiting guidance in relation to progression and assessment. Respondents indicated a strong desire for training and support in implementing the science curriculum.

7. Numeracy: The numeracy focus groups welcomed the opportunity to 'review our methodology' and to liaise more closely with colleagues across the primary-secondary divide. The main concerns expressed by the four groups related to strengthening consistency in interpretation and building effective systems for monitoring cross-curriculum provision and pupil progress. The trialling feedback and online questionnaires also raised this theme, indicating concern that time be given through CPD and whole school planning to the development of wider awareness and understanding of numeracy across the curriculum. There was a widely expressed view that many of the statements were vague and that more detailed guidance will be needed. The attempts to bring the numeracy curriculum closer to 'real life' were widely welcomed.
8. Modern Languages: Focus group participants were generally enthusiastic about the proposed changes and saw potential for stronger cross-curricular links, especially in terms of an integrated approach to literacy. Across the sources of data there was a commitment to the development of a broader range of innovative approaches and methodologies and recognition of the possible role of technology in enhancing learning. In summary, many participants sought reassurance rather than substantial re-writing and were keen to ground developments within the context of the particular status and challenges of Modern Languages teaching. Comments from the Modern Languages focus group were infused with a sense that this was a curriculum area 'under threat' or 'on the cusp' and hence the draft experiences and outcomes were seen as an opportunity to revitalise the area within the school curriculum. The most prominent themes across data sources were a concern for elaboration and exemplification to ensure consistency in interpretation, and hence assessment, and to provide stronger cross-curricular links.
9. Mathematics: The focus group was supportive of efforts to extend the range of teaching and learning methodologies employed in mathematics education and the emphasis placed on problem solving. Participants were most concerned with the level of detail currently provided to support teachers planning and to support the accurate measurement of standards, especially at transition points. The provision of nationally coordinated CPD, with exemplification, and opportunities for teachers to work together in schools were recommended as important steps in taking developments forward. Overall, the trialling and questionnaire responses did emphasise a wish for the document to offer considerably more detail, with greater specificity and fuller elaboration.

10. Classical Languages: The focus group generally welcomed the draft experiences and outcomes as promoting enhanced opportunities for teachers to think about their practice and for pupils to reflect on their learning. Participants did not raise specific issues about clarity or content, focusing instead on general issues relating to assessment and the capacity of pupils to engage in self-assessment/reflective dialogue. In taking forward developments, participants expressed a need for continuing professional development involving exemplification and appropriate ICT training to support the development of a wider range of teaching methodologies. Although the trialling questionnaire only yielded a very small number of responses, teachers showed enthusiasm for their involvement in the trialling. They were also very keen to pursue sharing experiences, exemplars and ideas with other teachers during the implementation of the revised curriculum. The teachers' readiness to accept the challenge entailed by the introduction of the draft experiences and outcomes comes through the feedback received from the questionnaire. They anticipate support in the form of CPD and exemplars before they can use the outcomes with full confidence. By and large, charting progression was acknowledged to be a challenge but nevertheless the stages were clear. The only major question posed concerned the parameters of this curriculum area.
11. Gaelic Learners: The focus group and trialling feedback identified a need for initial and continuing language training for teachers to support this area of the curriculum. Within the focus group a lack of 'child friendly' resources was identified as a potential barrier to development. One respondent in the small number of submissions to the online survey also highlighted a need for a pupil textbook. Across the three data sources, participants were generally keen to assert that a strong relationship between age and level did not necessarily apply for Gaelic Learners and that variation in progression routes/rates was to be expected. All of the responses to the trialling questionnaire were enthusiastic about the inclusion of Gaelic culture within the curriculum and the opportunity this presented for making links across the curriculum. This was reiterated in the online questionnaire submissions.
12. Expressive Arts: The focus group was strongly opposed to the use of the term 'magic' in the draft experiences and outcomes, which they felt did not represent and might even undermine the status and standing of the creative and expressive arts. In addition, the group sought further detail to support planning, but acknowledged the influence that an over-emphasis on assessment might have on the principles of the Curriculum for Excellence. The trialling feedback highlighted Expressive Arts practitioners' need for further guidance and support in different forms – CPD, exemplification and further elaboration. It was noted that many teachers are immersed in the '5 to 14 mindset' and the draft experiences and outcomes pose a significant challenge to their existing philosophies and classroom practice. In order for teachers to be confident in working with the revised curriculum, they would welcome continuing support. There was very strong feedback from those who completed the online questionnaire concerning lack of clarity and lack of guidelines, which makes planning extremely challenging. It was also recognised that experienced teachers may be able to modify their practice easily but a large number of teachers need to learn new 'skills'. Similar to the focus group participants, there was a very

strong objection to the use of 'magic, wonder and power' even where they were used as a metaphor.

13. Social Studies: The focus group was generally very positive about the flexibility, principles and values of the Curriculum for Excellence, especially for the ASN sector. Participants drew particular attention to the draft documents as a source of critical reflection on current practice and a catalyst for improvement. Where concerns were raised, these were primarily related to the issue of assessment and this is where greater clarification was sought. It was also recognised that achievement in Social Studies was perhaps more problematic to assess in the short-term than some other curriculum areas. The trialling feedback had further insight on what teachers think about the implementation of the CfE draft experiences and outcomes. It is not adequate that CfE is an excellent curriculum in its own right; they would like to be part of its success through effective delivery and maintaining high standards. Many of the practitioners who completed an online questionnaire were actually seeking answers to their questions. It appears from their questions that there is still haze obscuring teachers from understanding the steps forward. For them, an 'end point' is crucial as it heavily informs their planning process. They wanted to know where they were going as this is what they perceived to be the 'key' for getting there. Clarification regarding progression, transition and subject-specific issues were all deemed significant.
14. Literacy and English: The focus group data suggest the following strong themes. Teachers welcome the flexibility within the revised framework and the enhanced professionalism that this implies. They would however welcome opportunities for joint planning and the sharing of good practice at school, region and national levels. Such collaborative activity might address continuing concern among a small number of teachers regarding variations in interpretation across the profession. Exemplification of good practice would be an important scaffold to further teacher-led development. The most pressing concern expressed across the four focus groups was a lack of confidence in using the draft experiences and outcomes to assess progress within and between the wider levels. Some concern was expressed about the positioning of the Literacy experiences and outcomes within the Literacy and English framework only. It was argued that if literacy was indeed the responsibility of *all* teachers then the experiences and outcomes should be embedded across curriculum areas. A concern was noted with the promotion of critical literacy.
15. Literacy and Gàidhlig: Respondents were generally enthusiastic about the opportunities presented in the revised curriculum for tailoring learning experiences to real life contexts and the promotion of cross-curricular work. The focus group, in particular, welcomed the opportunities to reflect on current practice and the scope afforded to teachers to respond creatively in taking developments forward; this endorsement of greater flexibility, within a clear framework, was repeated in the questionnaire data. Where further guidance was requested this was primarily in relation to planning and assessment. Respondents were keen to ensure consistency in interpretation and close monitoring of progression within and across levels.
16. The common themes that emerged across all of the curriculum areas included:

- The way in which the Draft Experiences and Outcomes are currently framed provides a challenge for teachers, creating opportunities for greater creativity, choice and autonomy, but simultaneously bringing with it concerns about curriculum structure, pupil assessment and professional accountability.
- Successful development and implementation will require CPD to include the opportunity for teachers to meet together and discuss ideas about developing the curriculum and share good practice.
- The provision of exemplars as guidance – something to work with and adapt – rather than prescription would help to get discussion going within a subject area and enable teachers to respond with their own interpretation.
- Greater precision in the use of language is needed – this would be easier to achieve if closer reference was made to key concepts within disciplines and to what we know about learners’ developing understanding.
- There is a particular need to support those teachers who may not have the experience to interpret broad intentions into specific subject based outcomes.
- Reassurance is needed that policy makers will ensure that curriculum development will be aligned with summative assessment in national tests.

17. The report concludes by reviewing the findings and drawing out the following themes:

- A strong desire for more guidance from a subject specific, disciplinary perspective on the sequencing and structuring of the curriculum.
- A significant proportion of responses do welcome the opportunity for an increased role for teachers, individually and collectively, to make professional judgements in determining the detail of the curriculum that is taught in their schools and classrooms.
- There is however an apparent ambivalence about this increased responsibility deriving from the perceived difficulty of assessing progress and the ‘vagueness’ of the language used in the drafts as well as the issue of identifying the audience that the current documentation for *Curriculum for Excellence* is addressing.
- There is almost universal acknowledgement that a major programme of CPD activity will be necessary to support the successful development and implementation of the new curriculum.

18. In considering how to respond the range of advice offered by the thousands of respondents who have contributed in this process so far, it would seem important both that all key stakeholders with relevant responsibilities work even more closely together and that connections between these curriculum developments and other current policy developments in Scottish education are taken into consideration.

Introduction

This report contains the interim findings of research conducted by the University of Glasgow to collect, analyse and report data on the *Curriculum for Excellence* draft experiences and outcomes (January-July 2008).

Background

Following the National Debate on Education (2002), the Scottish Executive Education Department (now the Scottish Government) convened a Curriculum Review Group (2003) to consider the aims and purposes of education for the 3-18 age range. The review process was informed by the following priorities identified in the National Debate:

- Reduce overcrowding in the curriculum.
- Make learning more enjoyable.
- Make better connections between the stages in the curriculum from 3 to 18.
- Achieve a better balance between 'academic' and 'vocational' subjects.
- Broaden the range of learning experiences for young people.
- Equip young people with the skills they need now and in future employment.
- Make sure that approaches to assessment and certification support learning.
- Offer more choice to meet the needs of individual young people (LTS, 2008¹).

The work of the Review Group culminated in the publication in November 2004 of a proposed *Curriculum for Excellence* offering a single curriculum throughout the early years, primary and secondary school (across the 3-18 age range). The revised curriculum sought to:

- achieve clearly defined rounded outcomes for young people
- smoother transition between different stages of education, especially the entry to formal primary schooling
- offer new choice, space and time within the curriculum to teachers and schools to design learning to suit the needs of young people (SEED, 2004:14²)

The recommendations of the Curriculum Review Group were acknowledged in the modernisation agenda set out in *Ambitious, Excellent Schools* (SEED, 2004:4). Within a framework of national guidance schools were encouraged to explore flexible, creative and innovative approaches to school improvement. Through the progressive implementation of a *Curriculum for Excellence* all young people would be supported to become: *successful learners, effective contributors, responsible citizens and confident individuals*.

A Curriculum Review Programme Board subsequently embarked on a three-year development programme (2004-07) to map the overall architecture of the revised curriculum, a process that included small-scale practitioner engagement (2005-06). Draft experiences and outcomes for each curriculum area were released in stages from

¹ Curriculum for Excellence: Background. National Debate on Education. [Online] <http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/curriculumforexcellence/whatisfce/background.asp>

² SEED (2004) *Ambitious Excellent Schools*, Edinburgh, Scottish Executive.

November 2007 until May 2008³, accompanied by an engagement strategy to afford opportunities for feedback from the main stakeholder groups – teachers, parents, employers and representatives from local authorities, colleges and universities (November 2007-December 2008).

Engagement strategy

This report draws on data gathered through the first eight months of the engagement strategy. Following the release of the draft experiences and outcomes for each individual curriculum area between November 2007 and June 2008 feedback was obtained via online questionnaires, school trialling proforma and stakeholder focus groups.

| Feedback process |
|--|
| November 2007 – June 2008 Science, Numeracy and Modern Languages |
| December 2007 – June 2008 Mathematics, Classical Languages and Gaelic Learners |
| January 2008 – June 2008 Expressive Arts and Social Studies |
| February 2008 – June 2008 English and Literacy and Gaidhlig and Literacy |

Structure of the report

Following a process of competitive tendering a research team from the University of Glasgow was commissioned to collect, analyse and report data gathered through the engagement process. A summary of the methodology can be found on pages 17-20.

The main body of the report involves identification of the key messages emerging from feedback for each of the first ten curriculum areas (pp.21-108). Feedback for Technologies, Health and Well-Being, RE (Denom.) and RME will be reported in the Final Report (December 2008).

Throughout this document reporting of key messages is organised according to four guiding themes specified by Learning and Teaching Scotland at a Steering Group meeting held on 1st June 2008. These are:

- CPD requirement
- Exemplification
- Further elaboration
- Re-write/edit.

³ The draft experiences and outcomes for each curriculum area are available for download at: <http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/curriculumforexcellence/outcomes/>

While this does create some repetition in the form of the report it nevertheless provides a distinct summary for each curriculum area. Common themes across the sources of data for each curriculum area are identified on page 109 (see also appendix 6, pp.176-80).

The report concludes with a summary of the key messages that have emerged from the collection and analysis of feedback data on the draft experiences and outcomes.

SUMMARY OF METHODOLOGY

Introduction

A range of data was collected by a variety of mechanisms including focus groups, trialling feedback and online questionnaires. These data were analysed using different methods including Excel and Nvivo. Learning and Teaching Scotland also made available a range of supplementary material received from, for example, professional bodies and subject associations. Points raised in these submissions have been incorporated in this report where appropriate (full details of documents submitted can be found in appendix one, sources of data). Using a number of research instruments and processes for each subject area afforded a diversity of views and yielded a wide range of data on both the quantitative and the qualitative aspects of the research. The wide range of data sources and the availability of different types of data not only made the triangulation of findings possible, but it also helped in ascertaining if the key findings are observable across participants and across different types of datasets. The availability of varied data in numerous forms is a strength of the methodology adopted for this research.

Focus Groups

Focus groups of ninety minutes duration were convened for each of the fourteen curriculum areas in the *Curriculum for Excellence* (including four regional groups for both numeracy and literacy) (April-May 2008). The organisation of the focus groups, including participant selection, was managed by the university research team. One hundred and seventy-two participants took part in sixteen focus groups convened for the first four curriculum area tranches: Science, Numeracy and Modern Languages; Mathematics, Classical Languages and Gaelic Learners; Expressive Arts and Social Studies; and English and Literacy and Gaidhlig and Literacy.

Participants were selected from the Curriculum for Excellence online 'register of interest' established by Learning and Teaching Scotland (LTS) for practitioners. This database was supplemented by contacts drawn from the teacher education network of the University of Glasgow to ensure adequate representation of teachers from early years, primary, secondary and special education settings, as well as subject association representatives and Local Authority officers. Cross-sectoral groups were convened to accommodate discussion in the context of transition across the 3-18 age range. Initial invitations were issued via email, followed by telephone/email prompts to increase participation. On average the ratio of invitees to participants was 3:1. Details of the composition of the focus groups can be found in appendix one.

A member of the university research team acted as the moderator for each of the focus groups. The question guide employed by the moderators was constructed in consultation with partners in Learning and Teaching Scotland (appendix four). The questioning route opened with identification of participants' current understanding and engagement with the draft experiences and outcomes; and developed to promote discussion of the extent to which the revised guidance was likely to support reflection on current practice, strengthen cross-curricular links and enhance pupil motivation and engagement.

Participants were also asked to identify any professional development issues arising from the proposed reform of the school curriculum and the implications of these in their current work context.

Focus group discussions were digitally recorded to support full verbatim transcription. Analysis of the sixteen transcripts was supported through the use of NVivo 8 (qualitative data analysis software).

Trialling Feedback

Learning and Teaching Scotland is coordinating a process of trialling of the draft experiences and outcomes for all curriculum areas in collaboration with local authorities and independent schools. The trialling process was launched in January 2008 with an event in Inverurie focusing on the draft science experiences and outcomes and further events for each curriculum area have now been conducted. The formal trialling process involves a series of pilots over a four-month period following the release of each set of outcomes in a range of classroom settings across all sectors. Local authorities have identified schools and pre-school establishments to take part in the trialling process. Each establishment involved in the trialling process is invited to share feedback by completing a 'trialling questionnaire' that is available in both electronic and print form. All the trialling proforma were designed and distributed by Learning and Teaching Scotland, who also organised the submission and transfer of data. Several of the questions used in the trialling specific questionnaires are the same as those used for the online curriculum area questionnaires that were available to all practitioners on the Learning and Teaching Scotland website. The trialling feedback, however, also addresses additional points, both general and curriculum area specific.

Trialling feedback was shared with the research team through secure transfer of electronic datasets (online trialling questionnaire) and through coordinated exchange of print documents. 156 trialling questionnaires were submitted for analysis.

Establishments involved in the trialling process elected to offer a range of different responses. The evidence shows that the online questionnaire was not the preferred method of responding. Response rates for the trialling questionnaires, organised by curriculum area, can be found in appendix one. Topline frequencies from the trialling questionnaire in each curriculum area can be found in appendix three (pp.145-168).

Online Questionnaire

An online questionnaire was designed by Learning and Teaching Scotland to gather feedback on each curriculum area following the release of the draft experiences and outcomes. The questionnaire included a combination of open and closed questions and could be submitted in paper or online format. The questionnaires were made available on the Curriculum for Excellence website and datasets of responses transferred to the university on a monthly basis. Questionnaire responses to the publication of the first ten draft experiences and outcomes closed on 4th July 2008. 1,107 submissions were received in paper and electronic form across the ten curriculum areas (see appendix one, p.114).

Some caution should be exercised when interpreting the quantitative elements of the questionnaire data. All data collected was included in the analysis but in some subject areas the response achieved was limited⁴, which meant that cross-tabulation, or other sophisticated data analysis further dividing the number according to key variables, was not possible as it would not produce any meaningful findings. Higher numbers of responses were achieved for some subjects, for example Science (n=316); however since the population is an unknown factor this prevented the research team from ascertaining whether the response rate for this subject is proportionate to its population when compared with other subject areas⁵.

Data analysis

Full transcripts of each of the sixteen focus groups were coded by members of the research team using Nvivo software. The coding scheme was based on the four themes specified in advance by Learning and Teaching Scotland, which provided a simple structure: CPD requirement, exemplification, elaboration and re-write/edit. Under each of these lead headings, subheadings emerging from analysis of the transcripts were added. Code definitions were discussed at regular team meetings to ensure consistency in application and reduce variance between researchers. Cross-coding comparisons were conducted electronically and using hard copies of the coding summary report. The extracts selected for inclusion in the interim report are used to illustrate central issues. Care has been taken not to over-emphasise particularly strongly held minority views. Extracts were selected from a review of all segments of data coded at each of the four themes⁶. The views of curriculum area specialists within the Faculty of Education were also sought on interpretation of (anonymised) focus group data as a further test of the reliability of the analysis. The involvement of educators with extensive professional experience in each of the curriculum areas, in addition to the research officers, further strengthens the warrant of the findings.

Datasets from each of the online curriculum area questionnaires and trialling questionnaires were analysed using Excel. Manual data entry of all paper submissions was completed at the University. The respondents' option to answer question items with pre-set Likert scale⁷ type responses (quantitative) as well as open-endedly (qualitative) led to some challenges for analysis. It can be observed that a large number of participants across subject areas tended to provide their general perception when answering the first part of the question and then elaborated on their responses by filling in the comments box. An apparent discrepancy occurs when the answer to the Likert scale is favourable in general but is then followed by qualitative comments explaining their reservations. This, at times, appears to be conveying conflicting messages from the same group of participants. The nature of the questions presented to the participants

⁴ Taking into account the insight received from some of the focus group participants, it appeared that a large number of teachers were not aware of the existence of the online questionnaires.

⁵ In theory, it is possible that the response rate for a subject which only generated a small number of questionnaires is high because the entire population is also very small.

⁶ The references attached to the focus group extracts that appear in the report relate to the location of the extract in the coding summary report.

⁷ The scale includes 1 for strongly agree; 2 for agree; 3 for disagree, 4 for strongly disagree and 5 don't know.

may explain what appears to be an apparent discrepancy between the generated quantitative and the qualitative questionnaire data.

As the online questionnaires did not restrict participants from answering more than once, the datasets were carefully checked in order to eliminate any duplication of responses (manual and automatic checks). Evidence of a variety of different versions of the core trialling questionnaire precluded the combination of datasets for online and paper submissions. The frequency tables that appear in appendix three relate to the questions that are common across all the trialling questionnaire formats.

A comparison of findings from analysis of the three main data sources was undertaken in relation to each curriculum area and across all ten curriculum areas. The reliability of findings and the strength of the emergent cross-cutting themes was tested through triangulation. Throughout this process the research team was attentive in the search for divergent cases and sensitive to the issue of 'weighting'. Whilst it is not appropriate to engage in statistical calculation of weighting in this research, consistent efforts have been made to indicate the strength and provenance of responses throughout the report. All feedback from a wide range of stakeholders has been included in the analysis and equal consideration has been afforded to the perspectives of individuals, groups or organisations.

SCIENCE

Introduction

Thirteen teachers attended a focus group of ninety minutes duration held in Glasgow on 14th May 2008. Establishments involved in the trialling process were invited to submit feedback via an online questionnaire or paper proforma. Sixty-five print documents were submitted, including feedback from fifty-one trialling questionnaires. Several local authorities including East Renfrewshire, Glasgow, Aberdeenshire and Shetland submitted combined responses. In some instances individual and combined responses were received.

Feedback was received from the following local authorities:

1. Aberdeen City
2. Aberdeenshire
3. Angus
4. East Renfrewshire
5. Falkirk
6. Glasgow
7. Moray
8. Shetland
9. West Lothian

The science questionnaire made available on the Learning and Teaching Scotland website received the highest volume of responses within 316 paper and electronic submissions received in the period up to 4th July 2008. Two hundred and sixty-six had been completed electronically and fifty were returned as paper copies.

Submissions were also received from a number of interest and advisory groups and professional associations including:

- The Association for Science Education in Scotland (ASES)
- Scottish Science Advisory Group (SSAG)
- The Royal Society of Edinburgh
- Institute of Physics (IOP)
- BioIndustry Association Scotland (BIA)

Focus Group

CPD requirement

The CPD needs expressed by participants in the Science group were directed at the development of a broader repertoire of teaching and learning strategies to support the implementation of the draft experiences and outcomes (ref 3, p.171). Participants were keen to foreground the changing nature of science and the need for continuing development to maintain up-to-date knowledge, especially in terms of delivering the

Topical Science aspect of the revised curriculum (ref 2, p.171; ref 10, p.171). Participants suggested that whilst external CPD provision was important, time to collaborate with peers in school and across schools was equally significant and contributed to the development of cross-curricular links and the enhancement of the profession. (For example, one participant cited the formation of a Learning and Teaching group in Fife that is working with secondees to develop teaching materials for science with a focus on literacy). In discussing resource implications, participants signaled a need for sustained investment and comparisons were drawn with the central funding provided to support the Science Strategy (ref 3, p.173).

Another reason why a Curriculum for Excellence is so good is that it leaves the professionals to make a decision on what are the best approaches rather than taking pieces of paper and just delivering what is written down on them. I think CPD is a really important part of that, like team teaching to help develop and ensure good practice is definitely the way forward. (ref 11, p.173)

We all know what happens when you go on a course, you try it once, you come back, and then? It's not that you don't necessarily want to, but you are then back and there's no support there, and we need to start supporting each other, cross-sector, cross-authority in order to make this work. (ref 1, p.173)

Exemplification

In addition to CPD addressing core aspects of science education (topical content and 'new' methodologies), participants identified a need for illustrations of applied curriculum planning processes. Within the science group there were evident tensions or confusion between a primary emphasis on content or procedural principles as the guiding rationale in curriculum planning (refs 3 – 4, p.175). At a conceptual level there was appreciation of the value of flexibility, but for instrumental implementation purposes there was a concern with lack of consistency accompanied by requests for 'more briefing material' (ref 2, p.176).

By the very nature of what they have tried to do in keeping things quite general and open and flexible, what they have done is not allowed for actually, you know, key guidance as to what the standards are. So teachers have had to actually sit down and talk about that for quite long periods of time. Now it would be helpful to look at things nationally, see, well, what do we mean by these things. A bit more detail. (ref 1b, p.176)

A small number of participants expressed discomfort at a perceived watering down of the rigour of the science curriculum implied in a move towards the enhancement of core transferable skills and capacities. Command of subject expertise was highly valued in secondary school science and some participants sought 'a bit more prescription to the actual outcomes' (ref 7, p.177) and some form of comprehensive 'skills mapping' (ref 5, p.181).

There is not really anywhere in it that says the kids learn to do really difficult sums and that sounds like a really old-fashioned thing for a physics teacher to say in today's day and age when we are supposed to learn a little bit about

everything, but surely if we are really preparing them to become not just scientists that can talk a lot about things, but scientists that can actually go away and design something properly, they are going to have to be really good at problem-solving and it looks to me like taking out some of the stuff that you currently do in 3rd year and saying let's not bother about that until 4th year now because we are teaching a little bit of everything here...that just concerns me to some extent. (ref 3, p.175)

Elaboration

Clarification was sought on the extent to which teachers were expected to cover or expand on the draft experiences and outcomes. One participant, whilst positive about the draft experiences and outcomes, remained unsure as to whether the document was an 'official syllabus' or whether it was 'just a suggestion of what you might like to do?' (ref 3, p.177).

Participants highlighted the need for whole school approaches to embed and monitor science themes across the curriculum. One participant pointed to the challenges monitoring presented for senior management.

The biggest problem I see as a Manager within the school is that I monitor forward plans. We monitor breadth and balance, and how do you equate the whole idea of the Curriculum for Excellence if you know you have to do so much languages, so much maths, and so much of this and so much of that? And if they are all crossing over one another, how do you know how much Maths has been done? How do you know how much languages has been done? It is the monitoring aspect that concerns me. (ref 10, p.177).

Re-write/edit as appropriate

A small number of participants highlighted the difficulties of wording the statements in the first person and the extent to which 'adults writing for children' might appear contrived (ref 1a, p.176).

Trialling Feedback

CPD requirement

Many of the submissions contained reference to a need for additional CPD. A number of these respondents also gave additional detail on what this CPD should comprise. Some suggested a need for CPD to meet the particular needs of less experienced staff or to support staff in improving their knowledge of specific areas or activities within science education. There was some suggestion that primary teachers in particular required additional input to build their confidence with science - in a few instances electricity and forces & motion were singled out as areas for specific CPD. Secondary respondents were more likely than their primary colleagues to suggest a need for opportunities to

develop cross-curricular work. The group response from Glasgow secondary teachers identified SCN322T, SCN432R Bio and SCN411E Phys as examples of areas (outwith their own discipline) where CPD would be beneficial. The SSAG suggested LTS could involve ASE (Scotland) in disseminating materials and the provision of CPD.

Almost half of the informants indicated a desire for additional resources to support the implementation of the science curriculum. Most commonly staff called for increased or improved experimental equipment, ICT, video equipment, technical support, text books and time to be made available. There was some evidence to suggest that primary schools were particularly concerned about a lack of science resources and available technician support. The response from SSAG was fairly typical,

Funding is important to ensure effective change and is not apparent; lack of investment for large purchases at secondary level which are expensive, where will the monies come from to replace expensive worn-out or broken equipment?

Just under a third of respondents requested opportunities for networking with colleagues or with other schools to build their capacity and capitalise on the experiences and expertise of others. Approximately one in five comments indicated a need for more input on planning, recording and/or assessment.

Exemplification

A number of respondents indicated a need for further exemplification but provided little in the way of specifics. Several informants indicated that further general guidance and/or examples of good practice would be of great benefit to early career teachers and/or non-specialists. In a few cases respondents felt there was a lack of detail on how to demonstrate progress or a need for more specific assessment criteria. Several teachers suggested that putting outcomes online with access to examples on how to deliver them would be a useful way to provide support. One secondary respondent felt there was a lack of detail with respect to MCMC pupils.

The following responses represent more focused requests for exemplification.

- SCN209B - requires suggested activities
- SCN112M - requires specific activities to allow planning
- SCN002B/SCN102B - requires guidance and examples of paperwork so documentation has a common thread... to clearly show planning, evaluation, development and progress to satisfy the requirements of inspecting bodies.
- SCN203A, SCN224L, SCN212D – requires examples of finished pieces of work and suggestions of where to find resources.

Further elaboration

A number of respondents drew attention to the likely variation in how teachers would interpret the draft experiences and outcomes. Indeed across many of the trialling submissions respondents positively welcomed the flexibility that the draft outcomes and experiences offered but often tempered their comments with concerns over the interpretation of such an 'open' document, its vagueness or a lack of depth. For

example, an Aberdeenshire group response suggested that in relation to SCN321S,

Flexibility makes things so vague that it is open to widely different interpretations. What knowledge from this outcome will be required to underpin later courses leading to assessment. We need to know what will be expected as underlying knowledge before they start level 4.

and a primary class teacher from Moray noted,

In some instances the objectives do seem a little vague. For example, SCN230U does not specify the properties of light that the children should learn about.

However, it was also apparent from responses that levels of 'comfort' with the draft guidelines was, to some extent, related to the experience of the practitioner. Thus there was some concern that the draft outcomes were too vague for early career teachers or non-specialist science teachers but were sufficiently clear for more experienced teachers and science specialists. A number of respondents suggested that primary teachers lacked the confidence and knowledge to tease out relevant knowledge and understanding and would therefore require much more specificity. There was some evidence to suggest that early years practitioners were comfortable with the draft outcomes but a small number indicated that the levels were set too low and did not match their experiences.

There was more general agreement that there was a need for further development in the draft outcomes to deal with concerns regarding progression and attainment. For example, the group response from Glasgow suggests,

Particular concern was expressed over what happens after level four and in the teaching of electronics which seems to have no earlier levels to progress from..... Most [informants] felt that an overview of how science learning should progress and how progression links to cognitive development is needed to accompany the outcomes and experiences.

The future in this area is unclear; the assessment of the content of CfE across levels 0 to 4 is causing concern because of this uncertainty - SSAG

Insufficient attention has been paid to progressions. As a result it is difficult to see the connections between learning experiences. IOP

Much of proforma material suggested that the experience of trialling the material had been positive and had led a number of teachers to realise the potential in the draft outcomes for cross-sector and inter-departmental collaboration. Although informants often gave the impression that the draft outcomes document supported the development of cross-curricular links a number of respondents, particularly those for secondary schools, suggested that such links could be difficult to operationalise, requiring joint planning time and further coordination.

In general responses suggest that the curriculum framework may require additional development if it is to address needs of learners across diverse educational settings and of the importance of meeting the support needs of practitioners engaged in planning and development.

The following additional specific comments were offered:

- Energy and the environment – Energy is difficult to teach, more guidance in required to make it explicit what learning is important – IOP
- Forces and motion - Outcome statements are Sparse and lack detail. Need clear learning and teaching pathways. – IOP

Re-write/edit as appropriate

In general many of the comments made by informants were welcoming of the draft outcomes. However, in a number of instances comments suggest a particular need to develop and/or clarify the knowledge and understanding dimensions in the document – a number of respondents variously described them as ‘hidden’ or ‘buried’. Similarly a number of contributors remarked on difficulty in identifying concepts and being able to consistently identify breadth/depth for each. A few informants also suggested a need to match the concepts to specific outcomes while a few others including the Royal society of Edinburgh noted a need to include more on the fundamental principles, laws and techniques of scientific enquiry.

Some practitioners drew attention to the level of challenge. One secondary teacher commented,

I do not think that the level four outcomes are always more difficult than level three outcomes and because teachers are expected to be flexible, how do we control what is covered at level 3 and level four? There may be overlap that does not actually challenge pupils any further.

A few other respondents indicated that the level of challenge was too great for the children they taught.

Given the volume of advice and feedback submitted in relation to specific outcomes, an appendix containing specific comments and questions raised during the feedback process appears in appendix five (pp. 169-175).

Online questionnaire

CPD requirement

A large number of informants identified aspects of CPD as an additional requirement resulting from the draft science and experiences and outcomes. The majority, though not all, of the suggestions were made in response to Q9 which asked what professional development may be needed to help the implementation of the draft science experiences and outcomes. Many of the responses were general in nature, calling for more background knowledge or more time and resources to be made available for implementation. Others requested opportunities to experience or capitalise on the experience of others who had implemented the experiences and outcomes.

Others were more specific, significant numbers of informants highlighted; a need for additional input or training for inexperienced staff or for non-specialist staff,

Inexperienced staff will definitely need more support and guidance regarding implementation

New staff/inexperienced staff/teachers with no PT subject will need much support

Support and access to materials especially for some of the newer content for non-subject specific staff.

Non-scientist primary teachers need very specific guidelines behind the science

Many of these comments were linked to requests for greater detail and more specificity in the outcomes – highlighted elsewhere in this section.

Opportunities for staff to develop cross-curricular and/or cross-sector links were also highlighted by large numbers of respondents,

Time for collaboration with primary colleagues to ensure smooth transition from primary to secondary.

Opportunities to identify overlap with other curriculum areas to avoid repetition and encourage cross-subject work.

Mechanisms for coordinating work across departments

The need to support the development of new approaches to teaching and learning was raised by a substantial number of informants,

Many teachers will need to be taught how to present effectively, how to truly engage an audience, how to demonstrate science and its applications without getting bogged down in small details

The CPD needs are enormous since a broader set of teaching and learning approaches than currently the norm are indicated.

