

**CURRICULUM FOR EXCELLENCE
MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING**

**23 April 2013
West Lothian College, Livingston**

NOTE OF MEETING

LIST OF BOARD MEMBERS AND ATTENDEES

Board Members

Name	Organisation
Kay Barnett	Educational Institute of Scotland (EIS)
Janet Brown	Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA)
Tony Finn	General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS)
Grant Jarvie	Universities Scotland
Alan Johnston	Scottish Government (Chair)
Terry Lanagan	Association of Directors of Education in Scotland (ADES)
Mhairi Laughlin	College Development Network
Irene Matier	Association of Headteachers and Deputies in Scotland (AHDS)
Bill Maxwell	Education Scotland
Ken Muir	Education Scotland
Duncan Simpson	Community Learning and Development Network
Andy Smith	SLS

Others

Mike Corbett	NASUWT
Sarah Randall	Scottish Council of Independent Schools (SCIS)

Officials

Julie Anderson	Scottish Government (Secretariat)
Denise Brock	Education Scotland
Jeane Freeman	Scottish Government
Maggie Tierney	Scottish Government

Apologies

John Edward	Scottish Council of Independent Schools (SCIS)
Iain Ellis	National Parent Forum of Scotland (NPFS)
David McMurtry	Initial Teacher Education
Jane Peckham	NASUWT
Christine Pollock	Association of Directors of Education in Scotland (ADES)

1. Welcome and introductions

1.1 Alan Johnston (AJ) thanked Mhairi Laughlin (ML), Principal of West Lothian College for hosting the meeting and also Jim Cameron, Lindsay Seywright and Margaret Forisky for the very helpful presentation and tour prior to the meeting. He welcomed Board Members, in particular Andy Smith, Rector of Perth Academy, who has replaced Ronnie Summers as the SLS representative on the Board and Sarah Randall, Deputy Director of SCIS who was attending the meeting in place of John Edward.

2. Note and actions from meeting of 21 January 2013

2.1 The Management Board considered the list of actions from the January meeting, many of which were covered under agenda item 3. The following additional updates were provided:

CfE Implementation Process

2.2 In relation to the position of employers on CfE, Jeane Freeman (JF) updated the Board on the Cabinet Secretary's plans for engaging with employers, in particular highlighting plans for a Dinner with the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce on 9 May, a Glasgow Talks event on June and a planned series of events around the country, organised with local Chambers of Commerce and the Federation of Small Businesses in Scotland.

CfE Annual Report

2.3 As regards discussions with partners on the need for additional in-service time, AJ told the Board that a meeting of a sub set of MB members, including EIS, had been held on 26 February 2013. At the meeting, it was agreed: that assessment was a priority; that Education Scotland would develop materials for teachers to use in their in-service time; and that this would be a priority for action within the Implementation Group plan. There had been wide ranging discussions and views had been fed back to the Cabinet Secretary. It was agreed that the Cabinet Secretary would consider how the range of work already underway was developing and how this would sit with what is planned in the Implementation Group Action Plan for 2013-14, before reaching a decision on what further support is needed, including the question of additional in-service time.

2.4 Kay Barnett (KB) noted that the EIS were undertaking a survey of Primary School teachers, which had been launched that week, and would update the Board on the findings of this.

Management Board Learner Journey Sub Group

2.5 Terry Lanagan (TL) gave the Board an update on the work of the Learner Journey Sub Group, noting in particular that there had been further discussions in relation to the idea of an exit profile. The views of the sub group had been that it seemed wrong to stop the profiles at S3 and that this exit profile would be pupil owned but unlike the P7 and S3 ones, would not be compulsory. It would be about the process of “profiling” rather than the output of a “profile” and would be particularly helpful for young people not going on to university. The views of the Board were sought on this matter and the following points were discussed:

- Janet Brown (JB) noted that the profile should be for everyone, as the UCAS personal statement varies depending on the level of support the young person gets in completing it. She emphasised the value in teaching young people how to present themselves, as this was a skill they needed to learn when applying for jobs. She also suggested that this might be more of an online learning tool.
- Bill Maxwell (BM) suggested that there was a need for an IT system that enabled young people to take the lead and capture learning wherever this was happening and at whatever point they exited from learning.
- KB noted that, no matter what the positive intentions were or how this contributed to the development of young people, they needed to be mindful of the potential workload issues for staff. It would be important to focus on the benefits to learners when presenting plans in this area.
- Tony Finn (TF) also expressed concerns about how the exit profile would be introduced and acknowledged that it would be helpful, but could cause concerns around workload.
- Grant Jarvie (GJ) highlighted the work that had been done by universities in Scotland to put in place a Higher Education Achievement Record, in response to employers asking them to contextualise the outcomes. He noted that all universities had signed up to having these in place by 2014 and suggested that school exit profiles should link into these.
- ML noted that colleges were also doing work to look at what young people are taking with them into their next stages of learning and are looking at young people having their own websites on which they can share this information.