New approaches to teaching, more presentation by the pupils so new ICT skills or drama skills, video editing etc.

Certain science ideas are new to some teachers they may need training – learning skills such as debating.

Exemplification

Exemplification was mentioned by respondents in respect of a number of the questions but was most commonly mentioned in relation to Q10 which asked about the ways in which the draft experiences and outcomes could be developed further. Informants sought exemplification to meet a number of requirements, to give more depth and understanding of the outcomes, to provide examples of good practice, to highlight

resources, to suggest the way forward, or to generally aid implementation. The following responses were typical:

Hints as to what might be covered, examples of what people have done with the outcomes, inspiring leadership from LTS about communicating what is going on.

Illustrations of resources, stages and learning activities.

Exemplification of the outcomes – modern science resources, investigations, possibly aligning existing resources.

Provide indicative scenarios to illustrate how each outcome could be interpreted.

More examples of practical experiments and experiences available to show possible ways of: record keeping, methodology, pedagogy, assessment. Produce video clip examples of what a lesson will look like.

Exemplar materials and strategies to help individuals or organisations get underway in more innovative fashion.

Further elaboration

Respondents were most likely to make comments concerning the need for further elaboration in relation to Q1 - on whether the draft experiences and outlines were clearly worded, Q2 – on whether the draft experiences and outcomes were suitably challenging, Q3 – on whether they provided a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in science or Q10 – ways in which the draft experiences and outlines could be developed further. Across these questions many of the comments reflected the same point, principally, requests for further detail in relation to aspects of the learning outcomes.

Informants sought further information in relation to the depth or level expected in relation to the outcomes. They also requested elaboration in terms of what would be expected in relation to progression and/or attainment. Many of the points raised were clearly linked to concerns expressed by substantial numbers of informants that the draft experiences and outcomes were 'vague', lacked clear progression and were not as yet linked to assessment procedures. The following responses were representative:

They state an end point but not the level of learning required to get there.

Do we not need to have an idea of assessment endpoints?

How will we measure if it has been challenging or not?

Rationale of why certain experiences and outcomes are specific to certain levels is unclear.

Give detailed statements of Los so that we and children know exactly what they have to learn and what the success criteria are.

Expanded guidelines are required before one can fully judge the adequacy of the progression.

Re-write/edit as appropriate

A great number of the comments made by informants fell into the re-writing and editing category. Relevant comments were particularly frequent in relation to Q1 – on whether the draft experiences and outcomes were clearly worded, Q2 – on whether they were suitably challenging, Q3 – on whether they provided a good basis for planning how children will progress in their learning, Q8 – the main strengths of the draft experiences and outcomes and Q10 – ways in which the draft experiences and outcomes could be further developed. Respondents expressed least agreement (in percentage terms) with questions one, two, and three.

Large numbers of respondents indicated that while they agreed that the draft experiences and outcomes were clearly worded they also expressed the view that they lacked clarity and were too open-ended. The following comments are typical:

Clearly worded but many of the concepts are woolly.

Use of English is good but meaning is still not absolutely clear.

Insufficient detail, not prescriptive enough

They are clearly worded but describe very vague open-ended scenarios which do not indicate how the success will be assessed

Vague!

They require further clarification.

Concerns with the lack of prescription and the open-ended nature of the draft experiences and outlines led many informants to suggest that while experienced teachers would be able to develop and implement them this would be much more difficult for less experienced and non-specialist science staff. Interestingly, when asked about the strengths of the draft experiences and outcomes, many informants suggested their flexibility and openness. This flexibility was recognised as allowing teachers to pursue the most appropriate learning and teaching methods with their pupils.

Gives lots of flexibility and opportunities to link into and reinforce cross-curricular disciplines.

Encourages a more pupil-centered approach and allows more flexibility with content.

Respondents also frequently expressed the view that it was difficult to assess whether the draft experiences and outcomes were suitably challenging because of their flexibility and lack of clarity.

Many teachers may interpret the outcomes in their own way and continue along

the lines of 5-14 with very little challenge.

Could be challenging depending on interpretation.

Those who did express a view about the level of challenge tended to be fairly evenly divided, some saying the draft outcomes were too challenging while others suggested they were not challenging enough.

A number of respondents suggested that chemistry was under-represented in the draft experiences and outcomes. Moreover, at least one respondent felt that physics and biology outcomes were more interesting and engaging while the chemistry ones were 'fewer and dryer'.

Summary points

The feedback from the Science focus group was generally supportive of the aspirations for the Curriculum for Excellence but there were some significant misgivings about the implications for the greater emphasis on process on the development and progression of core curriculum area skills and knowledge. As one contributor noted,

We are having meetings with many, many teachers. None of them object to the aspirations or principles that underpin the Curriculum for Excellence. What I think there is, is a lack of vision as to what the classroom of the school looks like that does these things' (ref 7, p.181).

From the range of trialling feedback it is clear that the majority of respondents were enthusiastic about the opportunities presented in the draft experiences and outcomes. To capitalise on these opportunities, teachers identified a need for dedicated time to support sustained planning discussions and resource development. Teachers identified a specific need for support in distinguishing between what is expected at different levels.

Teachers raised a number of issues in their open responses to the questionnaire. Chief amongst these is the tension between increasing flexibility in the curriculum and the request for greater direction. Moreover there is also a strong indication that teachers are awaiting guidance in relation to progression and assessment. Respondents also indicated a strong desire for training and support in implementing the science curriculum.

NUMERACY

Introduction

This section of the report outlines key messages emerging from analysis of data from the Numeracy focus groups, trialling feedback and online questionnaire. Fifty-six teachers attended four regional focus groups of ninety minutes duration between April 30th and May 6th 2008. The groups were held in Aberdeen, Dumfries and Galloway, Edinburgh and Glasgow (see appendix one, focus group sample composition p.113).

Trialling feedback consisted of twenty-two items, mostly completed proforma. Some were completed by teams of teachers in particular schools, others by individuals. Some of the respondents made very little use of the open boxes to elaborate their views, but the majority did provide some valuable comments. Those who did not comment tended to be very positive about the document, agreeing or strongly agreeing with most of the statements (see appendix three, p.145).

135 online questionnaire responses were received. The quantitative data from these are included in appendix two (p. 119). A large amount of qualitative data was also offered by respondents and it is this that is analysed later in this section of the report. Some of the respondents had written very long responses to some of the questions with very detailed comments, some of which were based on wide discussions with colleagues.

It should be noted that some of those who completed trialling proforma and online questionnaires were clearly combining comments on mathematics and numeracy, in spite of the respective Outcomes and Experiences documents being separate. Where respondents are referring to both, this is made clear in what follows; sometimes specific points about the relationship between the two are offered and these have been included either in this section or in the section on mathematics.

Focus Group

CPD requirement

In common with other focus groups, the Numeracy groups were keen to assert the need for teachers across the school community – in promoted and non promoted posts - to discuss and plan for implementation. Participants stressed the need to allocate designated time for joint work and reflection as teachers contended with multiple other commitments. Participants described the need to think creatively about the use of collegiate hours and non-class contact time and of working within staffing and timetable constraints. For example a primary school manager pointed to the difficulties of releasing two colleagues at any one time for collaborative work. Other teachers were sceptical of the extent of dialogue in the secondary sector beyond subject boundaries and the senior management team.

Speaking just for one secondary school, the Outcomes and Experiences are not high on the staff's radar at this point in time because they have a huge set of other priorities that are dragging them forward. They're aware it's there. I think the local authority believe that we're going into the staff room every day and we're just talking about Curriculum for Excellence. We're worried about levels of attainment. We're worried about getting pupils in to sit exams. We're worried about classroom management and behaviour. As a manager in a school, I'm a bit concerned that there's a squeeze on the reflection time in terms of Curriculum for Excellence. (ref 3, p.96)

Teachers from the primary sector, delivering a range of subjects, identified a need for 'well written resources and textbooks to take them through the processes' (ref 7, p.97). Other teachers in the group were keen to stress a need to move away from 'textbook-centered provision' and hoped that the Curriculum for Excellence would provide the impetus for such a development (ref 8, p. 97). There was an awareness that the draft experiences and outcomes required a shift in approach - 'a sea change for existing staff' (ref 18, p.98) - that some teachers might find challenging and would need support in making the transition towards more interactive investigative approaches.

Talk is unusual in my Maths classrooms. It's not a feature and I think that's wrong. I think there should be much more discussion and active learning, and I think the Outcomes emphasise it. But it does mean that the staff have to have the confidence that they're not slaves to a syllabus that has to get them 'there' because that's the destination. (ref 10, p.97)

In common with other curriculum area focus groups, the Numeracy groups identified mixed messages in the strong central direction given to providing the guidelines followed by an apparent withdrawal to allow for professional creativity. As one participant observed: 'we've got to free up teachers and give them the strength and the capacity to actually plan for how they're going to link that in with the activities they set up for their class to do' (ref 17, p. 98). It was suggested that in the absence of adequate time for reflection and planning the principles on which the curriculum was based would be eroded as teachers in secondary schools focused attention on the demands of summative assessment.

We tend to work back from the assessment. Where's the assessment and we'll work back to make sure that the children are as successful as we can try and make them in that external assessment. (ref 18, p.98)

Exemplification

Some participants were concerned about the administrative demands of recording progress within the revised framework to satisfy external scrutiny, as well as to support future planning and self-evaluation. Record keeping and monitoring progression effectively was noted as a particular concern for teachers working with composite classes in smaller primary schools (ref 7, p.114). One participant observed: 'how are we going to actually record progress within this new system of levels in a less burdensome way? I think that time demand is a big obstacle'. Others were less certain that teachers were equipped to author new plans without further support and guidance.

A lot of staff have lived through the 5-14 and a lot of schools went down programs of work...It's quite scary for teachers now to think that they have got this freedom to plan. I want to give them that freedom, but I think we need some kind of skeleton there behind of the skills progression or we could go wrong again. (ref 2, p.103)

There is a major challenge for managers within schools in terms of monitoring the progression of what's happening for pupils. Because there are no floors and there are no ceilings, actually monitoring, getting it right for children, is going to be extremely difficult. (ref 3, p.103)

It was suggested that the draft experiences and outcomes would encourage pupil reflection on learning but some concern was expressed in terms of how to translate levels of achievement for the purposes of reporting to parents (ref 4, p.103). Additional guidance was sought on this issue.

The culture, I think, in Scotland is that of league tables and parents wanting to know their child's achieved a certain thing by a certain time, and I think I'm slightly wary of engaging with children's experiences if I'm still going to have to report to parents and parents are going to answer, yes, but can they do Pythagoras? (ref 5, p.105)

Participants also suggested that exemplification might restore teachers' confidence as they became more familiar with the draft experiences and outcomes and made the transition from a more prescriptive curriculum.

In 5-14 it told us whether that was a level B or it was a level D, whereas this is just the 'I can use money'. I think a lot of the confidence that our staff have that they're teaching the right things has come from having this spelled out in 5-14. The same with the one about using different operations. They add, subtract and the rest. Here, we know that we're working within ten at level A and within 1000 at C. But we don't have that with this because we've got depth but without being given a limit on that depth. (ref 5, p.103)

Elaboration

Participants in one of the four Numeracy focus groups expressed some concern that the emphasis on methodology or processes of learning expressed in the draft experiences and outcomes were not consistent with the current national assessments (ref 2, p.117). Several participants expressed some reluctance to embark on a process of significant change in advance of clarification of the future of national 'testing'.

At the moment we're not doing anything to implement it whatsoever until they decide what they're replacing 5-14 testing with, because we're left in the middle, headless chickens. (ref 3, p.177)

Participants requested further detail on expectations at particular levels to ensure consistency and void either gaps or duplication, especially at transition points/school transfer (ref 4, p.135). Several participants commented on the 'vagueness' of the draft

experiences and outcomes in relation to assessment. There was a concern to have reliable evidence of pupil achievement.

It addresses much more methodology than content and while perhaps 5-14 was too heavy on content, in logical subjects like maths there perhaps isn't sufficient detail in the content. It says things like, 'experience different ways of presenting data' – well what ways? If you say ways, it's plural, so are two ways sufficient, and are ten ways too many? How many ways? It's not detailed enough to be able to send a child from primary or even between schools to say, this is what they can actually do. (ref 5, p.119)

Re-write/edit as appropriate

There was agreement among the majority of participants that the first person expression would support attempts to 'individualise learning' (ref 7, p. 108) and promote self-assessment (ref 9, p.110). However, it was noted by one participant in one of the numeracy groups that the language may not be accessible to primary age pupils or pupils with support needs (ref 1, p. 107). Other participants questioned whether the term 'I have experienced' was an adequate basis on which to confidently assess learning (ref 8, p. 120).

Trialling feedback

CPD requirement

It was suggested strongly by a small number of respondents that the key CPD need was for cross-school activity in order to ensure that non-mathematics teachers were properly introduced to the idea of numeracy across the curriculum. This might also involve looking beyond the school to ensure that:

...classroom teachers are in touch with the mathematical/numeracy needs with different subject areas/professions/local business and community (secondary PT maths, MN03)

School-wide planning was a key aspect for a number of respondents:

I think that opportunities for subject specialist teachers in Secondary schools to plan both inter-departmentally and with their linked primaries will be essential to ensure continuity of learning and non-repetition for pupils. ... Management teams in schools will require advice on how to set up effective systems of monitoring and tracking pupil progress and assisting class teachers in planning the learning experiences for pupils. Dedicated budgeting and time management will be required to provide realistic and effective planning opportunities both in individual schools and across Learning Communities. (Primary PT, MN19)

It was also felt that the new approach offered much greater opportunity than previously for teachers to take more control of the curriculum. This was welcomed, but it was suggested that there would need to be time allocated for the development of this greater professionalism, and it was also suggested that teacher commitment was a critical factor in this being successful.

Exemplification

Many respondents felt the framing of the experiences and outcomes was too general or too broad and thus too open to teacher interpretation. It was sometimes put as being too dependent on the expertise or experience of the teacher, or as being 'difficult to build upon without examples' (Primary teacher, MN05). Some respondents saw this as a great opportunity however:

The outcomes are very broad which enables you to experiment and cover good practice from sharing resources and adapting them slightly to fit exactly into the aims of each outcome. (Sec maths teacher, MN24)

A number of responses indicated concern about the challenges of assessing pupil learning, when the statements in the document were seen to be so open. Some of these responses called for greater use of exemplification, others for more detailed elaboration of what is meant, so that the outcomes could be more readily measurable. The teacher whose positive views were just reported above also wrote that the broad outcomes:

[do] not entirely indicate the exact knowledge and level of such understanding needed to progress. This furthermore gives me worry upon assessment of the outcomes and recording attainment. (MN24)

The challenge of grasping meaning from the documents at a time of perceived continuing change in Scottish education was an issue for some, including one secondary school PT:

Although the wording of the outcomes may be clear, the underlying expectation can only be 'unpacked' with a wider knowledge base of the structure of Scottish education, many aspects of which are pending review. (MN09)

Further elaboration

Several respondents were concerned that new teachers would have particular difficulty in understanding and implementing the experiences and outcomes as currently framed. While it was suitably challenging it was not specific enough. As one primary head put it:

Challenging and relevant, but not sufficiently broken down to distinguish what should be completed in eg P5, P6, P7n (2nd level). ... Do not feel that they are specific enough for weekly or even termly planning without being broken down eg too general for PLPs or AifL practice. (MN06A)

A secondary PT wrote:

This is only a very broad outline and needs detailed plans built on top. There will need to be detailed plans provided to allow a consistently high standard to be maintained in Scottish education. (MN09)

An experienced primary school PT wrote:

The language used is clear and shows where pupils have opportunities to build on to skills acquired at earlier stages in each line of progression. I also welcome the flexible aspects of the outcomes allowing me to find learning experiences that are relevant and interesting to pupils and which relate directly to their life experiences. However, I feel that there is still a place for a clearly outline set of progressive skills to run parallel to these outcomes so that I can ensure that I am not teaching the same aspects of Money or Information Handling, for example, that other colleagues who have worked with the pupils previously have taught. (MN19)

The same teacher also expressed concern that

There is no practical guidance on how to monitor and track pupil progress through the learning experiences and outcomes... (MN19)

There was a feeling that less experienced teachers would need more detail in order to take a coherent approach to numeracy.

For experienced teachers they provide a clear indication however teachers new to the profession may require more explanation. (MN03)

There was also concern expressed by a number of teachers that if numeracy is to be genuinely cross-curricular, then specialists teachers of subjects other than mathematics might not understand the document as it is currently written. This view was expressed both by maths teachers and by a small number of teachers of other subjects. One maths teacher response suggested that numeracy teaching by non-specialists could even be 'dangerous', presumably meaning that there would be possible confusion with what pupils were learning in their designated maths lessons. The suggested 'lack of clarity of definitive expectations'

...makes it easy for a non-mathematics specialist to dip in and pay lip-service to addressing numeracy without actually pushing young people's boundaries of learning forward. (MN09)

Several suggestions were made that the cross-curricular nature of numeracy would be easier to manage within the primary school than in the secondary school.

Re-write/edit as required

One secondary school departmental response suggested that there was something of a 'jump' between Level 3 and Level 4 and that Level 4 would not be clear for young people themselves (MN01).

The relationship between numeracy and mathematics was of interest to many respondents and there was a suggestion from some that the two documents should each have greater distinctiveness, in order to make clear how these two terms were being used.

The apparent openness of the document gave rise to some expression of concern about possible variability in what pupils were taught, with the possibility of key aspects being either omitted or indeed repeated unnecessarily.

Online questionnaire

CPD requirement

In response to the question about professional development there were numerous suggestions about what is needed. There were many calls for CPD which would assist teachers in the implementation and 'delivery' of the experiences and outcomes, often supported by comments indicating uncertainty about what might be expected. There were also a number of suggestions that a national programme of CPD to support the adoption of the new curriculum would be very important in ensuring a consistent approach across the country and to ensure the avoidance of repetition, duplication or omission. Thirdly, there was a common suggestion that there needed to be CPD that would support the cross-curricular dimension of numeracy, especially in the secondary sector, where this was felt to create the greatest challenges. On this last point, one respondent suggested:

...it is not only based in Numeracy – language, social skills are also being requested. [There is a] need for more structure/example/ details.

Another wrote:

The overall view is that the Maths and Numeracy outcomes do provide excellent opportunities to link with other departments. To do this, time will need to be allocated to interdepartmental work if effective and meaningful changes are to be made in classrooms.

Two other responses were very positive about this aspect:

We like the fact that many other areas of the curriculum will need to consider the numeracy outcomes to fulfill delivery of their own outcomes. This shared approach to teaching and learning in numeracy is welcomed.

Commendable that 'numeracy' is being seen as all teachers' responsibility. The challenge is the implementation of this.

It was frequently suggested that much of this CPD could be collaborative in nature with teachers sharing good practice with each other. Such sharing could also include sharing of resources that had been found to be successful. At least one response called for the

development of numeracy resources by publishers that would be based on the new curriculum and help to ensure a common understanding of what is 'required'. It was felt that the challenges of implementation would be particularly great in small schools where there would be a smaller staff base on which to develop implementation plans.

There were a few suggestions that the particular issue of primary secondary transfer and transition should be a key concern; this was one example of a wider concern about ensuring progression throughout the whole of pupils' school experience.

The frequent expression about the lack of detail in the documents led some to suggest that there would need to be a strong focus within CPD provision on planning and coherence. Similarly, it was suggested that teachers' transition from the detailed approach of Curriculum 5-14 to the open more 'general' approach of CfE would itself create a need for training.

I realise that there is more freedom and a less prescriptive nature in the new curriculum, but I truly hope that teachers are not just left alone with vague outcomes and not enough resources to achieve them.

Or, in the words of another respondent:

The vagueness of the outcomes, and a lack of exemplars, will not ensure consistency across schools. Individual departments and schools will determine the intent of each outcome (what and how to deliver) and therein lies the problem of consistency between the levels and across schools. Careful planning will need to be facilitated with adequate time allowances and funding for resource development. The outcomes alone will not provide opportunities to promote good teaching; quality professional development and the aforementioned time and budget will also be essential.

The transition from the 5-14 approach will need support:

[Teachers will] need training and understanding to move from the 'spoon fed' mentality of the 5-14 programmes and a strategy for moving forward and making their own decisions. Teachers tend not to demonstrate the four capacities when teaching maths and until they are confident in this then there is little chance that they can develop the four capacities in their pupils. This is the opportunity for the development of numeracy in schools to change but there seems to be little direction and support for taking this forward.

It was also pointed out that parts of the CPD agenda associated with implementation of CfE should be designed for ancillary and support staff, for example including learning support staff and nursery nurses, where relevant.

Exemplification

While there was widespread expression of concern about the generality and 'vagueness' of the current statements, the number of explicit calls for exemplification were fewer than those calling for elaboration (see below). A few respondents indicated a wish to be given a clearer idea of what was meant by cross-curricularity of numeracy and there was

a suggestion that more might be made of new technologies in demonstrating how some of the experiences might be provided for learners. There was some suggestion that exemplification should also relate to differing pupils' needs and abilities.

Clearly worded but no category for ASN or for pupils operating at very early stage of development.

I think it tries to make more connections with pupils' lives. It would be great to be adding in contexts to do with i-pod technology, music downloads (time and speeds etc), mobile phone technology, pay and tariffs etc.

The statements are clearly stated.... However, the detail of knowledge, skills and understanding 'beneath' the statements requires further exemplification. ...MNU302C... is a numeracy outcome, applicable to all teachers in the school. How will other subject teachers understand – what 'methods', 'familiar contexts' for a 14 year old. This outcome is too vague and needs exemplars.

Most agreed that the wording is clear, but:

...on 'unpacking' each seems to cover a wide range of knowledge – how deep will we be expected to go at each level? – much more guidance and exemplification needed.

Further elaboration

As indicated above, a substantial majority of respondents expressed concern about the manner in which the outcomes and experiences are expressed. Many referred to their 'vagueness', others to their openness and, while a number welcomed this aspect (and the avoidance of a 'checklist' approach), they were very much in the minority. There was also particular concern about the ability of newly (or recently) qualified teachers to work effectively with so little detail. A very small number suggested that the document (and indeed the whole of CfE) was an example of ideologically driven educational thinking that ignored the realities of teaching and learning in schools.

Due to the 'largeness' of the outcomes they could be misinterpreted by inexperienced practitioners and several components missed. This would affect the pace and challenge considerably.

Vagueness could create huge difficulties with P7-S1 transition.

Impossible to plan coherently across the school without much more detailed outcomes.

There was general support for the four capacities and a sense that the development of numeracy was a particularly apposite curricular theme through which they could be developed, but some doubt as to whether the current statements in the document do enough to 'flesh out' what might be presented under the heading of numeracy. These respondents appeared not to be keen to accept increased professional responsibility for

doing this themselves and frequently talked of the need to avoid teachers repeatedly 'reinventing the wheel'.

I think that numeracy across the curriculum has been ignored for too long. This document may address this problem.

Many of the phrases used are very confusing. The language used is far too open ended and can be interpreted in too many ways.

A small number indicated concern about the progression aspect:

There is not nearly enough recognition of the developmental stages a child goes through to understand number. The outcomes as written will only serve to encourage more of the 'jumping through hoops' maths that is prevalent at the moment.

Please do not have us all reinventing the wheel again. The children's learning will suffer if we are confused or disagree about the outcomes and levels.

There was enthusiasm for the way in which the numeracy document emphasises the connection with 'real life' and several respondents particularly welcomed the explicit treatment of financial education. They felt this document strives to be much more 'meaningful' to young people, than previous curriculum statements.

Re-write/edit as appropriate

There were mixed views on the language adopted in the statements. While several commented that they felt the use of the first person – as if by a pupil - was a way of bringing the statements to life in the classroom context, others felt that it was strange to write in this way, especially given that they felt that young people themselves would not understand some of the statements, even after they had covered the area concerned.

Are you really suggesting that (most) children will read, analyse and take on board these outcomes? They may be written down in the 'I can...' format, but much more is needed than that. I have shown these outcomes to other teachers and Higher pupils, none of whom really appeared to understand them.

Phrasing the outcomes in the first person is utterly unhelpful and false: a token effort at being child-centred and pandering to current trends in education. The outcomes are not any the more comprehensible to the children for being expressed in this way and less clear to the teacher. It also makes them unnecessarily long-winded.

Given the concerns about openness of the statements, it is not surprising that there was much encouragement to make the outcomes 'more specific'. This was closely related to the wish to make pupils' learning more easily assessable. It was suggested that this is not a 'working document' that teachers could actually use in planning their teaching. Rather it was a general statement of principles that needed considerable 'translation' before it could be used to inform practice.

This is not a working document and it leaves too much unsaid and many questions unanswered. Are individual teachers once again going to bear the burden of translating this into something that can be used in the classroom?!

The following view came at the extreme end of the spectrum of the comments on the writing style adopted:

They should be rewritten by someone who is currently teaching and who has demonstrated the ability to write in precise plain language.

One or two responses from the early primary stages suggested that there may be less precision here than teachers have been used to.

Summary points

The numeracy focus groups welcomed the opportunity to 'review our methodology' (ref 5, p123) and to liaise more closely with colleagues across the primary-secondary divide. The main concerns expressed by the four groups related to strengthening consistency in interpretation and building effective systems for monitoring cross-curriculum provision and pupil progress.

The trialling feedback and online questionnaires also raised this theme, indicating concern that time be given through CPD and whole school planning to the development of wider awareness and understanding of numeracy across the curriculum. There was a widely expressed view that many of the statements were vague and that more detailed guidance will be needed. A submission from the Scottish Mathematical Council endorsed many of these concerns, suggesting that the documents for Numeracy and for Mathematics are very vague. The SMC is concerned about how numeracy will be 'steered' within a school and how learning will be assessed.

The attempts to bring the numeracy curriculum closer to 'real life' were widely welcomed.

MODERN LANGUAGES

Introduction

Fifteen participants attended a focus group held in Glasgow on 15th May 2008. The group included two primary school teachers, eight teachers working in secondary schools, one teacher employed in the independent sector, three local authority representatives and one representative from a Subject Specialist Network. There were 102 online responses/ paper submissions responses to the online questionnaire, of which 42 were from individuals and 58 from groups. Two responses did not contain identifiers. Five submissions were received in response to the trialling questionnaire.

Focus Group

CPD requirement

It was generally acknowledged by the group that teachers within the primary phase would benefit from on-going subject specific CPD to strengthen their skills, knowledge and understanding of modern languages teaching. It was suggested that there was a role for universities as providers of initial teacher education in meeting this need, with one participant suggesting some form of language skills accreditation (ref 2, p.84). The variability of access to languages teaching across large clusters of primary schools was cited as a barrier to improved provision and progression on transition – a difficulty that was outwith the control of headteachers (ref 2/3, p.86; ref 3, p.93). It was suggested that greater flexibility might be achieved through the use of native speakers and foreign language assistants (ref 9, p.87).

In addition to access to high quality professional education for teachers and greater consistency in the availability of Modern Languages teachers in the primary sector, participants identified a need for enhanced technological resources – software and smartboards – to support interactive approaches and motivating activities (ref 1b, p.86).

A general need was expressed for more support in 'building a curriculum' or course planning in relation to the outcomes (ref 5, p.85). The majority of the group felt that further guidance was needed in translating the draft experiences and outcomes into a coherent planned strategy.

Just now I feel I'm looking at a blank sheet of paper and I want to think, right, what are we going to do? (ref 7, p.85)

Teachers among the group recognised the need for greater collaboration with other teachers and looked forward to building stronger cross-curricular links. This was seen as beneficial for the future security of Modern Languages provision within the school curriculum and would also encourage higher levels of cooperation between related subjects. One participant suggested the development of closer links with teachers of English to identify areas of common practice such as the teaching of grammar and to

explore similarities in method and the timing/sequence of units (ref 3, p.84). It was suggested that time for teachers to meet and plan in school would prove important in carrying developments forward and several participants felt that Modern Languages teachers could be proactive and show initiative in leading developments at a local level. The SQA units on Language for Work were cited as possible drivers of enhanced collaboration between teachers in the secondary sector.

If we go about this the right way by speaking to colleagues in different departments, by planning in a cross curricular way, but planning meaningfully where learning outcomes will be achieved in a language and in another subject, I think we could secure our place in a curriculum that way. But I think we have got to do the running. (ref 2, p.85)

Exemplification

Across the group there was a strong desire for greater exemplification. Participants requested 'tangible, practical samples' (ref 3, p.88). It was hoped that good practice identified in establishments/authorities involved in formal trialling of the draft experience and outcomes would be shared with other schools (ref 1, p.86). Through the use of 'real' examples teachers might be able to gain a depth of understanding not readily accessible in text-based documents or check lists.

I think we need exemplification of maybe what a third level learning outcome might look like; but we might also need exemplification about how to plan towards the teaching and learning of that outcome. You know, we do not want to be just looking at these as boxes to tick. We want to get underneath them and see what the teaching and learning will look like. (ref 5, p.88)

However teachers were also wary of the attractions of 'exemplar' material or a 'prescribed topic list' and were keen to avoid externally produced exemplars becoming a substitute for active engagement with the outcomes:

If we just get exemplification on what these Levels look like, those examples will become the next test and that would be a huge backward step. (ref 6, p.88)

Elaboration

A key concern expressed by the group was the need for further specific guidance on how to differentiate between different levels of achievement with any degree of confidence. Participants were concerned about the reliability of assessment as teachers familiarised themselves with the revised framework.

In trying to make any judgments on the appropriateness of progression - either the linear progression or between Levels or between schools - I keep coming back to 5-14 and the area of difficulty since its inception on 5-14 was capturing what exactly is a Level C? What exactly is a Level D? Show us a picture of it. Show us a manifestation of it and then when you can actually drill it down to an

understanding of what it is by somebody being able to kind of paint the picture better, then we are able to say right we have an understanding of it. (ref 1, p.92)

Several participants raised questions about developments following level four, specifically the future shape of the examination structure (aligned with the review of the qualifications framework). Whilst supportive of the principle that the revised curriculum should not be outcomes-driven, participants were uncomfortable with the uncertainty this created for classroom practitioners.

I think the rationale behind this was the curriculum was going to drive the assessment, not assessment driving the curriculum. But if we are unsure as to how that curriculum is going to evolve, then it's that chicken and egg thing. Someone's got to draw a line in the sand and say, "This is where we're going". (ref 4, p.92)

Participants from the primary sector raised a number of issues. At the primary level it was generally felt that greater awareness was needed of Modern Languages policy to raise the profile of a 'marginalised' area. Some concern was expressed regarding the development of Modern Languages before second level, P4. A small number of participants drew attention to schools (independent and state nurseries) where it is current practice to start languages education at an earlier stage. It was suggested that the draft experiences and outcomes were of limited value in an early years/P1 setting, for example the reference to reading texts.

Re-write/edit as appropriate

Few comments were made in relation to required edits of the language of the draft experiences and outcomes. One participant offered the opinion that it is 'not clear whether these are written for the teacher or for the learner' (ref 1a, p.94). Another observed that 'it is quite a lengthy document' (ref 1b, p.94). The one substantive comment made in relation to the wording of the document was the lack of detailed guidance to support teachers' assessment practice.

They use comparative terms and you cannot use comparative terms without having a base line and I think they will not bring forward modern languages unless, and until, much more concrete curricular advice and guidance is given. (ref 1c, p.94)

The main concern was the adaptability of the document to meet the different needs of schools where pupils are embarking on Modern Languages education at an early stage and those commencing at P4.

Trialling

Thirteen documents were submitted during the trialling period. These included a range of individual and small group responses from trialling projects involving two primary schools and two secondary schools in Dumfries and Galloway and a collective response from Angus. Trialling feedback included case study reports with supporting contextual information. Two further submissions were received using the online trialling

questionnaire. These were submitted on behalf of a small group of teachers in a primary school in East Renfrewshire and a secondary school in Angus. Respondents were generally positive about the draft experiences and outcomes and endorsed the increased flexibility, which offered greater scope for teachers to be creative. The majority of respondents welcomed the enhanced emphasis on cultural awareness and were encouraged by the possibilities for making stronger connections across the curriculum.

CPD requirement

Respondents stressed the need for collaborative work and time for teachers to meet and discuss teaching and learning strategies. In bringing to the foreground the need for joint work, a number of teachers were also emphasising a need to focus on the process of learning. Some responses indicated that the development of a wider range of strategies for learning would be necessary to provide the kinds of 'rich learning experiences' advocated in a *Curriculum for Excellence* (ML-04B).

There may be a temptation to read the outcome and experiences and feel that they are already being achieved, but where they are most helpful is when new and innovative approaches are adopted by a group of teachers not only within one curriculum area but also across all curricular areas, where meaningful learning connections can be made and collaborative working can take place. (Curriculum Leader ML, secondary)

It takes the teachers' thinking away from the more traditional approaches to teaching the modern language skill areas to exploring new techniques and linking all language skills as well as making appropriate connections with other curricular areas (Trialling Reading at Second Level, ML-02A)

In describing the range of evidence needed to demonstrate the extent to which pupils achieved, respondents demonstrated a high level of awareness of the need to combine a range of 'product, process and third party evidence' (ML-04A), supported by dialogue with the learner (ML-04B). These comments connected with requests for CPD to support the development of innovative approaches e.g. through technology supported learning. It was noted that some primary schools are currently making effective use of radio broadcasts, podcasts and blogs (staff group, East Renfrewshire primary schools). Across the responses there was a strong focus on the development/enhancement of teachers' pedagogical practice in response to the opportunities presented in the revised framework.

The outcomes and experiences help to prioritise the areas for learning and teaching without losing the liberty to exercise imagination and creativity in terms of approaches and methodology. (Primary School Headteacher)

A minority of respondents were also concerned to highlight the need for supporting materials. An experienced primary school teacher, for example, suggested that the development of cross-curricular links would be supported through the provision of a 'general resource bank'. One request was made for suitable textbooks for both the primary and secondary sector, but greater emphasis across responses was placed on the need to generate tailored resources and share good practice. Reflecting on experiences in trialling the Writing outcomes, one teacher commented:

By digressing from the textbook the teachers did not feel that any time had been wasted but freed them up to explore a wider set of resources.

Exemplification

Although respondents were generally agreed that the wording of the draft experiences and outcomes was clear, several requested further guidance on their meaning.

Need steps to have more detailed outcomes e.g. in relation to length of text or level of difficulty. This may be addressed as more exemplification is shared (small group secondary school response, ML-05A)

Elaboration

Respondents generally welcomed the flexibility evident in the draft experiences and outcomes but sought clarification to ensure that teachers had a shared understanding. The need to combine flexibility with clear guidance and structure is illustrated in the following comment made by an experienced primary teacher who suggests:

Because of the open-endedness there is opportunity to focus on the strengths of individual children and to use these strengths to enhance their language learning

But goes on to argue:

Need a clearer bridge between the open-ended nature of the stimuli and the expectations in teachers' minds regarding knowledge and understanding (ML-04C)

Re-write/edit as appropriate

A number of submissions provided feedback in relation to specific outcomes. These are detailed below:

LAN 251MA - It was suggested that there is little progression from second to third level (experienced primary teacher)

LAN 260MF/359MF/459MF – A small number of secondary school teachers questioned whether 'I have worked with others' was suitable for Reading and suggested extending the statement to include: I have worked on my own or with others

LAN 261MG - Reading for enjoyment was regarded as possibly too challenging for primary age pupils (ML-04C).

LAN 265MI – LAN 346MI – One respondent suggested that progression between these levels was not clear, specifically in relation to 'expressing opinions' (ML-05D)

LAN 362MH – Two responses suggested that this outcome needs unpacking before judgments about achievement can be made (ML-04B, ML-03B)

LAN 266MJ – One respondent suggested the inclusion of 'simple opinions' would be helpful in this outcome (ML-01)

S1-S3 Writing – One response noted that the 'skill of translation' did not appear in the draft experiences and outcomes.

Online questionnaire

CPD requirement

The main CPD and related issues focused on the need for CPD to ensure the 'shared understanding and interpretation of the modern language experiences and outcomes' and to promote effective pedagogical approaches. For example CPD opportunities to help teachers to teach 'reading and Writing in French' and 'teaching approaches to develop collaborative learning and other learning and teaching issues and approaches'. Comments highlighted the need for exemplar materials to be used in CPD. Respondents would particularly welcome CPD conferences and workshops that focused on: demonstrating how the outcomes can be demonstrated and interpreted flexibly to respond to local circumstances and teachers' needs; developing cross-curricular projects and approaches ('this could range from Rich Task type to shorter tasks. Cross cutting/ curricular need not mean elaborate all singing, all dancing type activities') and delivering a more 'social based curriculum'.

It was suggested that increased networking opportunities and the sharing of good practice across school clusters/ neighbourhoods and local authorities, involving collaborative and cooperative learning, would be beneficial. The formation of working and focus groups involving teachers, parents and pupils was also suggested. Some respondents noted that the model of CPD that followed the implementation of Higher Still would be applicable to the current situation.

Other themes included the need for new resources deemed necessary for the effective implementation of Modern Languages in ACfE. For example, materials to cover cultural resources and assessment packs. The need to provide continuing support for primary school teachers was stressed given that, 'research has indicated that pupils are more confident if they are taught their foreign language by their class teacher'. Several respondents noted implications for ICT and an assumption that such resources were already available and that teachers were competent in their use. The importance of ensuring that there was sufficient time for training and planning was a recurring theme.

Exemplification

Along with comments on further elaboration, perhaps the most prominent theme to emerge across respondents' comments concerned the need for greater exemplification. There was concern that many outcomes were open to interpretation which would limit

the consistency from pupil to pupil and school to school. However, others praised the flexibility in the draft materials which was in line with the ethos of ACfE and liked the lack of too much prescription, which allowed for more creative thinking.

Some respondents stressed the draft Modern Languages experiences and outcomes 'strongly required exemplification of each level but that this was not to be confused with prescriptive content'. Respondents sometimes made positive reference to the practical approach to exemplification provided for Higher Still.

The views of concerned respondents can be summarised by the following extract:

With such vague outcomes, we will need exemplification of the standard of work expected from pupils in each skill – i.e. presentations, role plays, conversations, support that students are allowed in speaking activities, the level of language in listening and reading texts and also what pupils are expected to produce in written work. We will also need examples of the expected grammar, language structures and vocabulary / topics to understand what is meant by familiar language / basic structures/ pronunciation of sounds to master / writing frames etc.

Some key examples of areas requiring exemplification included:

The necessary sample illustrations to gauge the extent of the differentiation between levels...exemplification/ benchmarks as to what exactly is expected at each level to ensure consistency (as was done in the Higher Still development materials)

...exemplification of what is required nationally. The second level may be too ambitious if compared with the expectations of primary teachers

A national team to develop resources and exemplars for each of the levels so that we can all interpret the statements consistently. What happens after level four?

Concrete examples of what pupils could do to demonstrate that they have achieved an outcome...benchmarking, for example, exemplars of 'key epithets such as 'short', 'mainly predictable', 'more extended' ...'a longer imaginative text' etc.

Examples of planning approaches, examples of how to record evidence, examples of PLPs in use, examples of collaborative group work and Critical Skills in Modern Languages.

Elaboration

In common with the focus group responses, there was a requirement for guidance on how to differentiate between attainment at and within different levels and how SQA requirements would fit into the overall proposals. It was seen as important for the new guidelines to be linked to current levels of assessment 'so that teachers will have a clear picture as to what second, third and fourth level performances in various outcomes will

look like. Some saw questions remaining regarding assessment and related to this was the issue of how to address 'attainment versus achievement'. This was recognised as something 'still in the pipeline' but important to implementation.

Respondents' additional comments often suggested that the draft outcomes are generally too vague. There was recognition that for reasons of space, details on experiences and outcomes were not as extensive as they might be. Respondents to the questionnaire suggested there is a need for considerable expansion for teachers to develop practice which ensures that all pupils have valuable language learning experiences which lead to the outcomes set out in the document. Therefore, many teachers, particularly those who are less experienced, will require greater guidance, CPD and exemplars. National bodies and MFLE and GLOW were cited as important sources of support.

Some respondents suggested there should be a stage one or that stage two should reflect the primary learning and teaching to a greater extent. It was felt that the draft experiences and outcomes required elaboration to be of more value to an early years and primary school setting.

Some comments reflected a need for the experiences and outcomes to be conceptualised in terms of the broader developments in Scotland and internationally concerning language learning.

Feedback from the questionnaire suggested that Knowledge About Language (KAL) was not well represented and in comparison with the revised 5-14 Guidelines for Modern Languages there is no longer any consistent model of progression. Some respondents suggested that the draft document does not provide a comprehensive picture of KAL in the early years of language learning or provide teachers with a clear idea of how to build on developing concepts, competencies and strategies in this area.

Other comments suggested that the experiences and outcomes should reflect the potential of new technologies to support the development of skills, drawing on the expanding range of new technologies (texting, emailing, blogging, podcasting, social networking etc.) available as a means of communication.

Re-write/edit as appropriate

Respondents' comments in relation to possible re-writing largely suggested that the language was clearly worded for teachers, but was less clear for pupils. In some cases the language was seen as 'esoteric' or complex. For example, the language used in the 'I can' statements and terms 'the richness and interconnected nature of languages'. In LAN 257MC the language of the outcomes needs to be made more child-friendly in order to share with pupils.

There were a small number of specific references to the level of challenge with some seeing expectations of the draft experiences and outcomes as perhaps too challenging for the fourth level ('which sounds more like a credit level than a standard grade') or uncertainty over the where level three ends, with clarification required over the line between levels three and four 'which was not there in the ML outcomes which has now appeared in later documents'.

Other comments varied but included the need for clarification to reduce inconsistency and were linked to the requirements for exemplars and elaboration. Clarification was sought on terms such as 'short, simple, effectively, confidently and straightforward', which were seen as too subjective and had implications for assessment. Some specific examples included LAN266MJ where one teacher commented, 'it mentions success criteria – are these generated by pupils, teachers are they language based?' Other queries over the meaning of terms and, therefore, what is expected included: LAN 253MB (take part effectively...basic language structures), LAN353MB (variety of structures), LAN453MB (extended range) and LAN256MC (brief presentation). In Writing LAN 364MI and LAN 463MI some saw these outcomes as more open to differences in interpretation over the meaning of 'experiences' and 'opinions'.

Other comments referred to perceived omissions. These included a need for a contents guide, a grammar guide and pupil-friendly descriptors. Reference to 'Citizens of a Multilingual World' and the 'Nuffield Inquiry to the work of the Council of Europe in developing the Common European Framework' and the underlying concept of plurilingualism were regarded by some as significant omissions that would have been useful in terms of identifying the wide range of purposes learners have for learning languages. In addition, it was suggested that inter-cultural competence is referred at only a very superficial level with no plan for its systematic development or progression.

Summary points

Participants were generally enthusiastic about the proposed changes and saw potential for stronger cross-curricular links, especially in terms of an integrated approach to literacy. The focus group was equally positive about the emphasis on motivation, enjoyment and the enhancement of wider learning relevant to real life contexts. This stance was reiterated by the Sustainable Development Education Liaison Group (SDELG) who emphasised the role of languages education in active international citizenship and advised that such links should be strengthened throughout the draft guidance (GR-029).

Across the sources of data there was a commitment to the development of a broader range of innovative approaches and methodologies and recognition of the possible role of technology in enhancing learning. Participants' comments suggest potentially fruitful links with media and culture organisations. An organisational response from Scottish Screen suggests: 'different subtitling and soundtracking features of most DVDs, access to foreign language video online and the potential for students to make and edit digital films all highlight the creative potential of moving image in modern foreign language teaching' (GR-027).

In summary, many participants sought reassurance rather than substantial re-writing and were keen to ground developments within the context of the particular status and challenges of Modern Languages teaching. Comments from the Modern Languages focus group were infused with a sense that this was a curriculum area 'under threat', 'on the cusp' (ref 7, p.89) and hence the draft experiences and outcomes were seen as an opportunity to revitalise the area within the school curriculum. The most prominent themes across data sources were a concern for elaboration and exemplification to

ensure consistency in interpretation, and hence assessment, and to provide stronger cross-curricular links.

MATHEMATICS

Introduction

Ten teachers attended a focus group in Glasgow on 7th May 2008. Trialling feedback consisted of eight items, a mixture of completed proforma and detailed reports on the implementation of some of the statements. Some were completed by teams of teachers in particular schools, others by individuals. Some of the respondents made very little use of the open boxes to elaborate their views, but the majority did provide some valuable comments.

Ninety-nine online questionnaire responses were received with an additional thirty-four paper copies. The quantitative data from these are included in Appendix 2 (p.127). A large amount of qualitative data was also offered by respondents and it is this that is analysed later in this section of the report. Some of the respondents had written very long responses to some of the questions with very detailed comments, some of which were based on wide discussions with colleagues.

Eight submissions of the trialling feedback questionnaire were received. It should be noted that some of those who completed trialling proforma and online questionnaires were clearly combining comments on mathematics and numeracy. Where respondents are referring to both, this is made clear in what follows; sometimes specific points about the relationship between the two are offered and these have been included either in this section or in the section on numeracy.

Focus Group

CPD requirement

Several participants in this group identified a need for high quality, nationally coordinated CPD provision at local and regional levels. Group members acknowledged the particular needs of teachers at an early stage of their careers with limited experience and also the needs of experienced colleagues who may have a high degree of confidence and attachment to a less extensive but effective range of teaching and learning methodologies. It was argued that intervention through CPD was necessary in order to promote sustainable change in classroom practice and to avoid superficial amendments that would mean: 'we end up just doing what we've been doing all along and that learning and teaching hasn't changed in any way' (ref 4, p.75). There was an expectation that further guidance would be forthcoming and an implication that currently teachers were attempting to move forward on shifting terrain.

There is a need for some central national co-ordination of this and some national exemplification and national CPD. Why should individual schools, individual authorities reinvent the wheel? (ref 3, p.73)

It says in the document, because I've written 'time scale' on that, "in order to assist staff in meeting these new challenges, additional guidance will be given to support planning, recording and assessing the outcomes. When necessary, further explanation or exemplification will be offered to ensure that teachers across the country interpret the statements in a consistent way." So we're kind of working in the dark. (ref 1, p. 73)

It was suggested that the development of cross-curricular links was easier within the context of a primary school and that teachers within the secondary phase, in particular, needed planned (i.e. timetabled) opportunities for joint work. Barriers to collaborative ways of working within the secondary phase were identified as possible inhibitors of progress, such as the social geographies of the school site and the location of teachers within separate departmental 'base' rooms (ref 1, p.74). GLOW was suggested as a useful mechanism in 'pulling it all together' (ref 2a, p.75)

I just don't see how it's going to work the way they want it to work, unless we have more flexibility within the actual, not only the curriculum but the time-tabling of the curriculum and actually giving us a chance to work with other Departments when our time is so limited as it is. (ref 2, p.74)

It was further suggested that the integration of the 3-5 and 5-14 curriculum required the provision of opportunities for early years and P1 teachers to come together to work on transition arrangements (ref 3, p.80).

Exemplification

Several teachers in this group drew attention to the need for more detailed guidance on progression and success criteria. There was a concern to closely align teaching and learning approaches with the assessment practice. Teachers were concerned to provide consistency in the quality of learning experiences within and between schools and to avoid 'gaps' at transition points.

We have to make sure that the teaching and learning approaches are correct and these outcomes don't do that. They just give us a sort of hint in the right direction, they don't actually take us there. (ref 2, p.75)

At different points in the discussion participants repeated concerns that the draft experiences and outcomes were 'woolly' or 'vague' and 'open to everybody's different interpretations, every single teacher within every single school' (ref 6, p. 81). In particular it was suggested that that the draft experiences outlined content without an explanation of the degree of difficulty expected at each stage (ref 1, p.82). To support requests for additional guidance, one participant observed that the success of the Assessment is for Learning initiative lay in the level of detail provided to scaffold development in the context of teachers' day-to-day work.

The Assessment is For Learning had been very specific about where the children had been and what they were learning in that lesson and how that fits into a progressive series of lessons. If that's the core to good learning and teaching and progressing children, it's in contradiction to the vagueness of this. (ref 5, p.81)

Elaboration

Whilst supportive of the tenor of the document, there was some hesitancy, evident among secondary teachers in particular, about changes in practice in advance of clarification on assessment and in the context of the national qualifications review (ref 2, p.77). It was acknowledged that primary colleagues faced the particular challenge of coping with change across all curriculum areas. A small number of participants in the group expressed concern regarding the measurement of 'standards' between primary and secondary school and the sharing of reliable information on transition (ref. 5, p.78; ref 2, p.80).

We're always told aren't we that the curriculum in the past has been very detailed, that has led teachers to be very prescriptive in the way we teach it but then the other issue there is we shouldn't teach for the exams but unfortunately that's the way the futures of the kid's are determined. I'd love to have a looser curriculum like I could teach things perhaps in a more interesting way, but in the back of my mind is until I know what form of assessment is involved, I don't really know how to approach this. (ref 1, p. 75)

Looks very nice and the ideas behind it are very good but if I've got to get them through an exam, can I afford the time to do this approach which would be a much better approach. I mean I'm old enough to go back to the problem-solving investigator days where we used to teach that before we went on to the actual curriculum and I think we're so exam based and driven now with targets etc, I think that colleagues are very wary about going into this in detail at the moment when they don't know what the end point will be. (ref 1, p.78)

Re-write/edit as appropriate

The mathematics focus group did not suggest revision of specific codes but suggested that the document might be revised to support teachers in making sense of the codes and lines of development. One participant reported difficulty in navigating a path through the text and following lines of development (ref 2/4, p.78). Another commented that the document lacked coherence: 'Its all bitty rather than flowing' (ref 4, p.82).

Trialling feedback

CPD requirement

A major concern emerging in relation to CPD was that staff should be given time to develop an understanding of the new curriculum. This was felt to be a particular challenge for primary teachers who would be having to adjust to the full range of subjects.

Staff will need time to familiarise themselves – all other areas to consider too!
(Primary school teacher, MN13).

There was also a view expressed from some primary schools that those working in the early years would need specific dedicated CPD.

Early Years Staff (Teachers and Early Years Workers) may need some additional CPD to allow them to dissect the curriculum and relate it back to the current 3-5 curriculum. (Nursery teacher, MN04)

The investment needed was seen as considerable in the secondary sector as well:

A major allocation of CPD time, which is: relevant, structured and focused. In school development time [is required] to amend (i) teaching styles and (ii) schemes of work... (Secondary school maths department, MN25)

Exemplification

A call for greater use of exemplification in the documents was associated with a commonly expressed concern that there might be too much variation across the country in the delivery of the mathematics curriculum, given the generality of many of the statements.

Perhaps a clear guidance book could be produced to break these (Es and Os) down to ensure continuity across the country. ... Range of evidence would need to be robust enough to facilitate transition, to allow the next stage to build on the child's previous learning. Current transition documents must be revised to allow this. (Nursery Teacher, MN02)

All the outcomes need to be unpacked. This should be done centrally so that all teachers across Scotland are delivering the same curriculum. If it is left as it is there will be big differences across schools and authorities. (Secondary school, MN20)

Further elaboration

Indeed, frequent reference was made to the need for an 'unpacking' of the statements, implying a strong desire for much greater specificity. It was felt that the current approach would not provide an adequate basis for detailed planning by teachers, nor would it facilitate systematic assessment of learning.

This offers no basis for planning, each outcome discussed is too vague and during this trial each outcome had to be 'unpacked' and strongly related back to the 5-14 document already in place. (Secondary school, MN20)

This provides no basis for assessing the pupils' progress and is a vague document in places. (Secondary school, MN20)

There was a suggestion, expressed by several respondents, that the links between mathematics and numeracy should be set out more clearly.

As a high school we feel that in order to deliver the mathematics outcomes effectively we would have to distribute the numeracy outcomes across the departments within our school... this would need to be a school wide action plan and would involve a lot more planning and time than has already been devoted. (Secondary school, MN20)

Re-write/edit as required

While many respondents did feel that the statements were written clearly, not all were convinced that the progression between levels was apparent; it was felt that the learning 'gradient' was sometimes unclear.

Gradient of progression across levels may be unclear and open to individual teachers' interpretation – therefore causing repetition of teaching and learning experiences. ... Further clarification of the 'levels' required relating to ages/stages and expectations. (EY practitioner in a primary school, MN04)

Some concerns were expressed about particular statements, for example:

The majority of the outcomes were clearly worded, however the wording of MNU402C led to some confusion. (Secondary school, MN20)

Views on the linguistic approach taken differed. Some saw the 'I can...' statements as 'mainly child friendly' (Primary school teacher, MN13), others felt there was a danger that these could be turned into a checklist. For example, a statement beginning 'I have experimented with...' does not mean that a child has necessarily learned something and yet could be recorded as if they had. One response suggested that 'I can...' should be replaced by 'I will be able to...' (Secondary school, MN25).

The wording of the document could be amended to make it clear that the experiences and outcomes are not one off, tick box types of activities. They should emphasise that the learning is continually developing depth and breadth. (Nursery school teacher, MN02)

A view from one primary school was that, although the Nursery staff were 'happy with the breadth of the outcomes', the rest of the staff:

are a bit concerned with the breadth of the outcomes as they feel that the Maths in particular need to have a bit more structure to ensure no gaps. (Primary school, MN22A)

The focus on outcomes was criticised by some in their answer to the question about motivation:

This document does not suggest any methods to motivate pupils. This is all down to teachers! This highlights the need to change the way we are teaching NOT the outcomes we teach. (Secondary school, MN20)

Online questionnaire

CPD requirement

The questionnaire respondents expressed a strong view that a significant amount of CPD would be required to support the implementation of the mathematics curriculum. There was frequent emphasis of the need for time for teachers to spend time on this, including much time for discussion with each other.

The new outcomes do not significantly promote good teaching and deep learning any more than the previous curriculum. Time for teachers to discuss, observe and share developing and good practice was viewed as a clear way to promoting good teaching and encourage deep learning. Staff expressed a strong interest in funding being available for this.

There were suggestions that the whole success of Curriculum for Excellence was entirely dependent on teachers and that a large investment in supporting them would be required.

To make any curriculum work the biggest investment must be ensuring that we have a highly trained and highly skilled teaching body. Without excellent teachers there will just be 'A Curriculum'. Train, retrain, refresh skills, expect and receive high standards from our teachers.

There were some who said that there were specific aspects of the curriculum that would need special attention, because they were most novel or different from the 5-14 Curriculum. Examples included the elements of financial education and history of mathematics. There were also several respondents who emphasised the need to concentrate on new methods or approaches as much or indeed rather than on the content of the curriculum.

Referring simultaneously to the Numeracy Experiences and Outcomes, there were suggestions that the cross-curricular aspects of mathematics would also require particular attention within CPD provision.

The overall view is that the Maths and Numeracy outcomes do provide excellent opportunities to link with other departments. To do this time will need to be allocated to inter departmental work if effective and meaningful changes are to be made in classrooms.

Exemplification

A very strong view that the current statements were too vague, led to many suggestions both for considerable use of exemplification, but also for further elaboration (see below). It was felt by some that curriculum statements should provide a basis for target setting and that in their current form the statements do not provide that.

Many outcomes are vague, non-descriptive and have no examples provided. Broad and loose descriptions will do little to ensure a cohesive and consistent learning environment.

It's all too vague, it's nice to have a bit of leeway and flexibility, but how can the teacher tell if their class are working to the their best ability without clear target setting?

Even those who were more positive about the general approach felt exemplification would help:

The emphasis on collaborative approaches and investigations is a very positive development. It promotes independence and the adoption of problem solving strategies to tackle many aspects of learning. It may still be useful for teachers to receive some form of exemplification e.g. one outcome at one level with some ideas about how to approach the outcome as 'a starter for ten'!

Cross-curricular developments could also be assisted by exemplification:

Tying in outcomes with other parts of our own and other subjects' curricula is already happening at a high level in many schools and more specific, 'extra' ideas would be viewed as helpful.

Further elaboration

It was suggested by some respondents that the document did not offer a clear way forward for teachers working with pupils with Additional Support Needs. It was suggested that the wording (the 'I can...' statements) could lead to disappointment or even disaffection among students who might feel 'I cannot....'.

For pupils with additional support needs these outcomes are too broad and too wordy.

When asked whether the statements were sufficiently challenging, several respondents said they felt it was difficult to judge this because of the lack of detail. Indeed several suggested there was scope for 'too much interpretation'.

As the draft is unspecific in its wording, it is impossible to gauge how challenging the outcomes are.

Many of the teachers found it hard to know [how challenging they would be] because the outcomes were open to too much interpretation, with each outcome being as challenging as the teacher or school wants it to be.

Generally they are challenging, and some are particularly so. They have implications for resources and staff training to ensure that outcomes will be met fully. There are also concerns about the movement through the levels to ensure the children are challenged and it would be better to be provided with more detail for each outcome to ensure that there is not repetition over stages.

We will spend so long interpreting the outcomes that there will be no time left for planning interesting lessons or preparing collaborative tasks or researching relevant ICT activities. Be more specific – make our lives easier and we will teach more innovatively.

It was suggested that recently qualified teachers were likely to find particular difficulty in making the jump from such general statements to detailed planning of their teaching and there was concern about the possible experiences of pupils moving between schools.

Teachers with a lot of experience can easily break down the new outcomes into step by step segments, but newer teachers seem to be finding this difficult. More guidance is needed on how to break down each outcome into smaller steps.

Using the outcomes as they stand, teachers do not feel that they would know what has been covered by pupils coming from other schools. More guidelines are required for staff and examples need to be given of depth expected.

To be implemented successfully, teachers will need far more information in terms of specific examples to determine the exact content of an outcome. Unless this happens there will be huge uncertainty and chaos in most secondary classrooms in Scotland.

One response suggested the establishment of ‘a national working party of teachers’ to prepare and create a suitable programme/scheme of work to be ‘applied to each year of the primary school’. There was concern about time being wasted in the operationalisation of the document:

You need to add detail, otherwise everyone is just going to waste time transferring from the current curriculum. How are new or weak or non-subject specialist teachers going to confidently and effectively deliver the outcomes if they are not sure what they really are?

Re-write/edit as appropriate

In spite of the concern about vagueness and lack of specificity or exemplification, a large number of respondents did find that the wording was clear and only a minority suggested either ‘wordiness’ or that ‘jargon’ was being used.

A number of respondents said that they did not think that the statements were child-friendly, in spite of being written as if my pupils. A smaller number indicated that they did find the way in which they were written appropriate for children.

In general, within this authority, the feedback from practitioners was positive in relation to the wording of the experiences and outcomes. In particular many practitioners liked the use of ‘I am and ‘I can...’ statements. There is definite concern that the apparent lack of detail leaves the experiences and outcomes open to interpretation, which in turn might mean that ‘unpacked outcomes’ may vary from authority to authority and/or from school to school.

Some also expressed distaste for the coding system used, although others thought this would be helpful when it came to assessment of learning.

Too vague, very wordy, too much jargon, sentences far too long. Pretty meaningless. Lack of teachers' views from the very start. Codes are terrible and not easily remembered.

There is confusion with the 'I can/have' wording. The statements are not child friendly.

They are clearly worded but they are at times too vague and can encompass too much in one statement. They are written in first person as if read out by a child but not written in language accessible to most children.

The coding system could lead to good planning, however it needs to be refined and a clearer understanding of how to use the coding system.

Summary points

The focus group was supportive of efforts to extend the range of teaching and learning methodologies employed in mathematics education and the emphasis placed on problem solving. Participants were most concerned with the level of detail currently provided to support teachers planning and to support the accurate measurement of standards, especially at transition points. The provision of nationally coordinated CPD, with exemplification, and opportunities for teachers to work together in schools were recommended as important steps in taking developments forward.

Considerable affection for Curriculum 5-14 was expressed by some of the questionnaire respondents. They were apparently not persuaded that these statements in the new document were really significantly different from 5-14, but were not perhaps simply a distillation of what was already being delivered. The detail of 5-14 appeared to provide teachers with a sense of confidence that, in an age of accountability, they knew what they were doing and that it was acceptable to the wider community.

The Scottish Mathematical Council had been less enthusiastic about the 5-14 Curriculum and in their response to the current consultation expressed concern that 'the present document is even more vague'. The SMC was especially concerned about the potential for confusion that this would create in the primary-secondary transfer of pupils.

Overall, the trialling and questionnaire responses did emphasise a wish for the document to offer considerably more detail, with greater specificity and fuller elaboration.

CLASSICAL LANGUAGES

Introduction

It is acknowledged that Classical Languages is a subject taught by a very small minority of teachers in Scotland. This is reflected in the volume of feedback received through three data sources reported here. Four teachers attended a focus group in Glasgow on 19th May 2008. Three teachers were drawn from the secondary sector and one participant represented a Subject Specialist Network. Three online submissions were received providing trialling feedback with no additional paper copies and eight submissions were received in response to the open invitation to complete the online questionnaire available on the Learning and Teaching Scotland website. Despite the small number of responses, the overall feedback generated is generally positive and encouraging.

Focus Group

CPD requirement

Participants within the Classical Languages focus group identified two areas for continuing professional development. They valued opportunities to meet as a group and requested 'regular meetings where we can discuss what we're doing with each other and get ideas from each other' (ref 1, p.13). Communication was regarded as particularly important in sharing good practice in the early stages of implementation for teachers of Classical Languages as they are usually the only teachers of this curriculum area within individual schools.

I think we're all in our own individual schools. We're all on our own as well. We've got nobody else to discuss it with and we're all expected to take this away and go through our own courses and see how we fit, re-inventing the wheel. (ref 1a, p.13)

Participants also reflected on their use of ICT and how this might support the development of more interactive approaches to classroom learning. Two participants suggested that further training in the use of electronic whiteboards would be helpful (p.12).

Exemplification

The need for consistency in how the revised curriculum was implemented across schools was identified and this was aligned with a request for illustrative examples of standards at particular levels. Teachers requested initial guidance and exemplification

from which they could then proceed with enhanced levels of confidence in developing their own schemes of work.

Where it's a set course, whether it's an SQA course you're doing, all schools should be the same and it should be done, although it's lazy, but rather than us all doing our own thing, there it is, that's what you expect for Higher, that's what you expect for Standard Grade for all these four capacities, and that's what you should be doing, and then we can work our own second year courses or first courses, rather than us all doing separate things. (ref 1b, p.13)

Elaboration

This group did not request further elaboration in relation to the draft experiences and outcomes. Some concern was raised regarding assessment, but this was expressed in terms of professional ethics rather than ambiguity over what was expected. There was some discussion of the extent to which a system of internal assessment might be vulnerable to professional malpractice. It was suggested by one participant that pressure for increased levels of attainment render teacher assessment problematic. The need for transparency and rigorous systems for cross-marking would reduce such tensions. Implicit within the discussion was a need for reassurance to raise confidence in internal assessment procedures.

My big concern is this internal assessment. All the pressure in schools is to produce good results, every subject is judged on their results, subjects stand and fall by their results. If your results are poor, head teachers will drop the subject, and that's your job. Therefore if you put everything onto internal assessment or a large proportion onto internal assessment, teachers are in a moral dilemma. It's your job against the standards your pupils achieve and therefore the system will be open to abuse and people are only human, and they're under pressure, and they can find ways to help the pupils get better grades than they would normally, if it's internally assessed, and you know there's no chance of you getting moderated anyway, let's face it, what are you going to do? (ref 1c, p.13)

Re-write/ edit as required

It was felt that pupils might struggle to access some of the language in which the draft experiences and outcomes were expressed and that pupils were not yet practised in the forms of self-assessment encouraged in the draft document. Teachers' comments implied that the first person statements required a level of sophistication in reflection and self-assessment that were not typical of the types of learning conversations currently conducted.

A pupil will just say, "No, I can't do that". "I have evaluated the culture and heritage of the Greeks and Romans through language and literature", they'd just say no way. But then you say, "You've produced a 1,000 word investigation on that, yes you can". No, this would put pupils off. They've read the first line and they wouldn't have a clue what this was supposed to be. I think it's up to us to

tell them, “Yes, by completing the course and by passing the exams, you have, this is what you’ve achieved, this is what you can do.” Perhaps in slightly simpler language for them as well. This is teacher orientated, I don’t see pupils making any sense of this. (ref 2, p.14)

There was a suggestion that parents and pupils adopted an instrumental rather than reflective approach to assessment and would need support in valuing formative/development-centered approaches.

All they want to know is have they passed their exam? Have they passed it well? Does that mean they’re good at this? (ref 2, p.15)

If you went through this with parents, “your child is an effective contributor, a responsible citizen, a confident individual” they’d just say, “Ah but is he any good? Did he pass? Is he doing OK? Right, that’s fine, don’t blind me with this”. It has a tendency to be just jargon, and it’s enough for us to get to grips with it, without inflicting it too much on pupils. (ref 3, p.15)

Trialling Feedback

CPD requirement

A comment from a depute HT who has been working for over 20 years is very supportive: ‘I regard [Classical Languages draft experiences and outcomes] as comprehensive, inclusive and innovative. They reflect the best that Latin can offer’. Perhaps, this accounts for the lack of mention of CPD opportunities. Instead, it was suggested that what would be more helpful is the opportunity to be able to share, discuss and network with other teachers within the same circle.

‘Some way like this, and through other meetings, of sharing experience. This is very important in a small uptake subject like Latin.’ (Individual response from a secondary teacher in South Lanarkshire).

This was supported by another respondent who believes that ‘sharing of good practice’ and ‘encouraging collaboration amongst Classical Languages teachers is the way forward. A suggestion that is specific to this subject area is the importance of raising the subject’s profile as well.

Exemplification

Providing exemplars was clearly seen as the next step following the development of draft experiences and outcomes. The confidence in the materials is evident through the feedback expressed by one of the respondents.