2.6 TL explained that the next phase of work would be to: look at the feasibility of an exit profile; identify examples of current practice in this area; identify any issues around this; and consider some possible pilots to test approaches. He noted that

Education Scotland and the Scottish Government would bring examples of current practice to the next sub group meeting and gave KB assurances that they would address logistical and workload issues. It was agreed that the Board would come back to this item in September.

CLD Strategy

2.7 Duncan Simpson (DS) told the Board that a CLD strategy paper would be presented at the June meeting.

3. CfE Implementation Progress

3.1 BM spoke to paper 3.1, noting that in terms of overall progress, he was comfortable that work was on track. The next biggest milestone - the publication of materials by Education Scotland and SQA by the end of April - was also on track. In terms of risks, BM noted that the risk register was being kept updated and pointed out that there would be a problem with delivering additional demands if other organisations brought these forward at present. However, there were helpful discussions being held with the professional associations, who seemed happy that materials were in line with what was originally agreed. In relation to this point he noted that the wording at paragraph 1 on risks and issues in paper 3.1 would be clarified and KB agreed that it was important there was an acknowledgement of the risk but that the wording needed to be clearer.

3.2 As regards the Annual Progress Report, the Implementation Group's Action Plan for 2013-14 would be discussed at the next Implementation Group meeting and would cover support. The messages from the previous Management Board meeting in relation to support would be taken on board, for example around assessment in Primary Schools. This would be agreed by the Implementation Group on 29 May and circulated to Management Board, with the intention of sending to schools by the end of June.

3.3 BM noted that at the previous Management Board meeting they had discussed the format of and need for an annual progress report, given the ongoing reports that the Management Board received from the Implementation Group. He noted that a Benefits Realisation Strategy was being developed and it was intended that this would be the main focus of Management Board. He informed the Board that work was underway to put together a draft benefits realisation strategy which would look ahead to see if the learning and teaching benefits of CfE were really being achieved.

3.4 AJ noted that this would go to Implementation Group and then Management Board to be discussed, hopefully at the next meeting in June.

3.5 DS asked how the benefits might be measured and emphasised the need for clarity around expectations in terms of attainment and achievement and also around when we expect to see results. BM pointed out that they were using the Education Scotland Area Lead Officer network in an increasingly active way to monitor progress around implementation on the ground and to report back to the Implementation Group.

3.6 TF pointed out that “Benefits Realisation” was not a catchy title and emphasised the need to be clear about the benefits to be measured. BM noted that they were clear what they needed to measure but that the key thing was how they measured this.

3.7 KM emphasised the fact that this was an ongoing process of change and that there was no end point for the curriculum being fixed. Rather, it was a continuous process of curriculum change and review and that we must not lose sight of why CfE is there nor of what the intended benefits are. BM added that the Benefits Realisation Strategy was not to report on an end point but to feed into further developments.

3.8 AJ asked Education Scotland to give Management Board a flavour of the challenges and local issues that they had been seeing. KM said that they were seeing progress, growing confidence and fantastic learning in Primary and Secondary Schools, with some schools implementing CfE in a creative way. He noted that there was still a degree of variation and that schools were at different points in the journey. In Primary schools they were still seeing issues around assessment and moderation, with too much bureaucracy around planning and reporting getting in the way of learning and teaching. In secondary schools, most were getting to grips with the Broad General Education. There was a decline in the number of schools offering whole cohort choice at S2 and where this did remain it was a legacy. There was still an issue around subject choice at the beginning of the Senior Phase, with numbers of subjects levelling out at around 6 or 7. There was still variation but this was not a bad thing – the important thing was that schools had a clear rationale for their model.