‘A range of material has been successfully gathered ready for the exemplification stage.’

Respondents' comments suggest they appreciate the rationale and the significance of curriculum revision. This positive view has been reinforced by their trialling experience where they had firsthand experience of how the curriculum could be of benefit to both pupils and teachers alike. They argue that through sharing of exemplars and effective practice, other schools who did not take part in the trialling will benefit from these resources.

Further elaboration

In response to the question: 'Do the draft experiences and outcomes provide a suitable basis for assessing the progress of children and young people?', a respondent said that 'this is clearly reflected in the trialling'. A principal teacher with more than 20 years experience confirmed that the '[o]utcomes are suitably challenging'. The feedback below from another respondent is in agreement:

'There is a clear structure and clear progression for pupils.'

The perceived clarity in teaching the subject areas, according to the trialling feedback received, explained the apparent lack of need for elaboration. Not only do these teachers see how connections can be made between Classical Languages and other subjects, the draft experiences and outcomes offer 'great opportunities' for motivating the learners and. integrating the four capacities, '[T]he progression gradient' was also regarded as 'wholly appropriate'.

Re-write/edit as appropriate

Participants did not raise specific issues about re-writing or editing of the draft experiences and outcomes. Again, this perhaps emanates from the perceived intelligibility of how to translate them easily into teaching practice. The only minor point suggested was the promotion of 'common terminology across all subjects delivering languages'.

Online Questionnaire

CPD requirement

According to a secondary teacher with more than 20 years experience, the draft experiences and outcomes 'provide opportunities, but they do not indicate how these can be grasped'. Another secondary teacher from South Lanarkshire echoes a similar concern:

'There seems to be very little evidence to help teachers plan or implement a course to meet these outcomes – guesswork!'

As teachers will still need to familiarise themselves with the experiences and outcomes, opportunities to ask questions and air their specific concerns are considered necessary, especially in relation to understanding 'a good basis for planning'. In this regard, CPD events, including workshops and seminars potentially offer ideal avenues for some face-to-face discussion of issues facing teachers.

Exemplification

A principal teacher from a Glasgow secondary school suggested that '[o]utcomes could be broken down further within each experience'. It was also mentioned that the use of 'common terminology' across subjects is advisable to assist teachers' understanding of the new ways of planning and organising their pupils' learning experience.

Additionally, it was also suggested that in the promotion of good teaching approaches and deep learning, further guidance and exemplars could assist teachers achieving this:

'Allows plenty of scope for teachers to continue to develop current good practice both in teaching approaches and learning experience. However, some people may need more guidance in how they might best achieve this.'

As teachers move towards embracing completely new ways of planning their lessons and engaging with learners, support for how they can ensure/maintain effective practice will surely be welcomed.

Further elaboration

In terms of progression and attainment, very positive remarks were given. For example, a secondary teacher with 20 years experience said:

'There is evidence of progression from the third to the fourth level. A framework is provided that allows for progress to be charted.'

Similarly, a principal teacher from a South Lanarkshire secondary school agreed that '[p]rogression lines are clear even if they are challenging'. It was also implied by another principal teacher's comment that the transparency of the progression is extended even to the learners themselves.

'Through the progression lines, children will develop an understanding of how they are improving skills which will serve them well in their future lives e.g. oral and written communication skills, ICT skills, skills of research and presentation etc..'

There appears to be a convergence of ideas amongst the respondents that little is required in terms of elaborating further the draft experiences and outcomes.

Re-write/edit

Minor remarks on some phraseology were highlighted. For example, 'range of resources' is found 'nebulous' or LAN454CC is 'inordinately difficult to understand'. Apart from this, the only suggestion raised which may prompt some re-thinking and/or re-writing is the actual context used for the draft experiences and outcomes. A principal teacher from Fife who has been teaching Latin, Classical Studies and RE for over 20 years asserted that:

'It is important that linguistic, cultural and heritage/culture are ALL taught under the "umbrella" of Latin. It IS more than a language.'

It remains to be seen whether or not this opinion is shared by many Classical Languages teachers and is worth taking into account.

Summary points

The focus group generally welcomed the draft experiences and outcomes as promoting enhanced opportunities for teachers to think about their practice and for pupils to reflect on their learning. Participants did not raise specific issues about clarity or content, focusing instead on general issues relating to assessment and the capacity of pupils to engage in self-assessment/reflective dialogue. In taking forward developments, participants expressed a need for continuing professional development involving exemplification and appropriate ICT training to support the development of a wider range of teaching methodologies.

Although the trialling questionnaire only yielded a very small number of responses, teachers showed enthusiasm for their involvement in the trialling. They were also very keen to pursue sharing experiences, exemplars and ideas with other teachers during the implementation of the revised curriculum.

The teachers' readiness to accept the challenge entailed by the introduction of the draft experiences and outcomes comes through the feedback received from the questionnaires – both online and paper-based. They anticipate support in the form of CPD and exemplars before they can use the outcomes with full confidence. By and large, progression lines were acknowledged to be challenging but nevertheless clear. The only major question posed concerned the parameters of this curriculum area.

GAELIC LEARNERS

Introduction

Four teachers attended a focus group in Glasgow on 16th May 2008. Among the group were two primary school teachers, one secondary school teacher and one teacher from an all-through primary-secondary school. Seven responses to the trialling feedback questionnaire were received. Six responses were provided by individual classroom teachers: four primary school teachers and two teachers working in secondary schools. A further small group response was submitted on behalf of a secondary school department. All of the trialling questionnaire responses were prepared by teachers employed in schools in Argyll and Bute. Five submissions were made using the online questionnaire from four Local Authorities: Highland, Eilean Siar, Argyll and Bute and Clackmannanshire. Although low responses were received from the three data sources, those contributors who participated raised a number of significant points and their contributions provide valuable feedback.

Focus Group

CPD requirement

It was suggested that teachers needed time to identify and develop stronger cross-curricular links in secondary schools, especially with social subjects, expressive arts and literacy. Development time was needed in school in order to ensure that links were related to the outcomes and did not deteriorate into a process described by one participant as 'making connections for the sake of making connections' (ref 2, p.23).

The experience in the high school, because of the nature of high school, is obviously quite different and more difficult to achieve. It does happen to some extent and maybe this will focus people on doing it, but then I would be concerned at the time it would take up making links and connections with other members of staff, and the feasibility of being able to do it when pupils are doing six different subjects a day. I think the will is probably there to try and do it but there are lots of obstacles as well. (ref 1, p. 26)

The group was keen to acknowledge that some primary teachers might themselves have very little language and that all teachers needed opportunities for continuing professional development after completion of the GLPS language course. Participants also identified the lack of 'child-friendly resources' as a potential barrier to further development.

Teachers undertake block release and they acquire some Gaelic. But at the moment you only do it once and there is no follow up. It would certainly need back up and support on an ongoing basis. (ref 2, p.24)

Exemplification

Having acknowledged that teachers of Gaelic Learners have varying levels of experience, the group recommended the development of a range of support materials including 'lessons that are simple enough to be adapted and given by a teacher who has a limited vocabulary herself' (ref 2, p.24).

Elaboration

Clarification was requested on two terms that appear in the document. First, it was felt that the meaning of the word 'culture' in this context was not clear.

I'm not sure what this document means by referring to "culture". Is it people who live in the Highlands and Islands? Is it people who speak Gaelic? (ref 1, p.26)

Second, it was suggested that teachers needed further explicit guidance on how to interpret the word 'read' as it is used in the document.

I've been involved in a Gaelic Teachers Group where we are making materials for Gaelic learners and in contact with quite a few other teachers and we were concerned at one point where it says, "Read" because we are talking specifically about Gaelic learners, who will have clearly little language and won't really be able to read and I do understand that in its broadest term is what they're talking about. They say "read" almost just to identify, to talk about a picture or something like this, so I think possibly it would be useful if that was clarified a bit, because when teachers see the word "read" they assume it means what we all think of as reading, whereas in the guidelines it does say to be able to read and I think that would raise worries and concerns in teachers. (ref 1, p.27)

Most participants were keen to stress that patterns of progression in this curriculum area would not correlate neatly with age and levels and felt that this could be emphasised more strongly in the guidance document.

Early, first, second, third levels, may not correlate with age, as they do with Mathematics or social subjects. (ref 4, p.26)

I think you'll find that within your school, within each class, it might be, even with a particular outcome, a child may come in who can do that when they enter school and others may not achieve in the course of the time, so it's going to be quite difficult to categorise it as it is at the moment, because of the spread of the language. (ref 2, p.28)

Re-write/ edit as required

Some participants felt that the draft experiences and outcomes were, in places, too challenging for Gaelic Learners or 'over optimistic' (ref 5, p.26). Two participants felt that

the document was 'quite wordy' and required significant engagement in order to achieve familiarisation.

Trialling Feedback

CPD requirement

In common with the focus group, the development needs of teachers were expressed in terms of time for familiarisation and time to develop classroom strategies tailored to the needs of their pupils. A particular need was expressed in terms of the continuing development needs of GLPS teachers, who it was suggested would benefit from on-going language support as well as support for teaching.

The majority of respondents requested additional print resources and exemplar materials. A primary school teacher identified a lack of beginners' texts (P6/7) and secondary school responses requested greater access to 'reading for enjoyment texts'. In addition, it was suggested that a range of Gaelic culture 'factsheets' and a resource bank of interactive activities could be made available to support teachers as they engaged with the revised curriculum.

During the trialling process teachers were devising strategies to encourage active learning. Feedback proforma from the trials suggest teachers are drawing on a range of evidence from a variety of sources: teacher observation, digital photography, slide shows/PowerPoint presentations, art work, recorded conversations, completed worksheets/fact files and cooperative learning group tasks. Such responses draw attention to a developing range of pedagogical strategies and innovative uses of ICT, rather than stand alone materials.

There are many different ways of evidencing the learning that has taken place. When trialling outcomes LGL 301B and LAN 353MB, one class wrote and performed a short play based on the topic we had been studying. When trialling LAN 358ME and LGL 303F, one class looked at local Gaelic folk tales and then worked in groups to present these as a "comic life" display, using pictures and extracts from the texts. We also looked at creating a podcast which would be further evidence of the learning which has taken place. I think that having evidence such as this, matched against the outcomes to demonstrate learning is much more valuable than having a worksheet which can be corrected to assess learning. (secondary school teacher, Argyll and Bute)

Exemplification

Exemplification of standards at particular levels (through illustration of pupils' work) was requested to support teachers in making reliable assessments of achievement. However, across the responses, this small sample of teachers felt that progression routes were clear and sufficiently flexible to accommodate children starting with Gaelic at different points.

Further elaboration

Clarification was sought in relation to LGL 112I as to whether there was an expectation that children would be able to write about Gaelic culture and traditions in Gaelic. One primary school teacher commented that this was over ambitious at a relatively early stage and might also stretch the skills of a GLPS teacher (LGL 2071).

In a small group response, further clarification of the meaning of LAN362MH was sought: 'to make sense of vocabulary and of the connection between words'

One respondent from a secondary school requested further information on how the outcomes would align with the summative assessment framework in the future.

Re-write/edit as appropriate

Several respondents, at both primary and secondary level, expressed concern that some of the outcomes may prove 'too challenging'. The following were identified as particularly challenging in a small group response from a secondary school: LGL302C, LGL303F, LGL405F, LAN360MG, LAN460MG and LGL406I.

A primary school respondent considered the inclusion of the phrase 'spelling/sound pattern' inappropriate at early and first stage when children are also learning English language spelling and sound patterns (LGL 111H, LGL 001A/B/D/E, LGL 002B, LGL 005H/I). In addition, LAN 256MC was identified as presenting too high a degree of challenge for learners starting Gaelic at P6.

Online questionnaire

A small number of questionnaires were returned in relation to Gaelic Learners. Five online submissions were received from four Local Authorities: Highland, Eilean Siar, Argyll and Bute and Clackmannanshire. These included two small group responses (1-10 people) on behalf of a primary school trialling group and a Local Authority subject network, a whole school response from a primary school and two individual submissions from a Principal Teacher and Depute at different secondary schools. The results of responses to the quantitative aspects of the questionnaire are contained in appendix two.

CPD requirement

Respondents welcomed the promotion of a wider range of teaching strategies in the draft experiences and outcomes. One submission noted that the time committed to Gaelic Learners on the school timetable was limited and suggested that this might constrain the development of strategies to promote 'deep learning'. An individual response from Argyll and Bute suggested that teachers needed to meet together in order to plan 'practical tasks'. It was felt that Authority-wide events were a suitable forum for

the coordination of regional activities and the sharing of good practice. One submission also noted the need for an introductory level pupil textbook.

Exemplification

Requests for exemplification were directed at a need for, 'clear assessment guidelines and exemplars of good practice' (individual response, secondary school). It was suggested that a lack of clarity in the language used raised issues for ensuring consistency across teachers and schools where the draft experiences and outcomes might be interpreted in different ways. The following expressions were deemed to be problematic and requiring exemplification: 'a range.., more extended (than what?), simple (how simple?)'

It was suggested that effective support could be provided,

'by taking examples of Learning Intentions and showing how Success Criteria are measured in a practical context, say a piece of grammar/writing/literature' (individual response, secondary school).

Further elaboration

Three of the five responses did not agree that the draft experiences and outcomes were clearly worded. A group response from a primary school involved in trialling pointed to the use of the term 'sound patterns' in the early level and 'text' in first and second level and suggested that these were not specific enough. A group response from another primary school had anticipated a more 'specific framework'. The subject network, Eilean Siar, suggested that it would be useful for teachers to have access to further details on appropriate 'texts' to support Reading and Talking/Listening e.g. LAN360MG.

Re-write/edit as appropriate

Responses were mixed regarding the degree of challenge offered in the revised curriculum. Where three submissions were positive, responses from the Local Authority subject network and the primary school trialling group indicated that the draft experiences and outcomes were too challenging in relation to writing and for those learners who start with no Gaelic. These submissions indicated a concern with the expected pace of progression between levels. The response from a subject network suggested that the early, first and in some cases second level outcomes were too 'ambitious'. Primary school responses felt that greater attention should be afforded to listening and talking, rather than reading and writing in the early and first stages.

Summary points

The focus group and trialling feedback identified a need for initial and continuing language training for teachers to support this area of the curriculum. Within the focus group a lack of 'child friendly' resources was identified as a potential barrier to

development. One respondent in the small number of submissions to the online survey also highlighted a need for a pupil textbook. Across the three data sources, participants were generally keen to assert that a strong relationship between age and level did not necessarily apply for Gaelic Learners and that variation in progression routes/rates was to be expected. All of the responses to the trialling questionnaire were enthusiastic about the inclusion of Gaelic culture within the curriculum and the opportunity this presented for making links across the curriculum. This was reiterated in the online questionnaire submissions.

EXPRESSIVE ARTS

Introduction

In the following section, the summary findings from the three data sources will be presented. In comparison with other subject areas, the number of respondents/participants for focus groups and trialling questionnaires was relatively low but added feedback was received through the combined 117 online and paper-based questionnaires. Six participants took part in a focus group discussion held in Glasgow on 22nd May 2008. This group contained one primary school teacher, four teachers working in secondary schools and a local authority officer. Trialling feedback was provided through a combination of staff group response, a whole-department response, and individual classteachers, principal teachers and a visiting arts specialist. Eight trialling questionnaires were received. The primary, secondary, special and early years sectors were all represented. Additional feedback was received from external organisations such as Scottish Screen, the Sustainable Development Education Liaison Group and a combined response from the Visual Arts and Galleries Association (VAGA) Scotland and The National Association for Gallery Education.

Focus Group

CPD requirement

Teachers identified challenges in moving away from a perception of the Expressive Arts as delivered, in part, through extra-curricular activities on a voluntary basis. In order to enhance opportunities across the curriculum participants were aware of the need for time for joint planning with teachers of other subjects and the need for a coordinated response to the opportunities presented in the revised curriculum.

I think that the problem that we're having here is actually trying to find examples where it is a part of the core curriculum. How do we make that work when it's not after school and it's not through good will and people devising the units? (ref1, p.17)

Participants recognised that the draft experiences and outcomes presented particular challenges to non-specialists delivering Expressive Arts within the primary sector. It was the opinion of the group that this was exacerbated by the extended width of the levels (duration in years) and the level of generality of the statements.

Specialist teachers will be able to see progression through these big statements, but primary class teachers who have not got the confidence and experience. I really think it's unfair to expect them to understand how they're going to progress through these. First level was from Primary 2 to Primary 4, three years of teaching, how are they going to do that? (ref 1, p.18).

Exemplification

Participants in the Expressive Arts group did not identify particular codes that required exemplification but were concerned to identify a general lack of specific guidance to support future planning. In particular, further guidance was requested on what is meant 'performance opportunity' supported by 'real life example' (ref 3, p.18).

A small number of the group felt that a lack of clarity might adversely affect the pace of change and teachers' capacity to lobby for change within their own context. Participants hoped that the draft experiences and outcomes would scaffold a systematic approach to change but were concerned that other pressures might impinge on this process. Some concern was raised as to whether colleagues would seek to fit current practice to the document or use the document as a basis for critical reflection to inform future developments.

The document doesn't give us anything substantial to go on...I feel it's going to be interpreted by poverty struck schools as, "This wee bit that you're doing in the classroom is going to be fine, or the wee conversation that you had at the photocopier – that's fine, that fits the bill", whereas I get the feeling there should have been much bigger ideas in here and something more concrete that schools would have had to act on, if they really want this to go forward. (ref 2, p.17)

When you look at the outcomes, I feel something's gone missing in between and we've neither got a document that illuminates this any further or gives us anything very specific that we can then go to management levels and authorities and say, "Look, we have been told that this is the way ahead for education, you need to support us". (ref 1, p.20)

Elaboration

Greater clarity was sought on the meaning of terms such as 'enjoy' in relation to assessment. A small number of teachers were concerned that the draft document did not provide sufficient detail to support the development of assessment strategies.

I've written here for the music section, the assessment of it, "I enjoy", "I have experienced", "A sense of achievement". How does one measure that? Where is that in relation to skills and qualities? (ref 2, p.19)

The alignment of the values and principles of the Curriculum for Excellence with pressures for increased levels of pupil attainment was questioned. One participant suggested that teachers were positioned uncomfortably in relation to competing discourses in education for curriculum enrichment and measurable pupil attainment.

The hard fact is we're asked to do two completely opposite things in education. This document's asking us to give children life experiences but on the other hand I have just been asked to deliver better results and these two things to me seem to be going in completely opposite directions...As far as I can see, reading this, the teachers are going to be the piggies in the middle again, who are being asked to deliver two entirely different philosophies at the same time. (ref 4, p.20)

Re-write/edit as appropriate

The terms used in the draft experiences and outcomes to describe the curriculum area evoked some consternation. Participants strongly objected to the use of the term 'magic', which it was felt might have the consequence of trivializing the creative and expressive arts. Participants were keen to defend the status of these subjects and their place in the school curriculum among peers, pupils and parents.

I was bitterly disappointed how they have worded all of this... I think this is going to be the laughing stock of the education world to be quite honest and I think it's summed up in the first sentence, which says "enables me to experience the magic, wonder and power of the arts", which would be fabulous if it was an advert for David Blaine but as an advert for authentic educational and academic subjects, which we still are, I feel that it's unbelievably damaging. (ref 1, p.18)

I was absolutely aghast when I went to the launch of the Expressive Arts, because the majority of people were also saying, "I don't like that sentence, please take it out", but they were determined that they were leaving it in, because it just makes it 'airy fairy' again. We worked for years to get credence for the Arts and it's just blown it away in one fell swoop. (ref 2, p.20)

Although not citing specific examples, several teachers described difficulties in interpreting the draft experiences and outcomes, suggesting they were 'too vague' (ref 2, p.19), 'very loose in its language' (ref 4, p.19) and 'far too open to interpretation' (ref 3, p.19). Two participants among the group suggested that the structure of the document as a whole was not easy to navigate (ref 1, p.19, ref 4, p.19).

I think the clarity of it could have been better. Even though the language seems a bit woolly and broad, even the way it's put together is just really tricky to try and decipher. (ref 4, p.19)

Trialling feedback

CPD requirement

A primary class teacher with less than twenty years of experience acknowledged the many potential advantages of the new curriculum. At the same time, she also provided a detailed explanation of why additional guidance for teachers is required in order to ensure effective implementation of the Expressive Arts draft experiences and outcomes.

'The experiences and outcomes can be challenging if used with imagination but it may be necessary to provide exemplars and some guidance to show how this can be achieved. Many practitioners may be used to the 5 - 14 mindset of "achieve a skill and move on to the next", and may thus miss the opportunities to stretch learners by allowing them to use their skills across a range of activities and contexts. This is a different kind of challenge and it provides more opportunities for learners to take responsibility for their own learning and become

independent learners, building on the skills they have developed and exploring their potential. It may be more challenging for teachers to find ways of facilitating the independent learning which will challenge more able pupils whilst providing the scaffolding to support the less able and less confident.'

This teacher from Perth and Kinross pointed out how the experiences and outcomes present a number of challenges to practitioners. Two other primary teachers described the issue as outcomes being 'not specific enough to ensure development of skills'. They admitted to being puzzled as to the skills that pupils needed to develop. This accords with a large group⁸ response that advocated the need for 'staff training' especially in the area of 'benchmarking' and 'attainment levels' as well as with the views of the early years representative:

'Need to think outside 'the box' and ... need training for practitioners who are less EA-minded.'

There were also suggestions that other related events such as 'regular meetings amongst Arts specialists to exchange ideas', 'in-service talks by pioneers' accompanied by booklets issued to each teacher with a clear explanation of Curriculum for Excellence could help make a difference.

Exemplification

In general, teachers were lobbying for a consistent approach, including assessment across different schools or even with different teachers within a school. In this regard, it was recommended by some primary teachers that specific exemplars in the following areas would be immensely helpful:

- good practice and ideas of how to use the outcomes in relation to the four capacities
- planning and assessment methods
- planning time and space to begin implementation
- planning formats for implementation (at a practical level)
- development of specific success criteria
- generic and specific outcomes
- cross-curricular plans.

Furthermore, as the exemplars will be predominantly used during the planning process, it was also suggested that practitioners be allocated 'time to consult with other staff, especially specialists' to ensure effectual embedding of cross-curricular links. Although it may be deemed a minor point, busy teachers were also asking for guidance in paper form as opposed to electronic versions.

Exemplars were regarded as a very useful resource especially when 'less experienced teachers or those who lack confidence in Expressive Arts' are implementing the revised curriculum. A group response from a primary school suggested that 'further breakdown for non-specialist teachers is a must'. Likewise, a departmental response from the early years sector argued that the drafts are 'a little ambiguous and leave a lot for practitioners

⁸ consisting of more than 11 people

to “interpret”’. They are ‘open to interpretation and [are] causing confusion at a number of levels’.

Further elaboration

A debate amongst practitioners is evident regarding progression. A primary teacher with trialling for four or five months, asserted that ‘[t]he coding of strands makes progression clear for planning purposes, and the language demonstrates a clear progression’. In contrast, other practitioners from Perthshire were not convinced as ‘benchmarks’ and ‘attainment levels’ seem to be missing.

‘[Experiences and outcomes] provide a bass for cross-curricular planning but do not ensure an adequate progression of skills.’

‘Need to be more specific re: skills progression.’

‘good basis for contextualized planning – would debate how progression will occur without clear assessment/recording being developed.’

Early years practitioners were in agreement. There are important questions re: progression/transition for which they seek clarification: ‘[It is] hard to show progression within a level i.e. how do I show to a P1 teacher just what a child has achieved without extensive reporting? Especially if child is going to another school?’

On a more specific level, practitioners from one department asked for further clarification concerning Music technology.

‘Music technology is I understand in relation to all technology related to music making and not just sound technology. Clarification required.’

Re-write/edit

The relevance of Drama EXA 312M⁹ in Expressive Arts was strongly questioned by a Principal Teacher with over 20 years experience. It was suggested that the outcomes and experiences be made more explicit and focused.

‘I disagree entirely with this statement. Each outcome in Drama needs to be much further developed in terms of the development of specific success criteria. Many of the outcomes are too vague and rather woolly, too embedded in the vagueness of 5-14.’

A visiting Arts specialist was very positive about the different aspects of the experiences and outcomes. The only reservation she offered was that ‘[t]he range of knowledge and understanding, attributes and skills is too wide [and] could end in an uneven result’ when it comes to pupil assessment.

⁹ Drama EXA312M i.e. ‘Working on my own or with others, I can create, develop and sustain a believable or stylised character, conveying relationships and situations.’

Online Questionnaire

CPD requirement

Potential integration of Expressive Arts with other subject areas was welcomed by many respondents. However, there were also common concerns that it is 'extremely challenging for staff to deliver' and would require significant levels of CPD.

'...this document lacks clear guidelines in the necessary planning, progression and teaching approaches in order to produce 'successful learners' and 'confident individuals.'

'I am very concerned with the vagueness of this document in general. Although I understand the necessity to keep it open to allow flexibility, there is concern that it is so open and vague that it could be interpreted in so many different ways that consistency between schools would be an issue.'

Practitioners acknowledged that successful implementation of the revised curriculum is dependent on teachers' support. It is vital that teachers 'embrace' the proposed changes and 'make teaching challenging' for pupils. Whilst some practitioners may have engaged with the spirit of the proposed curriculum reform, it is not the case that all teachers have the 'skills' to take developments forward.

'Confident teachers who know and understand Expressive Arts subjects will be able to suitably challenge all children but there are concerns that less confident teachers will be unsure of what the children can achieve. They will need lots of support from specialists.'

'...there may not be consistently good opportunities for deep learning to take place e.g. in pre-five/primary sectors because of staff's perceived lack of their own expertise.'

Exemplification

Practitioners appreciated the fact that since outcomes have an 'open nature' and are not prescriptive, there is 'good potential for creative and flexible approaches to learning and teaching.' However, this positive quality was not free of concern. In terms of promoting 'good teaching', the draft experiences and outcomes 'will require thought and it is not immediately obvious how this would be done'. As a result, the 'openness' of the outcomes may subsequently hinder 'opportunities for deep learning'. It was suggested that without exemplars the document, 'does not really offer direction, merely the desire'.

'The outcomes and experiences can be translated in a number of different ways. Some of the outcomes are minimally different between levels – it is therefore difficult to differentiate between them.'

'Visual examples will be required. It is vital we are given examples showing standards expected.'

Further elaboration

Feedback from a whole primary school states that 'there are concerns that the document lacks guidance on a planning format. The middle years team would like to see more detail in the guidance.' Apart from lacking detail, there are other concerns related to progression and attainment:

The draft is far too general. It needs to be "beefed out" especially for young teachers.

I feel it will be very difficult to monitor progress across the different stages and therefore very difficult for reporting/assessing.

It is very difficult to see any flow of progression.

Some practitioners commented that '[t]here seems to be a natural progression from stage to stage' but for most practitioners, progression is only 'obvious' so long as 'experience' and/or 'expertise' exist.

It was also suggested that further consideration needs to be given to the requirements of students with Additional Support Needs (ASN). According to a special school in Renfrewshire, the draft experiences and outcomes are not suitable for learners with additional needs.

'They provide absolutely no guidance for aspects that I have to be "taught" in drama/art/music. I know that they should be able to adapt to the role. I'm unsure how to develop these skills in drama – that is what I look to the outcomes for guidance on.'

Re-write/edit

Sixty-one references were made to the 'magic, wonder and power of the arts' in the one hundred and seventeen submissions to the online questionnaire. All these references condemned the use of this phraseology – conveying a very strong message about the unsuitability of the phrase. The terminology appears to evoke a sense of embarrassment among Expressive Arts practitioners.

'This phrase is embarrassing and sounds like we are all hippies!! The wording of the overarching experiences for Expressive Arts, in particular "enables me to experience the magic, wonder, power of the arts" demeans all of the hard work that we do in this subject by making it sound like a Harry Potter novel!'

'I think phrases such as magic and wonder make it sound very sweet, naïve and do not really stress the importance of the arts as a subject.'

The issue was raised of how 'magic' might be measured and the messages teachers would be sending to a wider audience.

'...inspired by the magic, wonder and power of the Expressive Arts – If we allow ourselves to be represented by this airy-fairy, irrelevant, immeasurable language, then we have only ourselves to blame when we're not taken seriously by pupils, parents, SMT, etc..'

'...experience the 'magic and wonder' is not a good solid basis to build anything on ... [and] does not promote good teaching.'

Summary

The Expressive Arts focus group was strongly opposed to the use of the term 'magic' in the draft experiences and outcomes, which they felt did not represent and might even undermine the status and standing of the creative and expressive arts. This contrasted with the 'commendable attention' afforded to expressive arts as a group of subjects noted in comments on the draft experiences and outcomes from the Royal Society of Edinburgh (GR015-1). In addition, the group sought further detail to support planning, but acknowledged the influence that an over-emphasis on assessment might have on the principles of the Curriculum for Excellence.

The trialling feedback highlighted Expressive Arts practitioners' need for further guidance and support in different forms – CPD, exemplification and further elaboration. It was noted that many teachers are immersed in the '5 to 14 mindset' and the draft experiences and outcomes pose a significant challenge to their existing philosophies and classroom practice. In order for teachers to be confident in working with the revised curriculum, they would welcome continuing support.

Feedback was also received from a range of other sources. Scottish Screen advocates the inclusion of moving image arts within the definition of 'Expressive Arts'. The Sustainable Development Education Liaison Group endorsed the significant contribution of expressive arts in developing learners' attitudes and interpersonal skills. VAGA Scotland and Engage Scotland were generally positive about the experiences and outcomes. Their reservations were twofold: the outcomes do not appear to be clearly worded and too much is expected of teachers, especially in the secondary sector where there is inherent difficulty working across subject specific boundaries.

There was very strong feedback from those who completed the online questionnaire concerning lack of clarity and lack of guidelines, which makes planning extremely challenging. It was also recognised that experienced teachers may be able to conform and modify their practice easily but a large number of teachers need to learn such 'skills'. Similar to the focus group participants, there was a very strong objection to the use of 'magic, wonder and power' even where they were used as a metaphor. Not only did practitioners find the phrase very patronising, they suggested it was immeasurable and lacks credence in the educational arena. Likewise, the term was perceived to be 'numinous and unfathomable' by Scottish Screen.

SOCIAL STUDIES

Introduction

Thirteen teachers attended a focus group held in Glasgow on 20th May 2008. This group included one teacher from the early years sector, one teacher from a primary school and a special school, seven teachers working in secondary schools, two teachers employed in the independent sector and one representative from a Subject Specialist Network. A small number of practitioners from both the primary and the secondary sector responded to the online and paper-based trialling questionnaire (n=4) but a moderately large number of teachers (n=162) completed the questionnaire posted on the Learning and Teaching Scotland website. Feedback was also received from various groups and organisations with an interest in Social Studies.

Focus Group

CPD requirement

In common with other curriculum area focus groups, the Social Studies group was keen to assert a need for nationally coordinated CPD to support the implementation process. Some participants had benefited from regional CPD sessions and HMle Good Practice sessions, but it was generally felt that these were not available to a sufficiently wide teacher (as opposed to Adviser) audience. Requests for CPD were premised on the need for consistency in provision across schools and between sectors: early years, primary and secondary.

I think there definitely has to be something more central. There's no point in schools beavering away and producing materials and ways of doing this, even Local Authorities, 5-14 is a perfect example, and you get no consistency at all. (ref 4, p. 185)

We have to bring everybody with us. There's no point in Headteachers being aware or Principal Teachers, we have to get it down to the classroom teacher, because they're the ones who are going to deliver it and they need to be given the resources and the time. (ref 4, p.187)

The group acknowledged that financial pressures on Local Authorities restricted the availability of replacement teaching to support attendance at half-day or one-day conferences/events, but emphasised the importance of face-to-face contact over electronic communication (such as GLOW or distribution of CD/DVDs) (refs 5/6, p.185; ref 2, p.187).

The group welcomed opportunities to promote cross curricular links and identified a need to dismantle 'subject barriers' in the secondary phase. They were sensitive, however, of the need not to position a perceived 'subject-centeredness' of the secondary sector as inferior to the 'holistic' approach of primary education.

There seems to be an assumption in some quarters that subject expertise is almost old fashioned and it's one of these aspects of secondary education which is a bit inferior to the holistic approach of, say, primary. I think it's in a sense to mistake the process which pupils go through when they go through from primary to secondary. It's quite important that not just subject knowledge, but subject *enthusiasm*, subject expertise, subject *confidence* is maintained and again, it's another aspect that teachers in secondary feel a bit as though that's under attack (ref 8, p.194)

The draft experiences and outcomes promoted clear links between History and Modern Studies and between Modern Studies and Geography for example, but it was recognized that not all outcomes could be addressed equally through the social subjects. Teachers needed time to meet to identify appropriate links and it was felt by some teachers that Faculty structures had laid the foundation for making such links and establishing opportunities for collaborative work (ref 6, p.186). It was widely acknowledged by the group that primary schools held an advantage in carrying forward cross-cutting themes.

A lot of Secondary colleagues would like to do it but they are tied so much to exam results etc. and it's about management giving them opportunities to work across the curriculum. You'll find with the Eco school initiative, with the Health Promoting School, there are lot more primaries than secondaries that have these awards and it's not because the skills aren't in the secondaries. It's just that it's a different way of thinking and they haven't had the flexibility to work cross-curricular. (ref 8, p.186)

Exemplification

The Social Studies group identified a need for support materials that would assist teachers in translating the draft experiences and outcomes from abstract statements to practical examples that connected with teachers day-to-day practice. Several members of the group suggested that GLOW and HMIE had a significant role to play in sharing good practice and advocated the formation of Local Authority working groups to systematically 'unpack' the outcomes (work that is currently being undertaken, for example, in South Lanarkshire). Improved communication channels were regarded as key to supporting consistent implementation (as illustrated, for example, in East Ayrshire Learning Partnerships). Several participants expressed some scepticism as the degree of engagement beyond small clusters of informed colleagues in schools (refs 1-5, p. 195).

Quite a large number of teachers out there still feel very insecure, at a bit of a loss, that have maybe seen the outcomes but don't really know what they're meant to do with them; and they've got a lot of other work to do, and it's quite time consuming to sit down and work your way through them and to try and work out the practical applications of it. (ref 1b, p.187)

Elaboration

One participant suggested that it would be helpful if clarification was offered on the underpinning rationale that informs the design of the draft experiences and outcomes – the curriculum model on which the revised framework is built.

When the details of the outcomes and experiences were produced, it was difficult at first to see what the kind of design features were, why had they been arranged in this particular way? Particular themes weren't identified and some outcomes combined maybe three or even four different elements, and it becomes quite difficult then to apply those to what you're actually doing at the moment. (ref 1, p.193)

Whilst moving forward in mapping current provision against the draft experiences and outcomes, several participants from secondary schools expressed some reluctance about embarking in substantial changes to practice until further clarification was received about the outcome of the national qualifications review. This was seen as disincentive, slowing down the possible rate of change and adversely affecting initial levels of motivation.

In terms of the Outcomes, Departments within the school are still considering them, but we're not rushing into making any major changes. We're more doing an audit against the Outcomes in terms of what we already do. From our point of view, we really need to know what the examination changes will be at the end of all this. Until we know where we're heading ultimately it's very hard to make any major changes. (ref 2, p. 188)

People were already a bit uncertain about the last stages of the Curriculum for Excellence and the Outcomes and how they fitted in, and now, whereas before in Secondary they were thinking in terms of "What do we do up to the end of second year?", they're now a bit unsure as to what's happening in third and fourth year and I think this has added a further element of insecurity and difficulty for teachers generally. (ref 4, p.188)

Across the group participants requested more information to support the planning of detailed schemes of work. Some participants sought clarification about the level of difficulty of the content within the draft experiences and outcomes. It was acknowledged that the new flexibility within the revised framework challenged established modes of planning. Equally, however, other participants were quick to assert the emphasis on methodology rather than content.

Teachers naturally look at Units: x number of weeks, x number of periods. I welcome the idea that Curriculum for Excellence wants us to think outside of the box in that sense and look at different ways of delivering, but until we know how much we have to talk about income and items of expenditure, for example, between S1 and S3, we're not sure where we're supposed to be going. (ref 5, p.190)

Re-write/edit as appropriate

Very few comments were directed at the wording of the draft experiences and outcomes in the Social Subject group. One participant expressed disappointment that in his opinion the document was not as accessible to pupils as had originally been intended.

I thought the original idea was that these Outcomes were going to be expressed in kind of a language that the pupils themselves might use. I notice that that doesn't seem to be the case and certainly I don't think you'd motivate pupils by giving them these Outcomes. Some teachers are not getting motivated by them (ref 5, p.195)

Trialling feedback

CPD requirement

A primary class teacher from an independent school commented that the experiences and outcomes are not only 'very broad' but also came with a 'massive package' from all other subject areas and thus have implications for the teachers' ability to cope with doing a good job at a very quick pace of change'. They identified 'planning days' and 'residential courses' as the type of professional development activities which would be valuable in helping practitioners move forward.

'Emphasis is on staff to plan, prepare and deliver an appropriate curriculum and methodology to ensure the above is delivered. Staff in-service will be crucial if this is to be successful.'

Responses suggest a mixture of perceptions regarding the vagueness and clarity, looseness and specificity of the draft experiences and outcomes. Several respondents requested further detail to support planning and consistency in assessment.

'[Outcomes] are effective – yes, but how effective are the teachers going to be at delivering this? ... How [will] standards be ensured?'

It was suggested that cross-sector collaboration would be useful in improving transition, generating ideas and resources and sharing good practice.

'Secondary school staff [members] need more support in breaking down subject barriers. A lot can be learned from primary partners. ... More in-service required on co-operative collaborative learning techniques. More opportunities to work with colleagues in formulating "best practice".'

In addition to the provision of high quality courses, many teachers emphasised a need for time to reflect, plan and engage in research:

'...time set aside to think and plan may be the best possible resource. Time to check the available online resources and local community resources available to all teaching staff.'

Exemplification

Practitioners requested exemplars to help them gauge the standards within the revised framework. Exemplars were needed to support assessment and it was suggested that without further exemplification 'there are gaps which teachers may decide to fill and make it "fit".'

'[We are] beginning to work with statements for curriculum planning. ... [We] need examples of best practice [and] more guidance on what standards are expected when reporting.'

A Principal Teacher from Argyll and Bute cited a specific need for the exemplification for 'gradation of skills'. Likewise, in developing such concepts as 'culture', 'heritage' and 'identity', practitioners 'need to tease out these concepts and use them to underpin teaching methods and strategies'.

Further elaboration

Several respondents suggested that the draft experiences and outcomes are 'not always clear' and need to be made more transparent, specific and explicit.

'They are clearly worded but in some instances very broad and vague, which would lead in some occasions to be interpreted as "anything fits".'

'There needs to be clarification of what 'achieving' an outcome/experience looks like.'

Additionally, clarification was sought concerning progression and transition from primary to secondary level. Closer liaison between the primary and the secondary sectors was deemed beneficial.

'I feel it is very difficult to assess the progress within the experiences and outcomes, especially in the transition period from P7 to S1. It will be unclear as to what level pupils are working on unless greater clarification of achievement levels is given.'

It was suggested that assessment using the draft experiences and outcomes tends to be 'very subjective in some areas.' Therefore, in the promotion of a uniform standard and fair assessment, further elaboration, especially between levels, is considered key. A Principal Teacher from Inverclyde argued that it was important that there should be 'a more rigorous way of ensuring standards across subjects'.

Re-write/edit as appropriate

Very few concerns were expressed that were specifically addressed to re-drafting the experiences and outcomes. Instead, the questions asked and the reflections offered by practitioners (below) were directed to the context surrounding Social Studies.

'Is there enough to encourage responsible citizenship?'

'Fear that emphasis on the Scottish 'spine' may lead to an inward-looking generation and ... ignore the relationship between Scotland and the rest of the world.'

'Connections or overlaps' ... There is a great danger of many departments just teaching what they want whether it is being taught elsewhere or not.

Particular concern was expressed about the possibility of duplication due to close similarities between some outcomes. This highlighted a need for coordination and mapping at school level. The following outcomes were identified as raising these issues: 316M, 320P, 321Q and 322Q,

Online questionnaire

CPD requirement

Respondents generally recognised that 'a lot of work is still required at school level to divide the strands up for each stage'. The following questions were typical of those raised by respondents who had reviewed the draft experiences and outcomes:

Where do learning and teaching begin and end?

What do pupils need to know?

How can I plan when I do not know what to plan for?

It was evident from these questions that many teachers are still unsure about how to proceed. As a Principal Teacher from Fife explained, most secondary teachers backward map from a clear 'end point'.

'...I have no idea where the expectations are to lead. As teachers we need to know the "end point". I am aware that as innovators, you are concerned with design, but as teachers, we need to know where we are going.'

It was suggested that even though the outcomes may provide 'a good basis for planning', teachers may require additional support/CPD in order to plan effectively.

Sharing standards that are consistent across all schools was another consideration deemed significant by many respondents. Whilst valuing scope for creativity, further guidance was sought to ensure consistency across schools.

'...is this a free pass to plan and deliver as you wish and what you want to meet local circumstances? This is all very well, but what about standards across schools and across the nation? Is uniformity and consistency abandoned?.'

'[There are] opportunities for teacher creativity in delivery but clear guidelines required to ensure coherence.'

In addition to externally provided CPD opportunities, respondents recognised the professional responsibility of teachers to actively engage with the outcomes and reflect on current practice. Practitioners viewed this as a positive step as they would be encouraged to revise current courses and review the range of learning experiences encouraged.

Exemplification

Similar to other curriculum areas, the draft experiences and outcomes are perceived to be clear, to a certain extent. This prompted respondents to request further guidance, practical models, case studies and first-hand exemplars of lessons plans and activities.

'As a set of values, principles and purposes, the Social Studies experiences and outcomes are clear. To complement this, the publication of more case-studies showcasing practical applications and methods of evaluating outcomes should be valuable.'

'General outcomes clearly worded and show[ing] progression. Further guidance needed on how these to be taught.'

'There have been significant questions from secondary teachers as to how this might be achieved given the current structure of the secondary curriculum and the time restriction this imposes. Building the Curriculum 3 will hopefully focus this discussion, particularly in S1-S3, but it does not provide practical models that are being looked for.'

As highlighted by a response from a local authority group, some aspects of the experiences and outcomes (e.g. cross-curricular links) are particularly challenging for the secondary sector because of the existing structure and subject boundaries. Guidance and exemplars were also sought to demonstrate progression routes. Respondents' comments suggested that teachers are generally supportive of the philosophy of a *Curriculum for Excellence* but remained uncertain as to the 'how' or application component.

Further elaboration

It can be observed that where there is lack of understanding, people either ask genuine questions or sometimes resort to cynicism. Opportunities that will enable practitioners to ask questions, and seek clarification for their questions would be a very good starting point in integrating experiences and outcomes in their practice.

'Superficial learning is the name of the game. I know if I throw away rubbish, it impacts on the environment, does this mean I have achieved?'

Comments such as 'statements are clearly worded but some lack detail' recur throughout the questionnaire submissions e.g. SOC 214L. This could be positive as it gives the teacher a high degree of autonomy, but it could also be considered negative as it can leave them in doubt as to whether or not they have made the right decision.

There appears to be two positions in relation to the clarity of progression routes. Some respondents indicated that a clear and coherent framework for progression is integrated in the draft experiences and outcomes whilst others are unsure.

'There is clear and coherent framework for progression of learning between the levels.'

'...some outcomes are a bit challenging for pupils at Level 1 and 2. We are also in the dark about assessment, especially at Level 3 and this obviously affects the planning of our courses.'

At times, what needs further elaboration is subject-specific.

'More detailed guidance of content is required without going overboard with Scottish history. Also it is crucial to retain subject specialists in secondary schools to avoid some of the basic factual 'errors' in history/geography that we are experiencing among pupils coming from primary school.'

Further guidance and elaboration is considered a significant undertaking because of the many different facets of the outcomes. There seems to be wider recognition of the time involved before teachers can fully implement them all. In the words of an Edinburgh secondary teacher,

'These outcomes will take a long time to be unpacked by individual schools. This is a concern amongst many teachers and is resulting in a negative attitude towards ACfE as they worry about how and when it will be done. More guidance documents and training could be offered by government and local authorities regarding the unpacking of outcomes in order to ease concern and get more schools starting the process early.'

Two other considerations were put forward by secondary teachers to complement further elaboration of draft experiences and outcomes. They are:

'Links with the primaries will be essential to avoid repetition.'

'Need for clear instructions – In order to identify who is doing what? Delivering which parts – will this be left up to individual authorities? Schools?'

Re-write/edit as appropriate

In general, practitioners asserted that the language was clear – but sometimes too ‘wordy’ e.g. 214L. There appears to be some confusion as to who the audience of the document is – are they meant for teachers or pupils?

‘Who are they worded for? The “I can” model is incredibly irritating. This does not seem like a document for professionals.’

Concerns on poorly written outcomes were also aired.

‘We think they are very clumsily worded. We have had to rewrite them in child friendly language. It seems you have tried to amalgamate outcomes into one outcome by making clumsy sentences. SOC 004G should be 2 outcomes. They are very poorly written.’

Context-wise, the outcomes were perceived to be history-focused. There were also discussions about including or excluding teaching a related subject area.

‘...there is far too much emphasis on ‘Scotland’ for ten years study. If pupils opt out of history at the end of S1, even S3, they will have little knowledge of events outside Scotland but will all be good little ‘Bravehearts!’

‘The role of Modern Studies in the curriculum seems to have been compromised with the inclusion of Business Studies? I cannot see the “fit” with traditional Social Subjects.’

‘I think more outcomes should be added to the Social Studies outcomes regarding marketing.’

Summary

The Social Studies focus group was generally very positive about the flexibility, principles and values of the Curriculum for Excellence, especially for the pupils with Additional Support Needs (ref 8, p.198). Participants drew particular attention to the draft documents as a source of critical reflection on current practice and a catalyst for improvement:

‘What it will do is focus cynical staff, less interested staff, on the things that we’ve been trying to do for a very long time: how we teach and what we do and how we do that’ (ref 10, p.188).

Where concerns were raised, these were primarily related to the issue of assessment and this is where greater clarification was sought. It was also recognised that achievement in Social Studies was perhaps more problematic to assess in the short-term (school career) than some other curriculum areas (ref 4, p.191).

‘How is it going to be assessed in terms of hard practice? What are the Inspectors going to be looking for when they come in? How will the pupils themselves know that they’ve achieved what they are expected to achieve?’ (ref 2, p.191)

The trialling feedback had further insight on what teachers think about the implementation of the CfE draft experiences and outcomes. It is not adequate that CfE is an excellent curriculum in its own right; they would like to be part of its success through effective delivery and maintaining high standards.

Many of the practitioners who completed an online questionnaire were actually seeking answers to their own questions. It appears from their questions that there is still uncertainty about the way forward. For them, an 'end point' is crucial as it heavily informs their planning process. They wanted to know where they were going as this is what they perceived to be the 'key' for getting there. Practitioners also anticipate that full implementation of the new curriculum will require many years of 'unpacking'. Clarification regarding progression, transition and subject-specific issues were all deemed significant. Finally, questions over inclusion or exclusion of some related topics was also raised for consideration.

LITERACY AND ENGLISH

Introduction

The following section draws on analysis of transcripts from four regional focus groups involving forty-one education professionals. Focus groups of ninety minutes duration were convened during May 8-13th 2008. The section also reports key messages from a range of trialling feedback proforma submitted by seven local authorities in the period up to 4th July 2008. Fifty print documents were submitted, including forty-three paper and online questionnaires. Trialling feedback included planning documents, lesson plans and evaluation proforma, examples of pupils' work, photographs of learning activities and supporting resources. Collation of responses was affected by considerable variation in the extent to which respondents completed requests for identifiers and contextual information such as outcome codes, sector (early years, primary, secondary, special school) and the status of the responses (individual or group response). Feedback was offered using a number of different (print) questionnaire formats. Thirteen copies of plans for trialling the draft experiences and outcomes were submitted by teachers employed by Dundee City Council in addition to trialling questions. In reviewing the trialling feedback, the documents suggest that many teachers used the proforma to support their own reflection rather than to offer a systematic evaluation for reporting purposes.

Trialling feedback was received from the following local authorities:

1. Dundee City
2. East Dunbartonshire
3. East Renfrewshire
4. Fife
5. Highland
6. North Ayrshire
7. North Lanarkshire

In addition, 125 submissions were received in response to the curriculum area questionnaire for English and Literacy.

Focus Group

CPD Requirement

Some participants emphasised a need for the development of materials and training at a regional or national level, although there was an awareness of the financial implications for local authorities in meeting training needs vis-a-vis competing priorities (ref 7, p.4). Participants were concerned with the issue of consistency and spoke of the need to avoid 'all going off to our little corners' (ref 2, p.1), 'individuals schools coming up with their own local solutions' or 'reinventing the wheel' (ref 4, p.1). However, this should not be interpreted narrowly as a request for greater prescription as participants requested 'guidance from above *and* sharing amongst ourselves' (ref 3, p.1). Whilst asserting a

rejection of 'a very structured curriculum' (ref 3, p.42), participants sought further guidance to initiate development work within their own context.

You're not going to put your foot on a path that does not exist. You'll never get out of the forest, but if somebody says here's... and gives you an exemplar you will be more inclined to see if it works, see if it's the best. (ref 1, p.47)

In asserting that 'professionals will want to do this properly' participants requested opportunities for peer dialogue and collaboration following enhanced guidance and support (ref 5, p.1), especially between the primary and secondary phases and 'not just promoted staff' (ref 8, p.42). Several participants expressed some concern regarding sharing information on prior knowledge and achievement and the need to develop more effective channels of communication between primary and secondary partners (ref 2, p.6). Across the four groups a high value was attached to 'personal contact' and 'interaction' in recognition of the value of dialogue in supporting learning. As one participant commented: 'if that's what the whole thing is supposed to be about for pupils, then I think it would have to be about that for teachers as well. More interaction' (ref 4, p.42)

My experience of working with secondary colleagues, they are desperate to meet with primary teachers and just to talk and to look at these things. They were interested in looking at teachers planning and how primary teachers plan. Because, you know, perhaps there is a sort of mutual ignorance... on what was actually involved and I am sure there are answers both ways that would make the situation easier. So I think it has to do with collaborating and sharing some of the brass tacks on how you would put that together on paper even. (ref 6, p.2)

We need time not just to work within our own schools but across sectors as well ... I think it would be hugely rewarding for both sections to do that because I think it would clarify a number of issues... in my experience working in a cluster it works best when we actually say right okay we are working on a joint project, what's the nitty gritty of it? When you start teachers like that then suddenly they get quite animated and quite excited because they are engaged as professionals (ref 4, p.3)

The value of the document as a mapping tool, supporting the development of good practice, was also generally recognised:

I think it's going to be a very useful tool in my department just bringing all the good practice together and then building on it and taking it forward in a kind of uniform way, in a clear direction, once they give us the national qualification. (ref 1, p.72)

Whilst seeking further guidance and exemplification, teachers were not renouncing responsibility for active interpretation of the experiences and outcomes and consideration of their application in the specific context of their own school settings. It was suggested that such a process of deliberation might be professionally enhancing but would have significant implications in terms of staff time and department/section budgets as schools carried forward plans and developed new materials and activities (ref 9, p.5). A small number of teachers suggested that the provision of materials without opportunity for school-level collaboration would produce limited impact. Drawing comparisons with

the *Journey to Excellence* website, one participant commented: 'Anybody can watch it on their own, but unless you have that collaborative view within your school, then it's not going to impact on practice throughout the whole school' (ref 9, p.43). Participants were generally keen to assert the importance of 'time to think and talk about this' (ref 3, p.63).

I personally as Head would have anxieties about how much time that would require to really get a true understanding as a staff what an outcome means...I think it would be a wonderful opportunity to sit and do that as a professional, to have the opportunity and the time to really work through what we want. (ref 6, p.42)

Exemplification

Drawing comparisons with the 5-14 documentation, a request was made for further 'illustrations' (ref 1, p.5) supported by 'some form of moderation or standardisation' (ref 3, p.64). The HGIOS Level 5 illustrations were suggested as good model (ref 2, p.45), as were the equivalency statements that accompanied the introduction of higher and intermediate courses (ref 6, p.68). Summing up some general concerns around 'measurement', one participant expressed a need to know: 'where they should be and what they should be able to do and how we measure whether they're doing that' (ref 5, p.64).

The cross-curricular focus of literacy was identified by several participants as presenting a particular need for clear exemplification to reduce differing interpretations in the secondary context and to support the development of joint work between clusters of subjects.

Looking at it from a secondary point of view, I think for 5-14 as an English teacher that was our subject. But if this literacy is across the system, across all subjects, then the vagueness of it is a problem because you are talking about more people who can interpret it more widely. I think it needs to be a lot more focussed. Not necessarily restrictive but there needs to be clarity if there is a lot of other subjects. (ref 6, p.6)

Whilst acknowledging greater degrees of 'sophistication' between levels, a request was made for greater clarity in focus, especially to support pupils interpreting the draft experience and outcomes. For example, the need to 'explore *problems* and create a new text' appears in the third level and to 'explore *issues* and create a new text' in the fourth level (ref 5, p.8).

Further Elaboration

Drawing on experiences of teachers' interpretations of the purposes of the literacy curriculum, one participant identified a need to strengthen the definition of literacy in the supporting documents. It was suggested that there is an assumption that literacy development is interpreted by some teachers as a concern relevant to less able pupils.

I do think there are issues with the definition of literacy and people have different definitions of it. The official definition that comes through supporting documents with the outcomes, I don't think that is necessarily widely accepted. I have come across a lot of people who think of it as simply what you do with your least able pupils in order to allow them to access literacy. It's much more, it encompasses all abilities. So I think there is still work to be done with 'what is literacy', what do we mean by it and getting that message out there and perhaps through that encouraging people to take it on. (ref 1, p.6)

A small number of teachers had questions about expected rates of progression and curriculum coverage within stages. One participant expressed uncertainty regarding breadth of coverage: 'would our pupils be expected to achieve every outcome at the early stage or is it you can pick and choose the ones that you would be most interested to do?' (ref 2, p.49)

Some uncertainty was expressed regarding how teachers were to judge appropriate levels of proficiency within the different stages, but this was countered by an acknowledgement that the revised curriculum was explicit in its encouragement of different degrees of 'pace and challenge'. The draft experiences and outcomes challenged teachers' skills and confidence in assessing different levels of performance and in providing sufficiently personalised learning opportunities for pupils. One participant commented on a perceived 'lack of clarity on how and when and who will do the assessment of these skills' (ref 8, p.68)

The focus is so wide... We've got big concerns about when on that stage would we hope to do it. Would it be early? Would it be middle? Would it be late? Are we talking secondary? Are we talking seven year olds? (Ref 5, p.6)

The preamble also talked about the pace and the challenge so the statement has to be wide enough to allow pace and challenge so you would expect children to be performing at different skill levels within it. (Ref 6, p.6)

How are we going to assess such wide statements and go from P2 to P4? How are we going to report back taking it onto the next transition stage? That is very important otherwise we are going to have children who are very able who may not be challenged enough because everybody is thinking how are we going to move further on or not and other children might be over challenged.

Re-write or edit as required

One of the four literacy and English groups suggested that literacy should be separated from the English document to enhance the cross-curricular focus.

It has to be embedded in the documents for all the other subjects. If it's to be taken as seriously as I think Learning Teaching Scotland want it to be taken by teachers of different disciplines, it has to be in there from the word go. We've missed the boat already on that one, so we have to get in there as quickly as we can or else it will always be viewed as the job for an English teacher (ref 14, p.70)

A small number of participants questioned whether the phrasing of the draft experiences and outcomes for a pupil audience would be effective in eliciting the desired level of engagement. It was suggested that school processes deployed by teachers, as principle users of the documents, might not support the forms of pupil self-assessment anticipated. In one group a participant suggested that the statements were 'passive' rather than 'empowering' (ref 1, p.54). Other teachers suggested that the language was 'too difficult to understand' (ref 1, p.72).

I'm concerned about the language of all of this. The fact that it is written in 'I can' and 'I am' statements. But in actual fact the vocabulary that is in it is actually for the professionals. It's for us... It seems to me that is kind of a ticky box thing for kids doing their personal learning plans. They are just going to go 'Oh yeah, I'm doing that, I'm doing that' and they will just tick the box all the way through. I'm also concerned about words like 'developing' and 'awareness' and 'relevance' because they are not concrete enough. They are just sort of vague words, and they are not, well of course they are not tied to any assessment framework, so it is how well, how much, how often, how regularly, how consistently. It just seems very strange that it is written in this kind of 'I can' and 'I am' phrases and yet the language is the language for professionals. (ref 4, p.8)

Participants across the four groups generally welcomed the principles and values of the Curriculum for Excellence and found the cover paper useful in providing important contextual information and guidance. A key concern was the subsequent move from a 'high level' of explanation to the level of detail required by practitioners to support planning. Participants generally endorsed the 'vision' but sought more 'specific' detail (ref 4, p.64)

Teachers immediately want to pick up the actual outcomes and try to translate that into your practice and I worry that the language is not always clear. When you're referring to parts of the outcomes it can be difficult for practitioners to really understand what it is that we're actually talking about. (ref 1, p.52)

Trialling Feedback

CPD requirement

The trialling feedback contains repeated requests for more guidance on assessment, especially from early career stage teachers (those with under five years teaching experience). All four of the less experienced teachers completing proforma from North Lanarkshire expressed concerns around assessment. Across the feedback proforma the section relating to evidence (question 12) was completed in very general terms with few respondents (across the career stages) providing consideration in any degree of detail. Whilst this may reflect the very real time constraints on teachers completing the proforma, it may indicate a need for closer attention to processes of assessment in relation to specific outcomes. When asked to suggest types of evidence teachers would need to gather to demonstrate what the children and young people have achieved in

relation to a specific outcome, the majority of respondents offered a list of products – such as photographs, video, audio records, diaries, jotter work – or offered the ‘catch all’ of ‘formative and summative assessment’. Within the feedback proforma, a close and explicit relationship was not established between methods of assessment and intended experiences and outcomes.

Of those respondents identifying CPD needs, the majority requested time for teachers to meet with peers to discuss the draft experiences and outcomes in more detail and to develop a whole school approach.

Several responses provided through the trialling feedback identified a need for more resources, especially a variety of texts and Scots language texts. Respondents also identified a need for enhanced ICT provision in schools supported by further training in GLOW. Whilst welcoming opportunities to use a variety of media, several teachers expressed a lack of confidence in technology supported learning. One respondent requested ‘meaningful media CPD for beginners’ and observed that ‘ipods/MP3s are in schools but are not being used’.

Exemplification

Consistent with requests for further support for assessment, several respondents suggested that a weakness of the draft experiences and outcomes was a lack of detailed guidance that would support classroom practice. An early career teacher in North Lanarkshire typifies responses by suggesting that the main weakness of the draft document from a teacher’s perspective is the lack of ‘something more specific to aid their teaching’ (responding to LIT 213P). More specifically, many respondents identified what they felt was a lack of guidance on how to show progress and requested models of good practice attached to practical examples of pupils’ work. In describing uncertainty around the assessment of progress, teachers were indicating a need for illustrative ‘walkthroughs’ (Campbell, 2007) that would take practitioners through examples step-by-step.

Further elaboration

Some concern was expressed by several respondents about possible variance in how teachers would interpret the draft experiences and outcomes. It was suggested that there was ‘room for progression on paper but it will depend on how schools unpack the outcomes’ (LIT 001A/M; 002A/L/W).

In response to the question of whether the draft experiences and outcomes made clear the knowledge and understanding expected to be developed, a primary school Depute questioned whether the word ‘enjoy’ demonstrated a knowledge or understanding of an outcome (North Lanarkshire, LIT 001A.M; 002A/L/W).

A group response (6-10 people) from a secondary school in Fife requested additional exemplar materials showing progress within each stage to support teachers adjusting to the greater breadth of the stages in the revised framework. This group also pointed to possible difficulties in assessing individual achievement through collaborative learning

tasks. Similarly feedback from trialling the draft experiences and outcomes at the second level in a Dundee primary school suggested that whilst it is clear what children need to do to progress, it is less clear when children will have achieved a particular level.

'Difficult to distinguish between what is expected at different levels. For example, ENH 219V expects a pupil to 'discuss structure', ENG 319V expects a pupil to 'discuss and comment'. It is difficult to envisage a discussion that doesn't include some kind of comment. Requirements at different levels seem broadly synonymous – it is the strapline that would help planning/progression' (Group response from East Dunbartonshire secondary school)

Responses from an East Dunbartonshire special school questioned whether the breadth of the draft documents was helpful in supporting learners with severe and complex learning difficulties. Teachers employed in this setting identified a need for the draft experiences and outcomes to be 'broken down' in more detail to support the identification of individual targets: 'steps need to be specific and very small for our children'. For example, an individual response from an experienced teacher suggested that outcome LIT 002A/L/W needed to be considerably re-worked to be applicable in a special school setting. The outcome needed 'to be differentiated, individualised, enhanced, elaborated and adapted'.

Feedback from a North Ayrshire primary school also highlighted issues in responding to the draft experiences and outcomes in the particular context of a small school setting:

'Progression from first to second level has implications in a composite P1/2 or P1/2/3 class i.e. the mixture of active to more formal has to be balanced'

Such responses stress the need for the revised curriculum framework to be adaptable to meet the needs of learners across diverse educational settings and of the importance of meeting the support needs of practitioners engaged in planning and development processes.

Re-write/edit as appropriate

In common with one of the four Literacy and English focus groups, a group response (6-10 people) from a secondary school in Fife suggested that English and Literacy curriculum areas should be presented as two separate documents.

Some concern was expressed by a small number of teachers regarding the wording of draft experiences and outcomes in the first person (East Renfrewshire, North Ayrshire). Feedback from a North Ayrshire primary school suggested that 'using the child as first person using adult language and concepts is patronising and confusing'. A small number of respondents also suggested that there were too many over-arching statements for pupils cope with and that the language may not be accessible to all learners.

In a minority of cases respondents were challenged by the volume of text within the overall draft experiences and outcomes. The following description of the draft document was provided in trialling feedback from secondary school teachers in Dundee:

'Unwieldy and need to be tailored to the needs of the average English department. The actual bulk of material to be read before planning a lesson is

completely off-putting'

'The wording is too similar between levels. I also feel the wording at times is vague and that there is simply too much to take on board'

Further elaboration or re-wording was suggested in relation in ENG 329/429AG.

'Because of the nature of the subject, descriptions are necessarily subjective. We would need examples of what, for example, 'convincing' represents in ENG 329 AG and ENG 429AG. We are also unsure why ENG 329AG requires pupils to 'recreate' a personal response, while ENG 429AG requires pupils to 'create'.
(Group response from East Dunbartonshire secondary school)

From the range of trialling feedback it is clear that the majority of respondents were enthusiastic about the opportunities presented by the draft experiences and outcomes. Typical responses welcomed the emphasis on creativity, innovation and responsiveness to learners' needs.

'Allows teachers to be creative around outcomes'
'Allows teachers to plan their ideas around outcomes'.
'Encourages active learning'

To capitalise on these enhanced opportunities, teachers identified a need for dedicated time to support sustained planning discussions and resource development. It was acknowledged by respondents involved in the trialling process that greater attention needs to be afforded to 'processes' or teaching 'methodology' in the documentation. This concern was attached to requests for exemplar materials and illustrative examples of assessment processes. Teachers identified a particular need for further support in distinguishing between what is expected at different levels. This was a concern expressed most strongly by teachers with less than five years experience.

Online questionnaires

CPD requirement

Where respondents identified a need for CPD this was most often expressed in terms of building the capacity and confidence of teachers to implement the revised curriculum. It was acknowledged that a 'less restrictive' curriculum presented opportunities and challenges, which required continuing support. It was acknowledged that the relative success of Assessment for Learning was significant in providing a foundation for changes in pedagogy.

I value the specific inclusion of formative assessment in the draft outcomes, which promote deep learning - providing teachers are allowed time to concentrate on this instead of the need to teach to the test!

In order to promote deep level learning adults must concentrate on developing a rich environment which is conducive to the process of learning rather than products or outcomes.

Serious CPD is required to build staff confidence.

It was further acknowledged that teachers needed organisational support in-school, as well as the provision high quality external CPD, especially in making effective cross-curricular links and promoting literacy across the curriculum. A small minority of respondents were concerned that the combination of English with Literacy in a single document would position literacy as the responsibility of teachers of English Language.

Will require huge support/commitment from management regarding issues such as timetabling staffing, coop teaching, time to plan/resource etc

Quality time for liaison across secondary subjects and faculties, with primary sector is crucial for success. If this is not addressed we will be no better off than currently.

Exemplification

A key concern of respondents was the capacity of the draft experiences and outcomes to provide a sound basis for planning. 40% (n=49) of respondents did not give a positive response to the statement: 'Overall, the draft Literacy and English Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in Literacy and English'. Several respondents expressed some uncertainty about how to take developments forward within the wider stages of the revised framework. Teachers requested more detailed information on each of the different stages and exemplification of differences/case studies between levels of learning. There was a concern to avoid 'gaps' and 'duplication' in order to support continuity and progression.

A few concrete examples of good practice would be helpful, though in principal I can see how they fall in to my teaching, if we are to be assessed on these criteria it would be useful to make sure everyone is singing from the same hymn sheet.

Elaboration

Concern that the draft experiences and outcomes were 'vague', 'woolly' and hence open to varying interpretations was a strong recurring theme across the open responses to the questionnaire. Several respondents commended a perceived extension of 'professional autonomy' and 'professional judgement' in the revised curriculum, but were anxious to receive more detailed guidance to support considered judgments. Teachers in the secondary sector were also concerned with aligning develops with summative assessment.

It provides the opportunity and the framework, but fails to offer any practical blueprint or curricular model for bringing this about and there are huge planning and practical issues involved here which are barely touched on.

The outcomes seem more of a philosophy than a teaching tool. The general nature of the outcomes help open ended planning, but are not specific enough to help planning of work linked to external assessment. You must answer the assessment question properly

Although clearly worded, they are vague and open to vast interpretation and it will be difficult to measure consistently depth and breadth of learning.

The following items were identified as lacking in clarity by four respondents: ENG 101A/L/W, ENG 201 A/L/W. A small number of respondents were concerned with an apparent close similarity between levels, for example ENG 311M and ENG 411M and LIT112N and LIT 113P.

How do you distinguish a child's level if the criteria are similar?

It should be noted however that in a minority of cases there was an acknowledgement that greater familiarity in the context of practice allayed initial reservations. One teacher commented that only with greater engagement did a shift in emphasis from content/direction to an understanding of process/opportunities become apparent.

At first read, the wording seems quite vague but once read carefully a few times, they are actually quite clear. It may be the turnaround from what the teacher will do to what the pupils will experience that takes a while to grasp.

Re-write/edit as appropriate

A significant proportion of respondents commented on the use of the first person and questioned whether the level of difficulty of the language was appropriate for pupils, especially those with additional support needs e.g. the use of the term 'collaborative'. 28% of respondents did not offer a positive response to question one of the survey: 'The draft English and Literacy Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded'; 18% (n=22) of respondents disagreed and 10% (n=12) strongly disagreed with this statement. 83 of the 125 respondents (66%) offered a comment in relation to this question of which 22 (26%) explicitly mentioned the accessibility of the language for a pupil audience.

If the outcomes are intended for pupil use they would need to be expressed in simpler terms.

The outcomes are not pupil-friendly.

Not simple enough for a pupil to understand.

They would have to be simplified to be meaningful for pupils.

Some language is too complex to be used and understood by the learner.

More specifically a smaller number of respondents (n=6) questioned the audience for the document:

While the wording is clear for teachers, the use of First Person seems inappropriate given that pupils, even beyond Third Level, are unlikely to discuss/express their progress in such terms.

Not clear who the audience is – written from pupils' point of view, but for teachers.

A small minority of comments were directed at the presentation of the document itself. One respondent suggested that the layout might be improved by presenting all the outcomes for particular areas on a single A3 sheet e.g. Listening and Talking, Reading and Writing.

A significant proportion of comments were directed at the neglect of the role of the school library in English Language and Literacy education. It was frequently suggested that the resources of the school library, including the expertise of school librarians, was not considered in the draft experiences and outcome.

Summary points

Analysis of data from the above sources suggests the following strong themes. Teachers welcome the flexibility within the revised framework and the enhanced professionalism that this implies. They would however welcome opportunities for joint planning and the sharing of good practice at school, regional and national levels. Such collaborative activity might address continuing concern among a small number of teachers regarding variations in interpretation across the profession. Exemplification of good practice would be an important scaffold to further teacher-led development. The most pressing concern expressed across the four focus groups was a lack of confidence in using the draft experiences and outcomes to assess progress within and between the wider levels. Many teachers, for example as evidenced in an institutional response from a secondary school English department, identified significant challenges in ensuring 'standardisation of the interpretation of the outcomes and the assessment of whether they have been achieved' (GR-044). A further group response from a secondary school suggested that 'non-specific definitions of achievement' would make moderation difficult (GR-040). These were also recurring themes in responses to the online questionnaire.

The most severe reservations were expressed in comments from the Royal Society of Edinburgh that identified a relative neglect of the development of linguistic knowledge in the draft experiences and outcomes. It was argued that the proposed curriculum may not equip learners with the necessary skills to 'analyse formally the structure of written and spoken English' and hence support progress in 'writing and the interpretation and analysis of texts' (GR015-1, p.2)

'There is no attention to fundamental understanding – no systematic discussion of grammar, spelling, syntax, pragmatics, register or rhetoric' (GR015-1, p.2)

Some concern was expressed about the positioning of the Literacy experiences and outcomes within the Literacy and English framework only. This was noted in one of the

focus groups and also in feedback from the two secondary schools (PER-006) (GR-040). It was argued that if literacy was indeed the responsibility of *all* teachers then the experiences and outcomes should be embedded across curriculum areas.

In developing resources and materials to support implementation there are possibilities for collaboration with specialist organisations such as the Sustainable Development Education Liaison Group (SDELG) (GR-030). In comparing the draft experiences and outcomes against the recommendations offered in *Sustainable Development Education in a Curriculum for Excellence* (SDELG, 2006), a shared concern was noted with the promotion of critical literacy and the sustainable development education skill of reflective evaluation. It should also be noted however that critical literacy would include an understanding of 'sustainability' as a contested issue (a point made in comments from the Royal Society of Edinburgh (GR015-1, p.3)).

LITERACY AND GAIDHLIG

Introduction

Ten teachers attended a focus group held in Stornoway on 20th June 2008. Participants included four primary school teachers, five teachers working in secondary schools and one local authority officer. A limited number of trialling feedback proforma were received. Trialling feedback includes five print documents submitted for consideration from four local authorities and seven responses to the online trialling questionnaire. The response rate to the curriculum area online questionnaire was similarly low, with only four electronic (and no paper copies) received.

Focus Group

CPD requirement

The Literacy and Gaidhlig focus group suggested two areas where further support would be helpful. Participants welcomed the greater emphasis placed on listening and talking in the draft document and suggested that CPD would support teachers in responding to this shift in emphasis. Second, in common with many of the curriculum area focus groups, participants requested a common planning template 'from the centre', which could be adapted to meet the needs of particular school settings. It was suggested that the provision of a common planning structure would free teachers to focus on the generation of teaching resources and activities. These comments intersected with general concerns regarding the extent to which routine administrative tasks deflect teachers' attention from their core concerns as classroom teachers.

'you can then as a teacher use your skills to be as creative as possible, to put your energies into what you want to do looking at the Draft Outcomes and Experiences, rather than spend too much time on a planned format' (ref 4, p.55)

'The time that we're spending on the admin is all taking away from the creativity and the planning and the preparation for our pupils who are the most important but seem to, at certain times of the year, go on the back burner, because of the admin side. (ref 5, p.57)

In the secondary phase, teachers identified a need to come together at a local level to generate new materials and activities to motivate and engage learners. In this way the Curriculum for Excellence would further encourage the development of cross-curricular links. There was some evidence within the group that processes for peer learning were already in place and developing as schools responded to the need to implement the draft experiences and outcomes (p.56). It was suggested that GLOW might play a useful role in helping schools share locally developed resources with a wider professional audience. In an organisational response to the draft experiences and outcomes, Scottish Screen reported that they could provide advice on the selection of appropriate Gaidhlig language material to support the curriculum (GR034).

With departments working together and across departments, they can come up with opportunities for motivating activities, because that can happen in a group situation where some teachers are more arty, some teachers are more, you know...Even if this room just now we're hearing of things that are going on and I think if teachers work together in small groups and discuss things it'll help them to come up with ideas. (ref 3, p.56)

We're all stabbing in the dark, doing our own thing but we're having a go at least; seeing what works and what doesn't work. (ref 6, p.58)

Teachers working in the primary phase – and therefore covering all areas of the curriculum - were particularly keen to assert a need for on-going support throughout the first year of implementation.

Planning is vital in the Primary sector - and in the Secondary as well - and I think we would most certainly benefit from any format or anything that was deemed to be useful coming from the Authority in the first instance. (ref 5, p.55)

Exemplification

Related to the focus on support for planning, participants highlighted a need for more detailed consideration of skills development guided by the experiences and outcomes. Teachers among the group recognised the importance of demonstrating clear links between classroom activities undertaken and the development of pupils' capacity for self-evaluation. It was suggested that HMIE would have a role in supporting this development.

No use the children saying, "Look at that lovely picture we did, and that frieze we did, and there's a book we put together". "What skills did you learn doing that? It all looks pretty and I know you put a lot of work in it, but what skills did you learn and how did you move on through your skills base?" Like, "I could do speech marks but now I need to learn how to do paragraphs". So it's the skills, how the children know they're getting from one bit...We still have to get the skills behind that in the planning. (ref 2, p.58)

Elaboration

The group expressed general concern about consistency in interpretation across teachers and schools and the need for moderation procedures to cross-check the reliability of teacher assessment. Again, teachers were not rejecting a professional responsibility for active interpretation of the document, but rather were acknowledging the challenges this brings and the implications for continuing support. Exemplification of assessment practice would assist schools in moving forward with confidence.

I feel that a lot of them are open to interpretation by a teacher. So there's an awful lot of moderation needed, because one teacher, if it says, "I offer a range of something" – now, a range to one teacher could be this, and a range to another

teacher could be that, so the pupil who has this teacher, it's a different experience. (ref 1a, p.61)

Although it can be a good thing that these outcomes are up to staff interpretation, I think, as Head Teachers, we will have to monitor very carefully what is being done and how things are being covered. (ref 1b, p.61)

Re-write/edit as appropriate

Participants suggested that the draft experiences and outcomes did not provide sufficient detail to support teachers conducting assessment. In particular it was felt that differentiation between levels was not always clear and further guidance was needed to enhance teachers' confidence in using the document. The area of writing, in particular, was identified as 'very vague' (ref 1, p.61).

My first impression of the Learning Outcomes is that they're not specific enough. They're too broad, for example, I was reading the Outcomes for the third level and looking at the Outcomes for the fourth level and I wasn't seeing any difference, quite often. And then I started looking at the first and second levels and I was seeing similarities there as well. (ref 1, p.60)

It was suggested that the draft experiences and outcomes were not phrased in language that was immediately accessible to all learners. Although presented in first person, it was questioned whether the document would support reflection on learning.

I think it would be great if there was a pupil friendly version of this. It says, "As I listen" and "I can" but I can't see how even a first or second year child could understand a statement like this: "As I take part in conversations I can use familiar and new vocabulary, phrased in Gaelic idiom which I use to engage in a coherent manner, using extended vocabulary and more complex language structures". How could a child understand what that means? If that was put in simplified language, with even examples of what's meant, bullet points of what that could mean, I think that that would be a very good thing. (ref 2, p.61)

To assist teachers in working with the document, one participant suggested that it would be helpful to have a single summary sheet for each level which contained all the outcomes in one page view.

My main, not problem, but issue with it is that there are far too many pieces of paper. If you only have one stage in your class, then I really think, if for listening and talking that for, say, the early stage, or the first level, then you should just have all the Outcomes on one page, so you're not constantly trawling through pieces of paper. (ref 1d, p.61)

Trialling feedback

CPD requirement

The trialling feedback highlighted a need for targeted funding to support the development of courses and materials/activities in the early implementation period. A small group response (2-5 persons) from a North Lanarkshire primary school requested CPD in 'active' and 'creative' methodologies (LG-01B).

Exemplification

Respondents generally welcomed 'the opportunity for creativity with regards to planning' (LG-01B) but sought further direction to support the planning process in school. It was suggested that more detailed examples would be valuable as schools carried developments forward.

Elaboration

More detailed guidance was requested to support teachers in assessing the progress of senior pupils' in secondary schools; although it was acknowledged that the outcome of the national qualifications review would influence this. As one Highland secondary school teacher commented: 'Secondary schools, like it or not, have to have the end-point and how pupils will gain qualifications in mind' (LG-01A).

In responding to Q.8 'the provision of opportunities for motivating activities for all children and young people, including those who need more choices, more chances', it was noted that there is no explicit mention of this policy objective in the draft experiences and outcomes. However, as the following response from a West Dunbartonshire primary school notes, the de-cluttering of the curriculum and the emphasis on engagement and choice, were regarded as likely to enhance pupil motivation.

Because teachers will have the freedom to choose, the curriculum will be less restrictive. Children will be able to make choices which they will see as relevant. They will be given opportunities to enjoy and share (LG-02).

Re-write edit as required

Respondents did not identify specific statements as requiring re-write or edit. The wording of the draft experiences and outcomes was considered to be accessible to children. The guidance relating to reading strategies was considered to be particularly useful (LG-02).

Online questionnaire

Four completed questionnaires were returned for Gaidhlig and Literacy. Responses were received from Highland, Eilean Siar and South Lanarkshire (see appendix 2). No paper copies were returned.

CPD requirement

Respondents noted the enhanced skills required of classroom practitioners in supporting the revised curriculum. A Local Authority response suggested that progress made through Assessment is for Learning in sharing learning intentions would support the implementation of the draft experiences and outcomes but that continuing support would be necessary to share good practice.

Reviewing the outcomes and following the lines of progression, they appear to challenge and extend learning and experiences for pupils...However, the unknown variable are the class teachers and the way in which they interpret and use the outcomes, to provide good experiences for all children. The necessity to include a wide range of contexts and progress skills will be challenging for all but the very good classroom practitioners. (Highland Local Authority response)

The lack of Gaelic texts to support learning was cited a resource issue in the Highland Local Authority response. Provision of a glossary of some of the Gaelic language was also recommended.

Exemplification

Case studies of planning were suggested as an appropriate scaffold to support teachers as they 'unpacked' the draft experiences and outcomes.

Elaboration

Two respondents requested further guidance on mapping and monitoring progress to avoid duplication and to ensure continuity and progression. Guidance on reporting to parents was also raised as progression across the wider stages may show little rate of progress at an early stage.

Re-write/edit as appropriate

Two points were raised in relation to possible revision of the wording of the draft experiences and outcomes for Gaidhlig and Literacy. First, one respondent suggested that the term 'enjoy' was not helpful in making judgments about the achievement of learning outcomes.

I'm do not like the use of the word 'enjoy' as in "I enjoy exploring and discussing word patterns..." GAI 101A You can do this without actually 'enjoying' it. How can you asses if someone is 'enjoying' it? Surely the main thing is that they are 'doing' it and 'learning' from it? (Principal Teacher, Primary School)

Second, it was suggested that the draft experiences and outcomes contain an imbalance between literacy and Gaelic in the early level, and do not consider the needs of children for whom Gaelic is not their first language.

Early and First levels are the most important stages for acquiring Gaidlaig so GAI specific outcomes and experiences should reflect this. As they stand, all bar one of the Early level draft Literacy and Gaidlaig Experiences and Outcomes are literacy and not Gaidlaig. Pupils coming into Gaelic Immersion do not necessarily come in with the Gaelic language and so the Infant teacher has to teach the language before the other areas of the curriculum can be fully addressed. The draft Literacy and Gaidlaig Experiences and Outcomes would need to have at the very least, for example, the Early level Gaelic Learners draft outcomes and experiences added. (South Lanarkshire Local Authority response)

Summary points

Respondents were generally enthusiastic about the opportunities presented in the revised curriculum for tailoring learning experiences to real life contexts and the promotion of cross-curricular work. The focus group, in particular, welcomed the opportunities to reflect on current practice and the scope afforded to teachers to respond creatively in taking developments forward; this endorsement of greater flexibility, within a clear framework, was repeated in the questionnaire data.

I feel, having read it, I think it would greatly encourage myself to try and reflect on practice (Focus group ref 1, p.62)

I think it will motivated the children and it actually will motivate the teachers to start thinking, you know, "We're allowed to think differently and to approach things differently" (Focus group ref 3, p.62)

Where further guidance was requested this was primarily in relation to planning and assessment. Respondents were keen to ensure consistency in interpretation and close monitoring of progression within and across levels.

COMMON THEMES ACROSS ALL THE CURRICULUM AREAS

In this section we review the feedback obtained across all ten of the subject areas covered in this report. The intention is to identify common themes that may assist in the further development of *Curriculum for Excellence*. The analysis is based on the overview of the emergent themes that is provided as Appendix 6. Some of these themes come out more strongly in certain areas than in others and it should also be noted that some themes come through more strongly in some forms of data than others. Indeed it is important that those taking on responsibility for further development and for implementation take cognisance of the sometimes very distinctive views that are specific to particular curriculum areas. These themes emerge from the qualitative data that are the main focus of the foregoing sections of this report. It is important to relate these themes to the quantitative data offered in Appendices 2 and 3, where the wider levels of approval of the current draft documents are collated.

- The way in which the Draft Experiences and Outcomes are currently framed provides a challenge for teachers, creating opportunities for greater creativity, choice and autonomy, but simultaneously bringing with it concerns about curriculum structure, pupil assessment and professional accountability.
- Successful development and implementation will require CPD to include the opportunity for teachers to meet together and discuss ideas about developing the curriculum and share good practice.
- The provision of exemplars as guidance – something to work with and adapt – rather than prescription would help to get discussion going within a subject area and enable teachers to respond with their own interpretation.
- Greater precision in the use of language is needed – this would be easier to achieve if closer reference was made to key concepts within disciplines and to what we know about learners' developing understanding.
- Some uneasiness was expressed about the use of the first person in the framing of the statements, with questions about the intended readership.
- Teachers will find monitoring progression and undertaking assessment difficult unless the expectations are made more explicit and contextualised within classroom practice at particular ages and stages (although this needs to be considered in the light of the current moves towards curriculum flexibility).
- The opportunity to make the curriculum more relevant is welcome as is the scope for interpretation as long as it doesn't lead to confusion, repetition or omission of important concepts/content.
- There is a particular need to support those teachers who may not have the experience to interpret broad intentions into specific subject based outcomes (e.g. new teachers, those who have only known the level of prescription in recent documents such as 5-14 or teachers being asked to cover subjects with which they are less familiar, as can happen with supply teachers or in the primary

school; also, 'non-specialists' developing new areas, such as those taking responsibility for literacy and numeracy in their own curriculum areas).

- Reassurance is needed that policy makers will ensure that curriculum development will be aligned with summative assessment in national tests.

CONCLUSIONS

This report has synthesized and summarized an enormous quantity of data that have been generated through the various engagement processes that have been undertaken by LTS and by the University of Glasgow team since the first phase of publication of the draft *Experiences and Outcomes* in November 2007. The main purposes of this interim report were to:

1. summarise the feedback gathered so far, in order to inform the ongoing engagement and consultation processes
and
2. provide insights for those charged with the responsibility of further developing the *Curriculum for Excellence* for its formal implementation from 2009 onwards.

Different forms and sources of data have been gathered during this study and the report has indicated which sources have been used in each part. It has been apparent that those colleagues who have had the fuller engagement, the more 'hands-on' experience of working with the *Draft Experiences and Outcomes*, have tended to provide a more participative form of feedback. Thus the trialling feedback on the whole generally appears to be more positive than some of the other forms of data. Similarly it is often the case that the feedback that summarises responses from a range of people, such as that provided by some local authority officers, takes a more 'balanced' approach than some of that provided by individuals.

The authors of this report have not sought to make direct recommendations to the organizations and groups with responsibility for further development of the documents. The report seeks to provide a basis for those with these responsibilities to make their own professional judgements about how to change and develop the documents in the light of the feedback provided here, as well as drawing on their own experiences.

Overall, the responses to the *Draft Experiences and Outcomes* from across the different curriculum areas request more guidance from a subject specific, disciplinary perspective (particularly in the secondary sector) on the sequencing and structuring of the curriculum. Respondents are not necessarily asking for further prescription regarding content or tasks but rather that the key concepts to be addressed at each 'age and level' be made more explicit. Concern regarding the lack of guidance on principles and key concepts is expressed most strongly in responses to the science and mathematics draft experiences and outcomes.

A significant proportion of responses do welcome the opportunity for an increased role for teachers, individually and collectively, to make professional judgements in determining the detail of the curriculum that is taught in their schools and classrooms. Indeed, evidence from the trialling does suggest that many teachers have relished the opportunity to play a greater part than previously in this dimension of their work.

However, the apparent overall ambivalence about this increased responsibility also derives from the perceived difficulty of assessing progress and the 'vagueness' of the language used in the drafts as well as the issue of identifying the audience that the current documentation for *Curriculum for Excellence* is addressing. Many responses suggest that the levels of knowledge and understanding specified are unclear and there

was considerable concern that approaches and indeed 'standards' may vary across the country and between schools because of the wide scope for variable 'interpretation' of the statements. These concerns sometimes link to uneasiness about the way in which the statements have been formulated. For example, statements such as 'I can explain...' often evoked the response, 'Yes, but to what depth can you explain?'

There is almost universal acknowledgement that a major programme of CPD activity will be necessary to support the successful development and implementation of the new curriculum. Some of this will need to be organised at national level, but there will also be a need for local and particularly school-based elements in this activity. Primary and secondary schools will have rather different needs, as will early years and special educational settings. The challenges deriving from cross-curricular elements of the curriculum including numeracy and literacy, are likely to be greatest in the secondary sector, where there tends to be less experience of such ways of working. This suggests a need to consider the pedagogical implications of the implementation of a Curriculum for Excellence.

There appears to be a challenging implication for school management and organisation both in terms of building the curriculum and enhancing current pedagogical practice and it might be that an effective approach to this could be based on identifying 'learning leaders' perhaps in Faculty structures (in the secondary sector) to 'champion' change in a similar way to the approach taken within Assessment is for Learning.

One of the key original intentions of the development was to 'de-clutter' the curriculum. There appear to be differing views on the efficacy with which this has been done. On the one hand, it was said, the statements in the *Draft Experiences and Outcomes* are more concise than their predecessors in 5-14. But on the other hand there were many responses that suggested they were simply a shorter version of what had preceded and would therefore not in themselves make the curriculum any less cluttered than previously – they were simply a more concise way of expressing the same thing.

Another key intention was to make better connections between curriculum stages. There were several specific examples where doubts were expressed about continuity between stages as defined in the new documents. However, there was a wider and more general concern about pupils' experiences of transitions, especially between primary and secondary school. In developing the curriculum further it may be important to ensure that primary and secondary teachers work closely together to ensure that there is a shared understanding of the expectations that lie within the statements.

Where the curriculum is taking a more vocationally oriented approach and where it is seeking greater relevance to contemporary culture, there was generally a very positive response, but again an expression of the need for CPD to support the developments of new aspects of the curriculum.

In considering how to respond to the range of advice offered by the thousands of respondents who have contributed in this process so far, it would seem important both that all key stakeholders with relevant responsibilities work even more closely together and that connections between these developments and other current policy developments in Scottish education are taken into consideration.

On the first of these points, the key organizations that teachers will expect to see collaborating on the developments will include The Scottish Government, LTS, SQA and HMle. The current developments around national qualifications, for example, must be seen to relate closely to the development of Curriculum for Excellence. Similarly, the increased responsibility for curriculum implementation at school and teacher level, that is so much a part of the curriculum proposals, will need to be reflected in the evolution of inspection procedures. Such parallel developments are already very much in the minds of those who are leading on these developments, but there is likely to be a need for continuing demonstration of such cooperation and collaboration in order to give teachers confidence in the way in which policies are currently being developed.

On the second point, judging from the nature of the responses summarised in this report, the key aspects of parallel policy development that might be considered, relate to developing notions of teacher professionalism. There are several examples of current policies where teachers are being offered – and taking – increased opportunities for decision making and judgement, for becoming more reflective practitioners. Examples would include programmes such as SQH and Chartered Teacher, developments such as Assessment is for Learning and the teacher-led action research associated with Schools of Ambition. The development and implementation of *Curriculum for Excellence* would appear to provide a nationwide opportunity for extending such enquiry-oriented and enquiry-based models of teacher development across the profession as a whole. This could well be a key strand in the programme of CPD activity that is so clearly being called for by the education community, as reflected in this report.

This Interim Report will be made available by LTS in order to provide a basis for further discussions among relevant parties as the Curriculum for Excellence is developed. The University research team is continuing to collect and analyse further data and will be submitting a final report on this work at the end of 2008.

Appendices

1. Sources of data

Focus group: sample composition

Table 1

| Focus Group | Early Years /Nursery | Primary | Secondary | SEN | Independent | LA | SSN | Others | Total :172 |
|---|----------------------|---------|-----------|-----|-------------|----|-----|--------|------------|
| Science: Glasgow | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 13 |
| Numeracy: Edinburgh | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Numeracy: Glasgow | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Numeracy: Aberdeen | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 14 |
| Numeracy: Ayr | 1 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Modern Languages: Glasgow | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 15 |
| Mathematics: Glasgow | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Classical Languages: Glasgow | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Gaelic Learners: Glasgow | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Expressive Arts: Glasgow | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Social Studies: Glasgow | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 |
| Literacy and English: Edinburgh | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Literacy and English: Glasgow | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Literacy and English: Aberdeen | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Literacy and English: Ayr | 1 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 12 |
| Gaidhlig and Literacy: Stornoway | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

Total responses to the curriculum area and trialling questionnaires

Table 2

| Curricular area | Questionnaire on the Draft Experiences and Outcomes | Trialling questionnaire on the Draft Experiences and Outcomes | Total |
|-----------------------|---|---|-------|
| Science | 316 | 48 | 364 |
| Numeracy | 135 | 20 | 155 |
| Modern Languages | 102 | 5 | 107 |
| Mathematics | 133 | 8 | 141 |
| Classical Languages | 8 | 3 | 11 |
| Gaelic Learners | 5 | 7 | 12 |
| Expressive Arts | 117 | 8 | 125 |
| Social Studies | 162 | 4 | 166 |
| English and Literacy | 125 | 42 | 167 |
| Gaidhlig and Literacy | 4 | 7 | 11 |
| Total | 1,107 | 152 | 1,259 |

Total number of questionnaires on the draft experiences and outcomes is the total number of online and paper submissions.

Total number of trialling questionnaires is the total number of online and paper submissions. *This total excludes a range of other forms of documentation from the trials that were submitted for consideration and included in the analysis.*

Log of documents submitted during the consultation process

Table 3

| Log of General responses | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|---|------------|---|
| Code | Title | Compiled by | Source | Date | Brief description |
| GR001-1 | Response to CfE Draft Maths/ Numeracy Experiences and Outcomes | Dr. Penny Munn | University of Strathclyde | 31/03/2008 | 5 page document; |
| GR002-1 | Curriculum for Excellence: Draft Expressive Arts Outcomes consultation | VAGA Scotland & Engage Scotland | Ben Spencer, VAGA Scotland; Sarah Yearsley, Engage Scotland | N/A | 4 page document |
| GR003-1 | Curriculum for Excellence: Science and Numeracy Experiences and Outcomes | The Physics Department, Robert Gordon's College | Robert Gordon's College, Aberdeen | N/A | 3 page document |
| GR004-1 | Comments on the Science, Numeracy and Mathematics Draft Experiences and Outcomes in CfE | RSE | The Royal Society of Edinburgh | N/A | 7 page document |
| GR005-1 | ASE Scotland CfE Science Questionnaire | Mr. Stuart Farmer | David Binney, ACfE Inter-Authority Project Officer | 14/03/2008 | Inter-Authority Questionnaire by ASE Scotland |
| GR006-1 | Interim Feedback on Science Learning Outcomes | Edinburgh City | Mary Smith, Development Officer, Learning and Teaching Scotland | 08/04/2008 | 4 page document + 2 pages of e-mails attached |
| GR007-1 | A response to Consultation from STEM-ED Scotland | Annex A: Pages 5-6 | STEM-ED Scotland | N/A | 12 page document |
| GR008-1 | CfE - Numeracy, Science and Mathematics, and Wider Issues | Mr. William Hardie, Consultations Officer (RSE) | The Royal Society of Edinburgh | 29/04/2008 | 7 page document |
| GR009-1 | SDELG: Report 1, Draft Science Experiences and Outcomes | SDELG | SDELG; also a copy of identical report with a compliments slip from RSPB Scotland | Apr-08 | 39 page document |
| GR010-1 | ASE Scotland: CfE | Rhona Goss, Chair, ASE Scotland | Member's feedback based on LTS Questionnaire | 04/06/2008 | 7 page document |
| GR011-1 | BioIndustry Association Scotland | BIA Scotland | Dr. Barbara Blaney, Director, BIA Scotland | 26/03/2008 | 3 page document |
| GR012-1 | CfE: Feedback questions on the draft science experiences and outcomes | Mr. Kenneth MacFadyen | Beeslack Community High School Science Departments | N/A | 14 page document |
| GR013-1 | Scottish Local History Forum | Dr. C M M MacDonald | Scottish Forum Response | 01/04/2008 | Committee endorsed comments on 2 sheets |
| GR014-1 | The Association for Scottish Literary Studies | Mr. Ronald Renton, Convener of the Education Committee | Mr. James Alison | 11/06/2008 | 5 page questionnaire |

| | | | | | |
|---------|---|--|---|------------------|--|
| GR015-1 | CfE - Literacy & English, Expressive Arts and Social Studies. | Mr. William Hardie, Consultations Officer (RSE) | The Royal Society of Edinburgh | N/A | 6 page document |
| GR016-1 | Feedback on Science Experiences and Outcomes | Mr. Alasdair Deans QIO E Dunbartonshire. Seema Sircar Strategic Leader (5-18) | Scottish Science Advisory Group (SSAG). Membership QIOs, Reps from HMIE, LTS, SSERC | N/A | 5 page document |
| GR017-1 | CfE: Response to the Draft Outcomes: Part 1. Draft Outcomes Consultation | Contact: Shoeb Sarguroh | Scottish Muslim Parents Association | June 30th, 2008. | Feedback document; collated response to the draft outcomes online questionnaires |
| GR018-1 | Collated responses to generic online questionnaire (Science) | Mr. David Binney | David Binney, ACfE Inter-Authority Project Officer | N/A | Email with 2 appendices; 7 pages in total. |
| GR019-1 | Response to the Draft Literacy and English Experiences and Outcomes (S Lanarkshire) | Lindsay Ross on behalf of 500 practitioners, all sectors in South Lanarkshire | Education Resources Learning Centre, Station Road, Blantyre. | 27/06/2008 | 17 page document |
| GR020-1 | Response to the Draft Literacy and English Outcomes (North Lanarkshire) | Collective response from PTs English across North Lanarkshire | PTs English (North Lanarkshire) | N/A | |
| GR021-1 | Response to the Draft Science Experiences and Outcomes | Group response compiled by R. Griffith | On behalf of a group of 8 Science teachers within Science / Technology Faculty | N/A | 5 page document |
| GR022-1 | Comment on the Draft Social Studies Experiences & Outcomes | Mr. Alan B. Rabey. PT History | On behalf of the History Department of Lenzie Academy. | May-08 | 1 page double sided document |
| GR023-1 | CfE and the History L O s | Sheila Maclver; Portobello High School, History Department, Edinburgh | Mrs. Sheila Maclver on behalf of History Department, Portobello High School | N/A | 2 page document |
| GR024-1 | CfE: Feedback on the draft Science experiences and outcomes | IOP: An Institute of Physics response | Professor Peter Main, Director of Education and Science | 30-Jun-08 | Letter and questionnaire on behalf of the IOP. 4 page commentary. |
| GR025-1 | Scottish Screen on draft Technologies Experiences and Outcomes | Scottish SCREEN, the non-Departmental Public body for all aspects of screen culture and industry | SCOTTISH SCREEN | | Completed questionnaire on Technologies on behalf of Scottish SCREEN |
| GR026-1 | SDELG: Report 5, Draft Mathematics Experiences and Outcomes | SDELG | SDELG | 01/06/2008 | 4 page document |
| GR027-1 | Scottish Screen on draft Modern Languages Experiences and Outcomes | Scottish SCREEN, the non-Departmental Public body for all aspects of screen culture and industry | SCOTTISH SCREEN | N/A | 1 page document |

| | | | | | |
|----------|--|--|---|----------------|--|
| GR 028-1 | Scottish Screen on draft Science Experiences and Outcomes | Scottish SCREEN, the non-Departmental Public body for all aspects of screen culture and industry | SCOTTISH SCREEN | N/A | 7 page document |
| GR029-1 | SDELG: Report 3, Draft Modern Languages Experiences and Outcomes | SDELG | SDELG | 01/06/2008 | 8 page document |
| GR030-1 | SDELG: Report 6, Draft Literacy and English Experiences and Outcomes | SDELG | SDELG | 01/06/2008 | 7 page document |
| GR031-1 | SDELG: Report 4, Draft Expressive Arts Experiences and Outcomes | SDELG | SDELG | 01/06/2008 | 9 page document |
| GR032-1 | Scottish Screen on draft Science Experiences and Outcomes | Scottish SCREEN, the non-Departmental Public body for all aspects of screen culture and industry | SCOTTISH SCREEN | N/A | |
| GR033-1 | CfE: Response from the History and Modern Studies Department, Douglas Academy to the draft Social Studies Outcomes | Mr. Stephen Sinclair | PT History and Modern Studies | 26/06/2008 | 5 pages of detailed feedback on the draft Outcomes in Social Studies |
| GR034-1 | Scottish Screen on draft Gaidhlig and Literacy Experiences and Outcomes | Scottish SCREEN, the non-Departmental Public body for all aspects of screen culture and industry | SCOTTISH SCREEN | N/A | 1 page document |
| GR035-1 | SDELG: Report 2, Draft Social Studies Experiences and Outcomes | SDELG | SDELG; also a copy of identical report with a compliments slip from RSPB Scotland | Apr-08 | 43 page document |
| GR036-1 | Scottish Screen on draft Literacy and English Experiences and Outcomes | Scottish SCREEN, the non-Departmental Public body for all aspects of screen culture and industry | SCOTTISH SCREEN | N/A | 3 page document |
| GR037-1 | Response to the Social Subjects Experiences and Outcomes Business Education | No author or source: file description in footer reads: R\BE\ACfE\Q's SS Experiences and Outcomes | N/A | N/A | 4 page document |
| GR038-1 | Response to the Mathematics and Numeracy Outcomes and Experiences | The Scottish Mathematical Council | Professor TA Gillespie, Chair TSMC | N/A | 6 page narrative response |
| GR039-1 | CfE Numeracy feedback | Stockbridge Primary School | Stockbridge Primary School | Feb-08 | In-service feedback; 3 page document |
| GR040-1 | Response to the draft LO s Literacy (& English) | Mr. Kevin Park, PT Literacy and Performing Arts | English Department, Islay High School | 18th June 2008 | 2 pages of feedback via email |

| | | | | | |
|---------|--|---|--|-----|---|
| GR041-1 | Feedback from staff trialling Literacy Outcomes | Dundee feedback on Literacy outcomes | Mr. Peter Eavers (LTS, Dundee) | N/A | 1 page feedback/summary document from a Meeting |
| GR041-1 | Another response on CfE Literacy & English draft Outcomes | The Association for Scottish Literary Studies | Mr. Jim Alison and Dr. Ronald Renton | | An organisation response to the questionnaire |
| GR043-1 | Scottish Screen feedback on Draft Expressive Arts Experiences and Outcomes | Scottish SCREEN | N/A | N/A | 7 page document |
| GR044-1 | Response to the draft Literacy and English Outcomes - ACE | English Department, Glen Urquhart High School, The Highland Council | Mr. Iain Graham (PT English) Glen Urquhart High School | N/A | 2 page response |

Table 4

| Code | Title | Compiled by | Source | Date | Brief description |
|----------|--|---|---|------------|---|
| PER001-3 | CfE Learning Experiences and Outcomes for Science | Mr. Bob Kibble, Senior Lecturer in Science Education | University of Edinburgh | 23/02/2120 | 4 page document |
| PER002-1 | Feedback from Website: Physics: personal feedback in response to the draft Experiences and Outcomes in Science | Mr. Jon Osborne, PT Physics (St. Maurices High School) | St. Maurice's High School | N/A | 1 page document |
| PER003-1 | Gaelic Department/ Sgoil Lionacleit: Submission for Draft Literacy and Gaidhlig outcomes | Sgoil Lionacleit | Sgoil Lionacleit | N/A | 2 page document |
| PER004-1 | Views on Curriculum for Excellence (Science/ Chemistry) | Dr. Elizabeth Stevenson, University of Edinburgh, School of Chemistry | Dr. Elizabeth Stevenson, University of Edinburgh, School of Chemistry | 30/06/2008 | 2 page document |
| PER005-1 | Sgiol Lionacleit, Feedback on the draft outcomes for Gaelic Learners | Gaelic Department, Sgoil Lionacleit | Gaelic Department, Sgoil Lionacleit | N/A | 2 page document |
| PER006-1 | Feedback on the draft Experiences and Outcomes for Literacy | Maira Andrew, Donaldson's School for the Deaf | Maira Andrew, Donaldson's School for the Deaf | N/A | 1 paragraph of feedback |
| PER007-1 | Feedback on Technologies, Draft Outcomes | Daniel Livingstone | Daniel Livingstone, School of Computing, University of the West of Scotland | N/A | 1 page on CfE Technologies with reference to the computer games element |

2. Frequency tables: online questionnaires by curriculum area

Science

Q1. The draft **Science** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.1a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.1a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 19 | 6% |
| 2 agree | 138 | 44% |
| 3 disagree | 90 | 28% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 66 | 21% |
| 5 don't know | 3 | 1% |
| Grand Total | 316 | 100% |

Q2. The expectations of the draft **Science** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.2a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.2a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 22 | 7% |
| 2 agree | 134 | 43% |
| 3 disagree | 78 | 25% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 38 | 12% |
| 5 don't know | 43 | 14% |
| Grand Total | 315 | 100% |

Q3. Overall, the draft **Science** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Science**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.3a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.3a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 12 | 4% |
| 2 agree | 109 | 35% |
| 3 disagree | 94 | 30% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 84 | 27% |
| 5 don't know | 15 | 5% |
| Grand Total | 314 | 100% |

Q4. The draft **Science** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities to promote good teaching approaches and deep learning. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.4a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.4a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 46 | 15% |
| 2 agree | 153 | 49% |
| 3 disagree | 59 | 19% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 31 | 10% |
| 5 don't know | 26 | 8% |
| Grand Total | 315 | 100% |

Q5. The draft **Science** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for effective links with other areas of the curriculum. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.5a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.5a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 42 | 13% |
| 2 agree | 182 | 58% |
| 3 disagree | 48 | 15% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 17 | 5% |
| 5 don't know | 26 | 8% |
| Grand Total | 315 | 100% |

Q6. Taken together, the draft **Science** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.6a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.6a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 63 | 20% |
| 2 agree | 184 | 58% |
| 3 disagree | 30 | 10% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 15 | 5% |
| 5 don't know | 23 | 7% |
| Grand Total | 315 | 100% |

Q7. The draft **Science** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning will help them in their future lives. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.7a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.7a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 21 | 7% |
| 2 agree | 164 | 52% |
| 3 disagree | 61 | 19% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 22 | 7% |
| 5 don't know | 48 | 15% |
| Grand Total | 316 | 100% |

Science Questionnaire data by Individual or Group response:

| Count of Q1.12a | | |
|--|-------|------------|
| Q1.12a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 An individual | 227 | 72% |
| 2 On behalf of a group or organisation | 87 | 28% |
| Grand Total | 314 | 100% |

Numeracy

Q1. The draft **Numeracy** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.1a | | |
|--------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.1a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 9 | 7% |
| 2 agree | 52 | 39% |
| 3 disagree | 29 | 21% |
| 4strongly disagree | 39 | 29% |
| 5 don't know | 6 | 4% |
| Grand Total | 135 | 100% |

Q2. The expectations of the draft **Numeracy** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.2a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.2a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 7 | 5% |
| 2 agree | 55 | 41% |
| 3 disagree | 29 | 22% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 18 | 13% |
| 5 don't know | 25 | 19% |
| Grand Total | 134 | 100% |

Q3. Overall, the draft **Numeracy** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Numeracy**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.3a | | |
|--------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.3a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 7 | 5% |
| 2 agree | 45 | 33% |
| 3 disagree | 26 | 19% |
| 4strongly disagree | 46 | 34% |
| 5 don't know | 11 | 8% |
| Grand Total | 135 | 100% |

Q4. The draft **Numeracy** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities to promote good teaching approaches and deep learning. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.4a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.4a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 18 | 13% |
| 2 agree | 60 | 45% |
| 3 disagree | 22 | 16% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 25 | 19% |
| 5 don't know | 9 | 7% |
| Grand Total | 134 | 100% |

Q5. The draft **Numeracy** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for effective links with other areas of the curriculum. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.5a | | |
|--------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.5a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 23 | 17% |
| 2 agree | 73 | 54% |
| 3 disagree | 16 | 12% |
| 4strongly disagree | 13 | 10% |
| 5 don't know | 9 | 7% |
| Grand Total | 134 | 100% |

Q6. Taken together, the draft **Numeracy** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.6a | | |
|--------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.6a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 22 | 16% |
| 2 agree | 67 | 50% |
| 3 disagree | 23 | 17% |
| 4strongly disagree | 6 | 4% |
| 5 don't know | 16 | 12% |
| Grand Total | 134 | 100% |

Q7. The draft **Numeracy** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning will help them in their future lives. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.7a | | |
|--------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.7a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 15 | 11% |
| 2 agree | 78 | 59% |
| 3 disagree | 20 | 15% |
| 4strongly disagree | 8 | 6% |
| 5 don't know | 12 | 9% |
| Grand Total | 133 | 100% |

Numeracy Questionnaire data by Individual or Group response:

| Count of Q1.12a | | |
|--|-------|------------|
| Q1.12a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 An individual | 76 | 57% |
| 2 On behalf of a group or organisation | 57 | 43% |
| Grand Total | 133 | 100% |

Modern Languages

Q1. The draft **Modern Languages** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.1a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.1a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 11 | 11% |
| 2 agree | 62 | 61% |
| 3 disagree | 21 | 21% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 5 | 5% |
| 5 don't know | 2 | 2% |
| Grand Total | 101 | 100% |

Q2. The expectations of the draft **Modern Languages** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.2a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.2a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 14 | 14% |
| 2 agree | 54 | 55% |
| 3 disagree | 15 | 15% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 4 | 4% |
| 5 don't know | 12 | 12% |
| Grand Total | 99 | 100% |

Q3. Overall, the draft **Modern Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Modern Languages**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.3a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.3a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 12 | 12% |
| 2 agree | 50 | 50% |
| 3 disagree | 22 | 22% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 7 | 7% |
| 5 don't know | 9 | 9% |
| Grand Total | 100 | 100% |

Q4. The draft **Modern Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities to promote good teaching approaches and deep learning. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.4a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.4a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 26 | 26% |
| 2 agree | 57 | 58% |
| 3 disagree | 4 | 4% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 5 | 5% |
| 5 don't know | 7 | 7% |
| Grand Total | 99 | 100% |

Q5. The draft **Modern Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for effective links with other areas of the curriculum. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.5a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.5a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 27 | 26% |
| 2 agree | 57 | 56% |
| 3 disagree | 8 | 8% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 2 | 2% |
| 5 don't know | 8 | 8% |
| Grand Total | 102 | 100% |

Q6. Taken together, the draft **Modern Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.6a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.6a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 46 | 45% |
| 2 agree | 47 | 46% |
| 3 disagree | 2 | 2% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 1 | 1% |
| 5 don't know | 6 | 6% |
| Grand Total | 102 | 100% |

Q7. The draft **Modern Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning will help them in their future lives. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.7a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.7a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 10 | 10% |
| 2 agree | 66 | 66% |
| 3 disagree | 9 | 9% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 6 | 6% |
| 5 don't know | 9 | 9% |
| Grand Total | 100 | 100% |

Modern Languages Questionnaire data by Individual or Group response:

| Count of Q1.12a | | |
|--|-------|------------|
| Q1.12a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 An individual | 42 | 42% |
| 2 On behalf of a group or organisation | 58 | 58% |
| Grand Total | 100 | 100% |

Mathematics

Q1. The draft **Mathematics** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.1a | | |
|--------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.1a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 7 | 5% |
| 2 agree | 43 | 33% |
| 3 disagree | 42 | 32% |
| 4strongly disagree | 36 | 27% |
| 5 don't know | 4 | 3% |
| Grand Total | 132 | 100% |

Q2. The expectations of the draft **Mathematics** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.2a | | |
|--------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.2a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 7 | 5% |
| 2 agree | 60 | 46% |
| 3 disagree | 24 | 18% |
| 4strongly disagree | 19 | 15% |
| 5 don't know | 20 | 15% |
| Grand Total | 130 | 100% |

Q3. Overall, the draft **Mathematics** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Mathematics**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.3a | | |
|--------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.3a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 7 | 5% |
| 2 agree | 31 | 24% |
| 3 disagree | 39 | 30% |
| 4strongly disagree | 45 | 35% |
| 5 don't know | 8 | 6% |
| Grand Total | 130 | 100% |

Q4. The draft **Mathematics** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities to promote good teaching approaches and deep learning. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.4a | | |
|--------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.4a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 14 | 11% |
| 2 agree | 51 | 40% |
| 3 disagree | 29 | 22% |
| 4strongly disagree | 24 | 19% |
| 5 don't know | 11 | 9% |
| Grand Total | 129 | 100% |

Q5. The draft **Mathematics** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for effective links with other areas of the curriculum. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.5a | | |
|--------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.5a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 13 | 10% |
| 2 agree | 66 | 50% |
| 3 disagree | 21 | 16% |
| 4strongly disagree | 14 | 11% |
| 5 don't know | 17 | 13% |
| Grand Total | 131 | 100% |

Q6. Taken together, the draft **Mathematics** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.6a | | |
|--------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.6a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 14 | 11% |
| 2 agree | 65 | 50% |
| 3 disagree | 18 | 14% |
| 4strongly disagree | 12 | 9% |
| 5 don't know | 21 | 16% |
| Grand Total | 130 | 100% |

Q7. The draft **Mathematics** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning will help them in their future lives. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.7a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.7a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 12 | 9% |
| 2 agree | 65 | 50% |
| 3 disagree | 22 | 17% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 20 | 15% |
| 5 don't know | 12 | 9% |
| Grand Total | 131 | 100% |

Mathematics Questionnaire data by Individual or Group response:

| Count of Q1.12a | | |
|--|-------|------------|
| Q1.12a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 An individual | 73 | 56% |
| 2 On behalf of a group or organisation | 57 | 44% |
| Grand Total | 130 | 100% |

Classical Languages

Q1. The draft **Classical Languages** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.1a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.1a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 2 | 25% |
| 2 agree | 5 | 63% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 1 | 13% |
| Grand Total | 8 | 100% |

Q2. The expectations of the draft **Classical Languages** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.2a | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.2a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 13% |
| 2 agree | 6 | 75% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 13% |
| Grand Total | 8 | 100% |

Q3. Overall, the draft **Classical Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Classical Languages**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.3a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.3a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 3 | 38% |
| 2 agree | 3 | 38% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 13% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 1 | 13% |
| Grand Total | 8 | 100% |

Q4. The draft **Classical Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities to promote good teaching approaches and deep learning. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.4a | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.4a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 4 | 50% |
| 2 agree | 2 | 25% |
| 3 disagree | 2 | 25% |
| Grand Total | 8 | 100% |

Q5. The draft **Classical Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for effective links with other areas of the curriculum. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.5a | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.5a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 4 | 50% |
| 2 agree | 4 | 50% |
| Grand Total | 8 | 100% |

Q6. Taken together, the draft **Classical Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Q1.6a | Count | Percentage |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| 1 strongly agree | 5 | 63% |
| 2 agree | 3 | 38% |
| Grand Total | 8 | 100% |

Q7. The draft **Classical Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning will help them in their future lives. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.7a | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.7a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 6 | 75% |
| 2 agree | 2 | 25% |
| Grand Total | 8 | 100% |

Classical Languages Questionnaire data by Individual or Group response:

| Count of Q1.12a | | |
|--|-------|------------|
| Q1.12a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 An individual | 7 | 88% |
| 2 On behalf of a group or organisation | 1 | 13% |
| Grand Total | 8 | 100% |

Gaelic Learners

Q1. The draft **Gaelic Learners** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.1a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.1a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 20% |
| 2 agree | 1 | 20% |
| 3 disagree | 2 | 40% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 1 | 20% |
| Grand Total | 5 | 100% |

Q2. The expectations of the draft **Gaelic Learners** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.2a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.2a | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 3 | 60% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 20% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 1 | 20% |
| Grand Total | 5 | 100% |

Q3. Overall, the draft **Gaelic Learners** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Gaelic Learners**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.3a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.3a | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 2 | 40% |
| 3 disagree | 2 | 40% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 1 | 20% |
| Grand Total | 5 | 100% |

Q4. The draft **Gaelic Learners** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities to promote good teaching approaches and deep learning. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.4a | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.4a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 20% |
| 2 agree | 2 | 40% |
| 5 don't know | 2 | 40% |
| Grand Total | 5 | 100% |

Q5. The draft **Gaelic Learners** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for effective links with other areas of the curriculum. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.5a | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.5a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 20% |
| 2 agree | 3 | 60% |
| 5 don't know | 1 | 20% |
| Grand Total | 5 | 100% |

Q6. Taken together, the draft **Gaelic Learners** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.6a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.6a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 2 | 40% |
| 2 agree | 1 | 20% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 1 | 20% |
| 5 don't know | 1 | 20% |
| Grand Total | 5 | 100% |

Q7. The draft **Gaelic Learners** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning will help them in their future lives. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.7a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.7a | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 2 | 40% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 20% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 1 | 20% |
| 5 don't know | 1 | 20% |
| Grand Total | 5 | 100% |

Gaelic Learners Questionnaire data by Individual or Group response:

| Count of Q1.12a | | |
|--|-------|------------|
| Q1.12a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 An individual | 2 | 40% |
| 2 On behalf of a group or organisation | 3 | 60% |
| Grand Total | 5 | 100% |

Expressive Arts

Q1. The draft **Expressive Arts** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.1a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.1a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 7 | 6% |
| 2 agree | 56 | 48% |
| 3 disagree | 29 | 25% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 18 | 16% |
| 5 don't know | 6 | 5% |
| Grand Total | 116 | 100% |

Q2. The expectations of the draft **Expressive Arts** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.2a | | |
|--------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.2a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 10 | 9% |
| 2 agree | 55 | 47% |
| 3 disagree | 28 | 24% |
| 4strongly disagree | 8 | 7% |
| 5 don't know | 15 | 13% |
| Grand Total | 116 | 100% |

Q3. Overall, the draft **Expressive Arts** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Expressive Arts**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.3a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.3a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 7 | 6% |
| 2 agree | 51 | 45% |
| 3 disagree | 37 | 32% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 12 | 11% |
| 5 don't know | 7 | 6% |
| Grand Total | 114 | 100% |

Q4. The draft **Expressive Arts** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities to promote good teaching approaches and deep learning. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.4a | | |
|--------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.4a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 17 | 15% |
| 2 agree | 56 | 49% |
| 3 disagree | 16 | 14% |
| 4strongly disagree | 13 | 11% |
| 5 don't know | 12 | 11% |
| Grand Total | 114 | 100% |

Q5. The draft **Expressive Arts** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for effective links with other areas of the curriculum. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.5a | | |
|--------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.5a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 32 | 28% |
| 2 agree | 61 | 53% |
| 3 disagree | 9 | 8% |
| 4strongly disagree | 5 | 4% |
| 5 don't know | 8 | 7% |
| Grand Total | 115 | 100% |

Q6. Taken together, the draft **Expressive Arts** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.6a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.6a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 34 | 29% |
| 2 agree | 57 | 49% |
| 3 disagree | 13 | 11% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 4 | 3% |
| 5 don't know | 8 | 7% |
| Grand Total | 116 | 100% |

Q7. The draft **Expressive Arts** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning will help them in their future lives. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.7a | | |
|--------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.7a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 10 | 9% |
| 2 agree | 57 | 49% |
| 3 disagree | 27 | 23% |
| 4strongly disagree | 9 | 8% |
| 5 don't know | 13 | 11% |
| Grand Total | 116 | 100% |

Expressive Arts Questionnaire data by Individual or Group response:

| Count of Q1.12a | | |
|--|-------|------------|
| Q1.12a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 An individual | 64 | 56% |
| 2 On behalf of a group or organisation | 51 | 44% |
| Grand Total | 115 | 100% |

Social Studies

Q1. The draft **Social Studies** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.1a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.1a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 19 | 12% |
| 2 agree | 90 | 56% |
| 3 disagree | 33 | 20% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 17 | 10% |
| 5 don't know | 3 | 2% |
| Grand Total | 162 | 100% |

Q2. The expectations of the draft **Social Studies** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.2a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.2a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 16 | 10% |
| 2 agree | 81 | 50% |
| 3 disagree | 30 | 19% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 19 | 12% |
| 5 don't know | 15 | 9% |
| Grand Total | 161 | 100% |

Q3. Overall, the draft **Social Studies** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Social Studies**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.3a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.3a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 21 | 13% |
| 2 agree | 69 | 43% |
| 3 disagree | 32 | 20% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 21 | 13% |
| 5 don't know | 16 | 10% |
| Grand Total | 159 | 100% |

Q4. The draft **Social Studies** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities to promote good teaching approaches and deep learning. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.4a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.4a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 22 | 14% |
| 2 agree | 96 | 60% |
| 3 disagree | 16 | 10% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 16 | 10% |
| 5 don't know | 10 | 6% |
| Grand Total | 160 | 100% |

Q5. The draft **Social Studies** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for effective links with other areas of the curriculum. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.5a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.5a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 34 | 21% |
| 2 agree | 92 | 57% |
| 3 disagree | 19 | 12% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 5 | 3% |
| 5 don't know | 11 | 7% |
| Grand Total | 161 | 100% |

Q6. Taken together, the draft **Social Studies** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.6a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.6a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 32 | 20% |
| 2 agree | 99 | 62% |
| 3 disagree | 15 | 9% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 9 | 6% |
| 5 don't know | 5 | 3% |
| Grand Total | 160 | 100% |

Q7. The draft **Social Studies** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning will help them in their future lives. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.7a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.7a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 14 | 9% |
| 2 agree | 81 | 51% |
| 3 disagree | 29 | 18% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 12 | 8% |
| 5 don't know | 23 | 14% |
| Grand Total | 159 | 100% |

Social Studies Questionnaire data by Individual or Group response:

| Count of Q1.12a | | |
|--|-------|------------|
| Q1.12a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 An individual | 93 | 58% |
| 2 On behalf of a group or organisation | 66 | 42% |
| Grand Total | 159 | 100% |

Literacy and English

Q1. The draft **Literacy and English** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.1a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.1a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 4 | 3% |
| 2 agree | 82 | 66% |
| 3 disagree | 22 | 18% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 12 | 10% |
| 5 don't know | 5 | 4% |
| Grand Total | 125 | 100% |

Q2. The expectations of the draft **Literacy and English** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.2a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.2a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 9 | 7% |
| 2 agree | 77 | 62% |
| 3 disagree | 19 | 15% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 7 | 6% |
| 5 don't know | 12 | 10% |
| Grand Total | 124 | 100% |

Q3. Overall, the draft **Literacy and English** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Literacy and English**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.3a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.3a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 13 | 10% |
| 2 agree | 55 | 44% |
| 3 disagree | 31 | 25% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 18 | 15% |
| 5 don't know | 7 | 6% |
| Grand Total | 124 | 100% |

Q4. The draft **Literacy and English** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities to promote good teaching approaches and deep learning. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.4a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.4a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 18 | 15% |
| 2 agree | 67 | 54% |
| 3 disagree | 17 | 14% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 11 | 9% |
| 5 don't know | 11 | 9% |
| Grand Total | 124 | 100% |

Q5. The draft **Literacy and English** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for effective links with other areas of the curriculum. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.5a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.5a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 42 | 34% |
| 2 agree | 57 | 46% |
| 3 disagree | 10 | 8% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 6 | 5% |
| 5 don't know | 9 | 7% |
| (blank) | 1 | 1% |
| Grand Total | 125 | 100% |

Q6. Taken together, the draft **Literacy and English** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for the development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.6a | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.6a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 34 | 27% |
| 2 agree | 62 | 50% |
| 3 disagree | 6 | 5% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 8 | 7% |
| 5 don't know | 14 | 11% |
| Grand Total | 124 | 100% |

Q7. The draft **Literacy and English** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning will help them in their future lives. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.7a | | |
|-------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.7a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 13 | 10% |
| 2 agree | 74 | 60% |
| 3 disagree | 15 | 12% |
| 5 don't know | 14 | 11% |
| strongly disagree | 8 | 6% |
| Grand Total | 124 | 100% |

Literacy and English Questionnaire data by Individual or Group response:

| Count of Q1.12a | | |
|--|-------|------------|
| Q1.12a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 An individual | 78 | 64% |
| 2 On behalf of a group or organisation | 44 | 36% |
| Grand Total | 122 | 100% |

Gaidhlig and Literacy

Q1. The draft **Gaidhlig and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.1a | | |
|----------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.1a | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 3 | 75% |
| 5 don't know | 1 | 25% |
| Grand Total | 4 | 100% |

Q2. The expectations of the draft **Gaidhlig and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.2a | | |
|----------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.2a | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 3 | 75% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 25% |
| Grand Total | 4 | 100% |

Q3. Overall, the draft **Gaidhlig and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Gaidhlig and Literacy**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.3a | | |
|----------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.3a | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 2 | 50% |
| 3 disagree | 2 | 50% |
| Grand Total | 4 | 100% |

Q4. The draft **Gaidhlig and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities to promote good teaching approaches and deep learning. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Q1.4a | Count | Percentage |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| 1 strongly agree | 2 | 50% |
| 2 agree | 2 | 50% |
| Grand Total | 4 | 100% |

Q5. The draft **Gaidhlig and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for effective links with other areas of the curriculum. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.5a | | |
|----------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.5a | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 4 | 100% |
| Grand Total | 4 | 100% |

Q6. Taken together, the draft **Gaidhlig and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.6a | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.6a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 2 | 50% |
| 2 agree | 2 | 50% |
| Grand Total | 4 | 100% |

Q7. The draft **Gaidhlig and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning will help them in their future lives. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of Q1.7a | | |
|----------------|-------|------------|
| Q1.7a | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 4 | 100% |
| Grand Total | 4 | 100% |

Gaidhlig and Literacy Questionnaire data by Individual or Group response:

| Count of Q1.12a | | |
|--|-------|------------|
| Q1.12a | Count | Percentage |
| 1 An individual | 2 | 50% |
| 2 On behalf of a group or organisation | 2 | 50% |
| Grand Total | 4 | 100% |

3. Frequency tables: trialling questionnaires

Science

Q1. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Science** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.1 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.1 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 11 | 23% |
| 2 agree | 30 | 64% |
| 3 disagree | 5 | 11% |
| 5 don't know | 1 | 2% |
| Grand Total | 47 | 100% |

Q2. Trialling Questionnaire. The expectations of the draft **Science** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.2 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.2 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 6 | 13% |
| 2 agree | 31 | 67% |
| 3 disagree | 5 | 11% |
| 5 don't know | 4 | 9% |
| Grand Total | 46 | 100% |

Q3. Trialling Questionnaire. Overall, the draft **Science** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Science**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.3 | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| A.3 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 6 | 13% |
| 2 agree | 29 | 62% |
| 3 disagree | 9 | 19% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 1 | 2% |
| 5 don't know | 2 | 4% |
| Grand Total | 47 | 100% |

Q4. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Science** Experiences and Outcomes provide good opportunities to build upon good current learning and teaching practices. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.4 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.4 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 13 | 28% |
| 2 agree | 32 | 68% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 2% |
| 5 don't know | 1 | 2% |
| Grand Total | 47 | 100% |

Q5. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Science** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to make connections across curriculum areas. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.5 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.5 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 18 | 38% |
| 2 agree | 24 | 51% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 2% |
| 5 don't know | 4 | 9% |
| Grand Total | 47 | 100% |

Q6. Trialling Questionnaire. Taken together, the draft **Science** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.6 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.6 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 18 | 38% |
| 2 agree | 27 | 56% |
| 5 don't know | 3 | 6% |
| Grand Total | 48 | 100% |

Q7. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Science** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning is relevant to their lives, now and in the future. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.7 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.7 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 18 | 38% |
| 2 agree | 24 | 51% |
| 3 disagree | 2 | 4% |
| 5 don't know | 3 | 6% |
| Grand Total | 47 | 100% |

Numeracy

Q1. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Numeracy** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.1 | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| A.1 | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 16 | 80% |
| 3 disagree | 2 | 10% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 1 | 5% |
| 5 don't know | 1 | 5% |
| Grand Total | 20 | 100% |

Q2. Trialling Questionnaire. The expectations of the draft **Numeracy** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.2 | | |
|--------------|-------|------------|
| A.2 | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 17 | 85% |
| 3 disagree | 2 | 10% |
| 5 don't know | 1 | 5% |
| Grand Total | 20 | 100% |

Q3. Trialling Questionnaire. Overall, the draft **Numeracy** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Numeracy**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.3 | | |
|--------------|-------|------------|
| A.3 | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 10 | 50% |
| 3 disagree | 10 | 50% |
| Grand Total | 20 | 100% |

Q4. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Numeracy** Experiences and Outcomes provide good opportunities to build upon good current learning and teaching practices. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.4 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.4 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 5 | 25% |
| 2 agree | 12 | 60% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 5% |
| 5 don't know | 2 | 10% |
| Grand Total | 20 | 100% |

Q5. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Numeracy** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to make connections across curriculum areas. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.5 | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| A.5 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 8 | 40% |
| 2 agree | 10 | 50% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 1 | 5% |
| 5 don't know | 1 | 5% |
| Grand Total | 20 | 100% |

Q6. Trialling Questionnaire. Taken together, the draft **Numeracy** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.6 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.6 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 6 | 30% |
| 2 agree | 13 | 65% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 5% |
| Grand Total | 20 | 100% |

Q7. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Numeracy** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning is relevant to their lives, now and in the future. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.7 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.7 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 6 | 30% |
| 2 agree | 13 | 65% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 5% |
| Grand Total | 20 | 100% |

Modern Languages

Q1. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Modern Languages** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.1 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.1 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 20% |
| 2 agree | 3 | 60% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 20% |
| Grand Total | 5 | 100% |

Q2. Trialling Questionnaire. The expectations of the draft **Modern Languages** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.2 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.2 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 2 | 40% |
| 2 agree | 2 | 40% |
| 5 don't know | 1 | 20% |
| Grand Total | 5 | 100% |

Q3. Trialling Questionnaire. Overall, the draft **Modern Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Modern Languages**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.3 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.3 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 2 | 40% |
| 2 agree | 3 | 60% |
| Grand Total | 5 | 100% |

Q4. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Modern Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide good opportunities to build upon good current learning and teaching practices. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.4 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.4 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 20% |
| 2 agree | 4 | 80% |
| Grand Total | 5 | 100% |

Q5. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Modern Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to make connections across curriculum areas. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.5 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.5 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 4 | 80% |
| 2 agree | 1 | 20% |
| Grand Total | 5 | 100% |

Q6. Trialling Questionnaire. Taken together, the draft **Modern Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.6 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.6 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 4 | 80% |
| 2 agree | 1 | 20% |
| Grand Total | 5 | 100% |

Q7. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Modern Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning is relevant to their lives, now and in the future. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.7 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.7 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 20% |
| 2 agree | 4 | 80% |
| Grand Total | 5 | 100% |

Mathematics

Q1. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Mathematics** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.1 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.1 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 14% |
| 2 agree | 5 | 71% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 14% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q2. Trialling Questionnaire. The expectations of the draft **Mathematics** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.2 | | |
|--------------|-------|------------|
| A.2 | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 5 | 71% |
| 3 disagree | 2 | 29% |
| (blank) | | 0% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q3. Trialling Questionnaire. Overall, the draft **Mathematics** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Mathematics**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.3 | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| A.3 | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 4 | 57% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 2 | 29% |
| 5 don't know | 1 | 14% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q4. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Mathematics** Experiences and Outcomes provide good opportunities to build upon good current learning and teaching practices. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.4 | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| A.4 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 2 | 29% |
| 2 agree | 3 | 43% |
| 3 strongly disagree | 1 | 14% |
| 5 don't know | 1 | 14% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q5. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Mathematics** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to make connections across curriculum areas. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.5 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.5 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 2 | 29% |
| 2 agree | 5 | 71% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q6. Trialling Questionnaire. Taken together, the draft **Mathematics** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.6 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.6 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 2 | 29% |
| 2 agree | 3 | 43% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 14% |
| 5 don't know | 1 | 14% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q7. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Mathematics** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning is relevant to their lives, now and in the future. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.7 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.7 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 3 | 43% |
| 2 agree | 4 | 57% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Classical Languages

Q1. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Classical Languages** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.1 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.1 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 33% |
| 2 agree | 2 | 67% |
| Grand Total | 3 | 100% |

Q2. Trialling Questionnaire. The expectations of the draft **Classical Languages** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.2 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.2 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 33% |
| 2 agree | 2 | 67% |
| Grand Total | 3 | 100% |

Q3. Trialling Questionnaire. Overall, the draft **Classical Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Classical Languages**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.3 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.3 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 33% |
| 2 agree | 2 | 67% |
| Grand Total | 3 | 100% |

Q4. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Classical Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide good opportunities to build upon good current learning and teaching practices. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.4 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.4 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 2 | 67% |
| 2 agree | 1 | 33% |
| Grand Total | 3 | 100% |

Q5. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Classical Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to make connections across curriculum areas. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.5 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.5 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 2 | 67% |
| 2 agree | 1 | 33% |
| Grand Total | 3 | 100% |

Q6. Trialling Questionnaire. Taken together, the draft **Classical Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.6 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.6 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 2 | 67% |
| 2 agree | 1 | 33% |
| Grand Total | 3 | 100% |

Q7. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Classical Languages** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning is relevant to their lives, now and in the future. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.7 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.7 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 2 | 67% |
| 2 agree | 1 | 33% |
| Grand Total | 3 | 100% |

Gaelic Learners

Q1. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Gaelic Learners** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.1 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.1 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 14% |
| 2 agree | 5 | 71% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 14% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q2. Trialling Questionnaire. The expectations of the draft **Gaelic Learners** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.2 | | |
|--------------|-------|------------|
| A.2 | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 6 | 86% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 14% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q3. Trialling Questionnaire. Overall, the draft **Gaelic Learners** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Gaelic Learners**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.3 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.3 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 3 | 43% |
| 2 agree | 4 | 57% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q4. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Gaelic Learners** Experiences and Outcomes provide good opportunities to build upon good current learning and teaching practices. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.4 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.4 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 4 | 57% |
| 2 agree | 2 | 29% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 14% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q5. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Gaelic Learners** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to make connections across curriculum areas. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.5 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.5 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 3 | 43% |
| 2 agree | 4 | 57% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q6. Trialling Questionnaire. Taken together, the draft **Gaelic Learners** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.6 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.6 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 5 | 71% |
| 2 agree | 2 | 29% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q7. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Gaelic Learners** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning is relevant to their lives, now and in the future. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.7 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.7 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 14% |
| 2 agree | 4 | 57% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 14% |
| 5 don't know | 1 | 14% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Expressive Arts

Q1. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Expressive Arts** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.1 | | |
|--------------|-------|------------|
| A.1 | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 7 | 88% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 13% |
| Grand Total | 8 | 100% |

Q2. Trialling Questionnaire. The expectations of the draft **Expressive Arts** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.2 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.2 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 13% |
| 2 agree | 6 | 75% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 13% |
| Grand Total | 8 | 100% |

Q3. Trialling Questionnaire. Overall, the draft **Expressive Arts** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Expressive Arts**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.3 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.3 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 2 | 25% |
| 2 agree | 6 | 75% |
| Grand Total | 8 | 100% |

Q4. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Expressive Arts** Experiences and Outcomes provide good opportunities to build upon good current learning and teaching practices. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.4 | | |
|--------------|-------|------------|
| A.4 | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 7 | 100% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q5. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Expressive Arts** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to make connections across curriculum areas. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.5 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.5 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 4 | 57% |
| 2 agree | 2 | 29% |
| 5 don't know | 1 | 14% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q6. Trialling Questionnaire. Taken together, the draft **Expressive Arts** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.6 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.6 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 3 | 38% |
| 2 agree | 5 | 63% |
| Grand Total | 8 | 100% |

Q7. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Expressive Arts** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning is relevant to their lives, now and in the future. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.7 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.7 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 3 | 38% |
| 2 agree | 5 | 63% |
| Grand Total | 8 | 100% |

Social Studies

Q1. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Social Studies** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.1 | | |
|--------------|-------|------------|
| A.1 | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 4 | 100% |
| Grand Total | 4 | 100% |

Q2. Trialling Questionnaire. The expectations of the draft **Social Studies** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.2 | | |
|--------------|-------|------------|
| A.2 | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 4 | 100% |
| Grand Total | 4 | 100% |

Q3. Trialling Questionnaire. Overall, the draft **Social Studies** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in Social Studies. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.3 | | |
|--------------|-------|------------|
| A.3 | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 3 | 75% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 25% |
| Grand Total | 4 | 100% |

Q4. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Social Studies** Experiences and Outcomes provide good opportunities to build upon good current learning and teaching practices. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.4 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.4 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 25.0% |
| 2 agree | 3 | 75.0% |
| Grand Total | 4 | 100.0% |

Q5. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Social Studies** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to make connections across curriculum areas. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.5 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.5 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 25% |
| 2 agree | 3 | 75% |
| Grand Total | 4 | 100% |

Q6. Trialling Questionnaire. Taken together, the draft **Social Studies** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.6 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.6 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 25% |
| 2 agree | 3 | 75% |
| Grand Total | 4 | 100% |

Q7. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Social Studies** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning is relevant to their lives, now and in the future. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.7 | | |
|--------------|-------|------------|
| A.7 | Count | Percentage |
| 2 agree | 2 | 67% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 33% |
| Grand Total | 3 | 100% |

English and Literacy

Q1. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **English and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.1 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.1 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 6 | 15% |
| 2 agree | 30 | 77% |
| 3 disagree | 3 | 8% |
| Grand Total | 39 | 100% |

Q2. Trialling Questionnaire. The expectations of the draft **English and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.2 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.2 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 4 | 10% |
| 2 agree | 29 | 71% |
| 3 disagree | 5 | 12% |
| 5 don't know | 3 | 7% |
| Grand Total | 41 | 100% |

Q3. Trialling Questionnaire. Overall, the draft **English and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **English and Literacy**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.3 | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| A.3 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 5 | 13% |
| 2 agree | 28 | 70% |
| 3 disagree | 2 | 5% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 1 | 3% |
| 5 don't know | 4 | 10% |
| Grand Total | 40 | 100% |

Q4. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **English and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes provide good opportunities to build upon good current learning and teaching practices. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.4 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.4 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 8 | 20% |
| 2 agree | 28 | 70% |
| 3 disagree | 3 | 8% |
| 5 don't know | 1 | 3% |
| Grand Total | 40 | 100% |

Q5. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **English and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to make connections across curriculum areas. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.5 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.5 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 14 | 37% |
| 2 agree | 22 | 58% |
| 3 disagree | 2 | 5% |
| Grand Total | 38 | 100% |

Q6. Trialling Questionnaire. Taken together, the draft **English and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.6 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.6 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 10 | 26% |
| 2 agree | 29 | 74% |
| Grand Total | 39 | 100% |

Q7. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **English and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning is relevant to their lives, now and in the future. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.7 | | |
|---------------------|-------|------------|
| A.7 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 5 | 13% |
| 2 agree | 28 | 72% |
| 3 disagree | 2 | 5% |
| 4 strongly disagree | 2 | 5% |
| 5 don't know | 2 | 5% |
| Grand Total | 39 | 100% |

Gaidhlig and Literacy

Q1. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Gaidhlig and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes are clearly worded. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.1 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.1 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 3 | 43% |
| 2 agree | 2 | 29% |
| 3 disagree | 2 | 29% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q2. Trialling Questionnaire. The expectations of the draft **Gaidhlig and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes at each level are suitably challenging. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.2 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.2 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 1 | 14% |
| 2 agree | 6 | 86% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q3. Trialling Questionnaire. Overall, the draft **Gaidhlig and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes provide a good basis for planning how children and young people will progress in their learning in **Gaidhlig and Literacy**. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.3 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.3 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 2 | 29% |
| 2 agree | 4 | 57% |
| 3 disagree | 1 | 14% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q4. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Gaidhlig and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes provide good opportunities to build upon good current learning and teaching practices. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.4 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.4 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 4 | 57% |
| 2 agree | 3 | 43% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q5. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Gaidhlig and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to make connections across curriculum areas. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.5 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.5 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 5 | 71% |
| 2 agree | 2 | 29% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q6. Trialling Questionnaire. Taken together, the draft **Gaidhlig and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for development of the four capacities (successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors). To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.6 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.6 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 5 | 71% |
| 2 agree | 2 | 29% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

Q7. Trialling Questionnaire. The draft **Gaidhlig and Literacy** Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning is relevant to their lives, now and in the future. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

| Count of A.7 | | |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| A.7 | Count | Percentage |
| 1 strongly agree | 3 | 43% |
| 2 agree | 4 | 57% |
| Grand Total | 7 | 100% |

4. Focus group questions

Topics for Focus Groups

CURRICULUM AREAS

Teachers not taking part in the trialling, EA's, school-college partnerships, subject specific networks (12 people).

Participants (male/female): _____ / _____

Region/Councils:

Subject area: (e.g. Maths, Science, Numeracy, Classical languages etc.)

Date:

Logistics: Tea, coffee and biscuits available 15 minutes prior to Focus Group. Timing for Focus Group to be 1 hour 15 mins. Whole session will be recorded. Flip chart to be available to record main themes, if appropriate. Expenses forms for participants. Copies of Draft Experiences and Outcomes for specific curriculum area.

Introduction

A. Participants' Background

- What are your job roles? Where are you from? (Prompt: Sector (s) etc)

B. Level of Understanding

- What do you know about the Curriculum for Excellence Draft Experiences and Outcomes? *Please Explain briefly*

C. Prior Engagement with the CfE Draft Experiences and Outcomes

- Are you aware of them?
- Have you read them?
- Have you implemented any of the Draft Experiences and Outcomes?

Hand out copies of Draft Experiences and Outcomes for specific curriculum area. Participants given 5 minutes to review the content of the Draft Experiences and Outcomes.

D. Participants' Views on the Draft Experiences and Outcomes and the Curriculum for Excellence

- To what extent do the draft Experiences and Outcomes in [insert curriculum area] encourage you to reflect on your current practice? *Please explain briefly.*
- Do you think that the draft Experiences and Outcomes encourage change to bring about improvement to current practice in [insert curriculum area]

- Do you think that the new Experiences and Outcomes in [insert curriculum area] encourage the development of cross-curricular themes? *Please explain briefly and give an example*
- Do you think that the new Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for 'deep learning'? *Please explain briefly and give an example.*
- Are the draft Experiences and Outcomes suitable? (e.g. content, challenge, motivation for all children and young people, including those with additional support needs and those needing more choices and more chances)?
- Taken together, do the draft Experiences and Outcomes provide opportunities for the development of the four capacities (*Please give examples linked to the development of successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens, effective contributors*)?
- Do the draft Experiences and Outcomes in [insert curriculum area] provide opportunities for children and young people to develop an understanding of how their learning is relevant to their lives, now and in the future?

E. Further Development of the Draft Experiences and Outcomes and the Curriculum for Excellence

- What do you see as the main strengths and weaknesses of the draft Experiences and Outcomes? (*Prompts: e.g., clearly worded, good basis for planning, allow children and young people to make connections across the curricular areas, it is clear what knowledge, attributes and skills are to be developed, provide a suitable basis for assessing the progress of children and young people*).
- In what ways do you think that the draft Experiences and Outcomes could be further developed? *Please explain briefly and give a specific example.*
- What professional development or other support and/or resources may be needed to help with the implementation of the new Experiences and Outcomes?

F. Any other Relevant Issues?

Thank all for participating.
Close of Focus Groups/ Distribute expenses forms

5. Feedback on Science: specific comments and questions

A number of the trailing proforma provided more detailed feedback regarding specific areas of the science curriculum. These are presented below.

- Pre-school practitioners would like a Topical science outcome - NE consortium
- Pre-school practitioners would like more challenge within some early outcomes - NE consortium
- SCN006J – a bit boring! Nothing on electricity and light until 2nd level. Possibly split 230U with 1st level.
- SCN006J – wording seems strange for P1 pupils
- SCN101A/201A – Concept requires to be underpinned by a basic awareness of recycling of materials – primary teacher
- SCN107F – reference to ‘sources’ rather than ‘types’ of energy more helpful - NE consortium
- SCN110L Phys – Major time gap between level 1 outcome on magnets and the level 4 outcome SCN424L - IOP
- SCN111M - clear progression difficult to ascertain – primary teacher
- SCN113S – some teachers puzzled why this outcome focuses on ‘reliability’ rather than ‘how’ senses allow us to explore our environment - NE consortium.
- SCN116BB – Outcome makes assumption that the science that appears in the media is both robust and accurately presented. Not always the case. Suggest amending wording to encourage more critical thinking around science. – SDELG
- SCN202A – suggest removing ‘environmental’ and using ‘sustainable’ to give outcome a wider focus. - SDELG
- SCN203A – Suggest last two words of outcome changed to ‘living things’ to ensure focus is on all life not just ‘the wild’ - SDELG
- SCN205B – Other sources such as what? Text books? Internet? - Primary teacher
- SCN205B - Recommend last word of outcome changed to diversity to encompass both the diversity within species in addition to biodiversity. - SDELG
- SCN206B - Feel this is above the level my children are operating at. Are they expected to simply produce posters as a campaign or something more complex? Primary teacher
- SCN206B – deeper understanding at this level would require understanding of how species adapt to live in differing habitat and how habitat change can cause species to become endangered/extinct. Outcome SCN205B could lay foundation for this- NE consortium
- SCN206B – Outcome makes assumption that pupils should campaign to save

- endangered species rather than encouraging them to think critically about the issue. Change wording to 'use my understanding to critically assess the ethics and issues involved in campaigns to save an endangered species'. - SDELG
- SCN207B – Are the children expected to visit each of these places? Above level of my class - Primary teacher
 - SCN207B – Outcome makes assumption that these institutions have a role to play rather than encouraging critical thinking about why they exist. Suggest text changed to '...an informed opinion on the responsibilities and ethics involved in the operation of zoos...' – SDELG
 - SCN209B – wording changed from 'plants' to 'biodiversity'. This will broaden the context of the outcome without loss of clarity - SDELG
 - SCN209B – Recommend text amended to '...showing how society and our quality of life have benefited from biodiversity and discuss the importance of biodiversity'. – SDELG
 - SCN210C – recommend that the words '*both in Scotland and the wider world*' are added to the end of this outcome to encourage both local and global thinking. - SDELG
 - SCN211D Consequences of melting and freezing on global sea levels, too subtle/complex for this level. Opportunities for experimental work in a primary setting are restricted as access to cooling and heating sources is limited and class sizes large - NE consortium.
 - SCN214F – How are children supposed to do this? Are they meant to create a real wildlife area? Imaginary one? Will this be effective?
 - SCN215F – Change 'energy cannot be created or destroyed' to something like 'energy is needed for things to work'. - NE consortium
 - SCN217G – Use of term 'the world' in this outcome is confusing. Suggest amended to 'the future of life on our planet that...' - SDELG
 - SCN218G – Outcome hints at a study of energy usage, many primary schools currently do this and look at alternative energy. Why remove this learning from this level when these issues feature in the new curriculum- NE consortium.
 - SCN219H – Some teachers have concerns associated with burning in classroom. If key purpose is the development of science enquiry skills suggest there should be alternative opportunities- NE consortium.
 - SCN220J – could/should be done at first level.
 - SCN220J – to achieve outcome requires preliminary work relating to the nature of a complete circuit as is concept of a switch. - IOP
 - SCN220J – Some surprise that this outcome restricts learning to series circuit, many children currently progress onto and enjoy the logic and sophistication of simple parallel circuits- NE consortium.
 - SCN221J – possibly simpler outcome for level 1 rather than level 2
 - SCN224L – Phrasing of outcome led to differing interpretations, viz an experiential approach that would arguably be better suited to first level or a more

structured, possibly quantitative approach better suited to fourth level or above. Divergence of views could be addressed by better working- NE consortium.

- SCN230U/SCN231W – light outcome very wide to challenge up to individual teacher. Sound outcome very specific – only about pitch - limiting – primary teacher
- SCN235BB - Outcome makes assumption that the science that appears in the media is both robust and accurately presented. Not always the case. Suggest amending wording to encourage more critical thinking around science. – SDELG
- SCN307E – Sustainability of outcome strengthened by amending it to ‘reasoned report on whether we can and should...’ to encourage pupils to think about the ethical implications of space exploration. - SDELG
- SCN309F – Concerned that statement mixes pedagogical strategies and content in a way that limits teaching approaches - IOP
- SCN310G - confusing to learner, optimizing the output of an energy-generating device is an important question of applied physics. Understanding this is not the same as, and is potentially confused by, the equally important but quite separate matter of its ‘commercial potential’. - Royal Society of Edinburgh.
- SCN312J – Outcome seriously flawed. For this outcome to be taught with any understanding, let alone deeper understanding, understanding of circuits not covered until level 4 required. If taught without understanding it lacks purpose. Teachers bemused/confused by notion of advising how faulty electrical appliances can be corrected. - NE consortium
- SCN312J – Children should not be encouraged to find faults in electrical appliances nor suggest correction - IOP
- SCN321S – Flexibility makes it so vague. What knowledge from this outcome will be required to underpin later courses leading to assessment.
- SCN322T – ‘Many types of visual displays’, danger that this will be related only to the CRT. Outcome also misses opportunity to link with energy conservation issues. (May link naturally with Art – but has to be a distinction between mixing pigments/paints and mixing light). Outcome appears to be ‘future proof’ but only because it is so vague. Needs more detail.
- SCN322T – not sure of merit
- SCN324V – Physics teachers agree that inclusion of non-visible parts of EM spectrum at level 3 is both desirable for those who exit at this point and also for those who study further. They are puzzled as to why experiences limited to infra red and microwaves and why context limited to communication. Exemplification requested – as it stands, many teachers cannot envisage how they can develop understanding in a challenging and fun way with active involvement. - NE consortium
- SCN325X – Outcome makes assumption that novel materials are beneficial to society. Suggest text amended to ‘...and their potential impacts, both positive and negative on society.’ - SDELG

- SCN330AA – Some concern that current popular labels such as Forensic Science, have been adopted as if they represent fundamental learning in science. Argue that outcome would be more powerful if the constraint of ‘forensic science investigations’ was removed. If the aim is to emphasis and support development of problem solving skills there should not be an outcome at every level which is context free. - NE consortium
- The gap between SCN205B and SCN405B was a problem for one trialling school. - NE consortium
- LO 302B, 316N, 318Q and 320R are too open ended and open to teacher interpretations.
- SCN402A Chem – suggest wording changed to ‘...debate the ethical and *environmental issues*....’ Ethical inextricably linked to environmental impacts. – SDELG
- SCN402A Chem – confusing to learner, bringing together two different kinds of knowledge (‘of extraction of metals’ and of ‘ethical issues’). - Royal Society of Edinburgh.
- SCN403A Bio/Chem – recommend using ‘sustainability’ used instead of environmental and that wording changed to ‘....express an informed view of the *ethics and implications* of a national....’ To give outcome a wider focus. - SDELG
- SCN407B Bio – Suggest that text amended to ‘having investigated the Earths ability to feed a growing human population, I can debate the moral and ethical issues of using scientific knowledge to address this issue’. – SDELG
- SCN407B Bio – confusing to learner, bringing together two different kinds of knowledge (how science ‘can’ be used is conflated with how it ‘ought’ to be used). - Royal Society of Edinburgh.
- SCN408B Bio – Suggest text amended to ‘... compare these methods to those used commercially and discuss the sustainability of these methods’. - SDELG
- SCN410E Phys – sustainability of outcome strengthened by amending it to ‘knowledge of the Earth and our Universe and how they have changed over time’. To encourage pupils to think about how we use technology to understand large scale changes to our planet. – SDELG
- SCN414G Chem – outcome makes assumption that plastics are important to all lifestyles and implies always will be. Sustainability of outcome strengthened by amending it to ‘to discuss the problems and benefits of using carbon based compounds to support....’ – SDELG
- SCN415G Bio/Chem – Sustainability of outcome strengthened by amending it to ‘informed view on the risks, benefits and ethics of future fuel options, including those produced from food crops and other plants.’ - SDELG
- SCN417J Phys – Implied need for understanding of circuit symbols and ability to construct circuit from formal circuit diagram. - IOP
- SCN420J Phys – Understanding of electric charge and charged particles must be based on an appreciation of electrons and atomic structure in some simplified

model. - IOP

- SCN430P Bio – Outcome strengthened by amending to ‘...moral, ethical and uncertainty issues....’ To ensure complexity and uncertainty are part of debate. - SDELG
- SCN431Q Bio - New – vague
- SCN424L Phys – Used to be in electricity and more suited there.
- SCN444BB ALL – There is no science in this outcome at all. – Royal Society of Edinburgh.

- Need for mechanics – gears pulleys/ levers to be included in curriculum.
- Like to see more environmental biology ie habitats, sampling etc. to link with sustainability.
- No mention of dinosaurs, this is a huge interest for young children - primary teacher
- Some of the outcomes proved far too challenging for the level the children are operating in. How are children supposed to campaign to save endangered species? - Primary teacher
- Need more information on assessment – secondary teacher
- Early and first levels could be more challenging
- There is a need for a rationale for the inclusion of individual outcome statements - IOP
- The outcomes do not give sufficient prominence to skills – IOP
- Planet Earth – Suggest early and level 1 outcomes re-written to recognize that many pupils study the seasons, time and relate these to the motion of the earth – IOP
- Not clear why distinction made between energy transfer, energy sources and energy in food – IOP
- Idea of fuels being a repository or source of energy, and other things being ‘energy stores’; the idea that machines or appliances can be used to ‘move energy around’ isn’t clearly articulated through the outcomes – IOP
- Difference between physical changes we can track and tracking changes in the amounts of energy in energy stores associated with real objects needs to be more clearly explored – IOP
- Within section on EM spectrum seems peculiar not to mention radio waves, X-rays or Gamma radiation within learning outcomes. However does not sit easily within theme of communication. On that basis not clear why there is a learning outcome associated with the ultraviolet radiation in medicine.

Feedback from the online survey drew attention to the following specific points:

- SCN114T – mentions limitations why not potential?
- SCN201A – In P7 then a big gap, no mention of topic in 3rd level then SCN401A
- SCN203A – teaching need to be more advanced
- SCN205B – Need clarity and further explanation
- SCN210C – question of sustainability in primary schools
- SCN214F – Good idea, difficult to do with a P7 class every year
- SCN214F – Question of sustainability in primary
- SCN215F – concept of energy not being created or destroyed too abstract.
- SCN212D – difficult for primary, more appropriate challenge for Level 3 secondary
- SCN219H - Exemplify expected differences in methods for energy release
- SCN219H – difficult to burn food with 33 in a class
- SCN220J – based on one previous level, is this sufficient for electricity?
- SCN220J – need prior knowledge of electricity and simple components

- SCN311G – mentions combustion – never mentioned before.
- SCN314M – clarification required on which systems are expected here and at what depth.
- SCN314M, 315M, 318Q, 320R, 321S – negates de-clutter argument
- SCN315M - should be at level 4
- SCN318Q – move up a level
- SCN318Q - too challenging especially biology
- SCN318Q – too challenging
- SCN320R - too challenging especially biology
- SCN320R – too challenging
- SCN320R – must have covered cells first or at least intro to nucleus
- SCN332T – very challenging
- SCN325X – challenges even the brightest
- SCN327Z – Structure of the atom needs to be added to give basis for progression

- SCN401A Chem - spread over level 3 and 4
- SCN403A Bio/Chem – could be at level 3
- SCN407B – must come before 408

SCN409C Bio/Chem - very challenging

SCN416H Bio – Exemplify expected differences in methods for energy release

SCN417J Phys – introduce at earlier level

SCN418J Phys – introduce at earlier level

SCN420J Phys - needs to be delivered prior to 312J to set scene

SCN420J Phys – should come before 312J

SCN421K Phys – introduce at earlier level

SCN421K Phys - requires prior knowledge and needs taught by physicist

SCN424L Phys – wrongly allocated

SCN426M Bio – should come before 314M

SCN430P Bio – progression unclear, what are the ethical issues discussing?

SCN434R Bio – better studied with mitosis

SCN440Y Chem – could be very difficult. May stretch able pupils

SCN440Y Chem – assumes a lot of previous work

SCN440Y Chem – very challenging

Level 4 outcomes difficult for some pupils to understand

6. Summary of cross-cutting themes

| | CPD requirement | Exemplification | Elaboration | Re-write/edit |
|-----------------|---|--|---|---|
| Science | <p>Broader repertoires of teaching and learning strategies.</p> <p>Continuing development to maintain up-to-date knowledge.</p> <p>Time to collaborate with peers and participate in joint planning, especially in the secondary sector.</p> <p>Support for less experienced teachers and support staff.</p> <p>Available resources to access to high quality CPD.</p> <p>Additional resources: equipment/ICT/AV/text books, especially primary sector.</p> | <p>Illustrations of applied curriculum planning.</p> <p>Skills mapping of core skills.</p> <p>Provision of briefing materials.</p> <p>Examples of good practice, especially for early career teachers and non-specialist science teachers.</p> | <p>Expectations of extent of coverage.</p> <p>Monitoring processes at a whole school level.</p> <p>Likely variation in interpretation. Concern with reliability of assessment.</p> <p>Uncertainty of progression from level four.</p> | <p>Wording of statements in the first person.</p> <p>Greater clarity in differences between levels (overlap).</p> <p>Clarification of 'hidden' knowledge an understanding dimensions.</p> |
| Numeracy | <p>Designated time for joint work and reflection.</p> <p>Opportunities for collaborative CPD and sharing resources.</p> <p>Challenges of moving towards more interactive investigative approaches.</p> <p>Focus on improving primary-secondary transition (3-18)</p> <p>School-wide planning to embed numeracy across the curriculum, especially in the secondary sector.</p> <p>Support for non-specialists teaching numeracy.</p> <p>Inclusion of ancillary and support staff in CPD agenda.</p> <p>Importance of building teacher commitment to ACfE.</p> <p>National programme of</p> | <p>Exemplification of achievement at particular levels – to support consistency.</p> <p>Broad outlines need 'unpacking' to support planning.</p> <p>Clearly worded but clarification needed on meaning e.g. 'cross-curricular numeracy'</p> | <p>Administrative demands of monitoring progress.</p> <p>Reporting achievement to parents.</p> <p>Uncertainty around future of national testing.</p> | <p>Inconsistency in progression e.g. level three and four.</p> <p>Concern with possibilities of omission or duplication.</p> <p>Accessibility of language to children and young people.</p> <p>'Translation' required to create a 'working document' to support planning.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| | CPD to support consistent approach across Scotland. | | | |
| Modern Languages | <p>Continuing support for non-specialists teaching Modern Languages in primary schools.</p> <p>Increased availability of Modern Languages teachers in the primary sector.</p> <p>Development of a wider range of teaching and learning strategies to provide 'rich learning experiences'.</p> <p>Technological resources to support the development of interactive approaches and motivating activities.</p> <p>Support in 'building a curriculum' in relation to the experiences and outcomes.</p> <p>Time for cross-curricular collaboration in the secondary sector and regional networking opportunities.</p> <p>Development of both teacher-produced and nationally provided resources/shared 'resource bank'.</p> <p>Support integrated approach to literacy.</p> | <p>Sharing of good practice identified during trialling.</p> <p>Clearly worded but more detailed guidance needed through exemplification.</p> <p>Further guidance e.g. exemplification following Higher Still.</p> | <p>Openness of outcomes.</p> <p>Distinguishing between levels of achievement.</p> <p>Reliability of assessment during initial familiarisation stages.</p> <p>Uncertainty around future examination structure.</p> | <p>Lack of detailed guidance to support teachers' assessment practice.</p> <p>Unclear progression e.g. between the second and third level.</p> <p>Clarification of the distinction between third and fourth level e.g. 'where level three ends'</p> <p>Further elaboration needed to be of greater value in early years and primary settings.</p> <p>Appropriateness of language for children and young people.</p> |
| Mathematics | <p>Nationally coordinated CPD at local and regional levels/</p> <p>Timetabled opportunities for joint work, especially in promoting cross-curricularity in secondary sector.</p> <p>Focus on methods and (new) content of the curriculum</p> <p>Sharing good practice e.g. GLOW.</p> | <p>More detailed guidance on progression and success criteria, especially in supporting recently qualified teachers.</p> <p>Mapping to avoid 'gaps' and ensure reliable information at transition points.</p> | <p>Alignment of ACfE with the outcome of the national qualifications review.</p> <p>Outcomes do not currently provide an adequate basis for target setting.</p> | <p>Easier navigation through the document to assist in following lines of progression.</p> <p>Unclear gradient of progression.</p> <p>Some concern with coding system.</p> <p>Some concern with 'I can' wording, especially in relation to learners with Additional Support Needs.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | <p>Opportunities for early years and P1 teachers to collaborate on transition arrangements.</p> <p>Dedicated CPD time for early years/primary teachers managing change across the curriculum.</p> | | | |
| Classical Languages | <p>Opportunities to meet and collaborate on planning.</p> <p>Support in the use of technology to enhance learning e.g. electronic whiteboards.</p> | <p>Illustrative examples of standards at particular levels.</p> <p>Sharing resources from trialling projects.</p> <p>Guidance and exemplars in relation to the promotion of 'deep learning'</p> | <p>Some concern about the reliability of assessment/ consistency in interpretation of the outcomes.</p> | <p>Wording suggests level of sophistication in pupil reflection and self-assessment.</p> <p>Progression gradient considered appropriate.</p> <p>Promotion of common terminology across all language-based curriculum areas</p> |
| Gaelic Learners | <p>Develop stronger cross-curricular links, especially in secondary schools.</p> <p>Continuing support following initial GLPS course.</p> <p>Lack of child-friendly' resources e.g. beginners' texts (primary) and reading for enjoyment texts (secondary).</p> <p>Development of a resource bank of interactive activities.</p> | <p>Development of a range of support materials suitable for less experienced teachers.</p> <p>Exemplification of standards at particular levels to support reliable teacher assessment e.g. illustration of pupils' work.</p> | <p>Patterns of progression unlikely to show close correlation between age and level.</p> <p>Alignment with future summative assessment framework.</p> <p>Further details on appropriate 'texts'.</p> | <p>Draft document dense – 'wordy'.</p> <p>Clarification of terms e.g. 'culture' and 'read' in the specific context of the draft experiences and outcomes.</p> <p>Some concern that the outcomes are 'too challenging' (primary and secondary)</p> |
| Expressive Arts | <p>Time for joint planning with teachers in other curriculum areas.</p> <p>Challenges for non-specialists 'delivering' Expressive Arts in the primary sector.</p> <p>Connections with expressive arts practitioners.</p> | <p>Further specific guidance/support for planning, especially to meet the needs of less experienced teachers or those who may lack confidence in Expressive Arts.</p> <p>Exemplification to reduce variance in interpretation.</p> | <p>Further guidance to support the development of assessment strategies.</p> <p>Clarification on progression within levels e.g. to support sharing of information on transition/transfer.</p> <p>Clarification of terms for assessment purposes e.g. 'enjoy'.</p> | <p>Strong negative perception on the inclusion of the term 'magic'.</p> <p>Some difficulty in following the structure of the document.</p> <p>Some similarities between outcomes at different levels, which presents difficulties in distinguishing between them.</p> <p>Further consideration of pupils with Additional Support Needs</p> |
| Social | Nationally coordinated | Role for HMIE and | Uncertainty around | Some concern about |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| <p>Studies</p> | <p>CPD</p> <p>Opportunities for face-to-face collaboration/networking e.g. through local partnerships.</p> <p>Promotion of cross-curricular links, especially in secondary sector.</p> <p>Development of a broader repertoire of teaching and learning strategies.</p> <p>Close liaison between primary and secondary schools to support transition.</p> <p>Time implications of 'unpacking' the outcomes at school level.</p> | <p>GLOW</p> <p>Exemplification of the gradation of skills.</p> | <p>outcome of national qualifications review.</p> <p>More detailed support for planning and the assessment of achievement.</p> <p>Coordination of activity at school/regional levels.</p> <p>Elaboration on key concepts e.g. 'culture' and 'identity'</p> | <p>accessibility of language for all pupils and audience for the document.</p> <p>Concern regarding close similarities between of outcomes (overlap)</p> <p>Language generally clear for teacher audience, but document 'too wordy'</p> |
| <p>Literacy and English</p> | <p>Coordinated national/regional CPD, especially in media technology.</p> <p>Opportunities/time for peer dialogue and collaboration, especially in promotion of cross-curricular links.</p> <p>Improved communication between primary and secondary sectors.</p> <p>Promotion of literacy across the curriculum i.e. not exclusive responsibility of teachers of English Language.</p> <p>Guidance on assessment, especially to support less experienced teachers.</p> | <p>Exemplification to support moderation/standardisation e.g. similar to HGIOS level 5 illustrations or equivalency statements accompanying introduction of higher and intermediate course.</p> <p>Models of good practice attached to practical examples of pupils' work.</p> <p>Illustrative 'walkthroughs': step-by-step guidance on assessment.</p> <p>More detailed information on each of the different stages and exemplification of differences/case studies between levels of learning.</p> | <p>Expectations of extent of coverage.</p> <p>Exemplar materials showing progress within each level.</p> <p>Rationale for combination of English Language and Literacy.</p> <p>Consideration of special schools and small schools with composite classes.</p> <p>Alignment with developments in summative assessment framework.</p> | <p>Clarification on similarities between outcomes at different levels.</p> <p>Accessibility and appropriateness of language for pupil audience.</p> <p>Inclusion of the role of the school library and school librarian.</p> |
| <p>Literacy and Gaidhlig</p> | <p>CPD to support a welcome shift in emphasis to listening and talking.</p> <p>Build on foundation laid by AIFL</p> <p>Development of a</p> | <p>Exemplification of clear links between classroom activities and the development of pupils' capacity for self-evaluation e.g. HMle exemplification.</p> <p>Useful guidance</p> | <p>Clarification on moderation procedures to ensure consistency in interpretation.</p> <p>Clarification on summative assessment (secondary schools)</p> | <p>Clarification on differentiation between levels e.g. Writing outcomes.</p> <p>Some concern that language is not accessible to all learners.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| | <p>common planning structure/template 'from the centre'.</p> <p>On-going support during early implementation phase, especially for primary schools.</p> <p>Sharing locally generated resources e.g. through GLOW</p> | <p>provided on reading strategies.</p> | <p>Further guidance on mapping and monitoring progress to avoid duplication and omissions.</p> <p>Guidance on reporting to parents.</p> | <p>Single summary sheets with clear overview.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|---|