3.9 TL agreed that there was growing confidence. He told the Board that the ADES conference on 13th May would be a celebration of the best of CfE and had been oversubscribed in terms of attendees and also in terms of numbers of workshops. He felt this signalled a change in thinking with people seeing the benefits of CfE and being willing to share their experiences.

4. Communications and engagement update

4.1 Denise Brock (DB) talked to paper 4.1, updating the Board on key communications and engagement work undertaken since the January Board meeting. In particular she highlighted that a priority had been ensuring practitioners were aware of all materials that had been published and that Education Scotland was using all available channels to share messages as widely as possible. She noted that the publication timetable leaflet that went to all teachers in the GTCS magazine had been well received.

4.2 DB also informed the Board that 9 CfE briefings had been published to date, with further versions planned for CLD, parents, early years and on the Senior Phase, amongst other things. These briefings had been developed in partnership with a range of stakeholders. DB pointed out that the end of April would see the completion of the publication of qualifications support materials and that SQA, ES and the SG were working on a joint media plan.

4.3 On engagement with parents, DB noted that there had been a lot of good work done, with messages for parents being integrated into all the practitioner briefings. She also highlighted specific work with the National Parent Forum of Scotland (NPFOS) which included:

- The publication of 25 “Nationals in a Nutshell” (with 12 more in production). Feedback from parents had been positive and had indicated that the priority going forward should be on explaining what was different and what the benefits were of the National 4 and National 5 qualifications.
- The development of an action plan on the back of the 3 Qualifications Plus Events held in March.
- Work with the Scottish Government on the development of their leaflet for all parents of school age children which would show the journey, the benefits and the expectations around CfE from 3 to 18. The aim was to make this available for teachers by the end of the current school session, with a hard copy for parents at the start of the next school session.

4.4 In terms of the media, DB explained that the strategy had been to focus on local media and share good examples of practice, using inspection reports, which they had been doing in collaboration with local authorities. As regards the national

media, a series of briefings had been lined up around the publication of final support materials on 30/4.

4.5 Other communications activities included a CLD communications strategy which would be presented to the Board at a future meeting, alongside the CLD strategy paper. Work was also in hand to revamp the Scottish Government website and to bring together the Parentzone and Scottish Schools Online webpages into a one stop shop for parents.

5. Position of universities on Curriculum for Excellence

5.1 GJ presented paper 5.1 and informed the Board that there had been three strands of work undertaken with universities in relation to CfE:

- universities were reviewing their admissions policies to ensure they were fair and were issuing statements around entry requirements
- Universities Scotland had undertaken two surveys and drafted a set of FAQs around admissions policies
- Universities Scotland were undertaking a programme of engagement with universities across Scotland on CfE.

5.2 GJ explained that a number of statements had already been published and more were coming out presently and that the FAQs addressed many of the concerns that were being raised by parents. Management Board members agreed that paper 5.1 was very helpful but long overdue. In discussing the paper, the following points were made:

- JF pointed out that quite a few of the universities had gone beyond the implications for admissions and had looked at how the philosophy of CfE better placed young people to benefit from HE. It was agreed that there was a need to capture this and use it to help increase understanding. It was felt that this message was much more powerful coming directly from universities. It was also agreed that work should be done to work with the NPFS to turn these messages into something helpful for parents. The SG, ADES and Universities Scotland would look at how best to communicate these messages.
- JB highlighted that there were still 2 years of young people not doing CfE and the need to remember this in communications activities. TL pointed out that these young people will also have benefitted from the impact CfE has had on learning and teaching practice at all levels in the system.

- KM noted that CfE was not just about young people going to university and suggested that it would be very helpful to have a similar paper setting out the needs of employers in Scotland.

6. Update on Senior Phase benchmarking Tool

6.1 AJ invited Maggie Tierney (MT) to give a short update on the Senior Phase Benchmarking Tool. MT reminded the Board that the main aim of the tool was to better reflect the outcomes of CfE and it was intended for use by classroom teachers, as well as local authorities. It was much more user friendly and would reduce workload. MT explained that the four quadrants of the national dashboard would be: literacy; positive destinations; raising attainment for all and closing the gap, with much more detailed info underpinning each of these areas. The tool would go live in 2014 to coincide with the new qualifications, but a prototype was available now which would be refined and reviewed until the launch (and continually reviewed thereafter). This prototype would be shared with MB at their June meeting.

6.2 MT noted that since the last meeting of MB in January, work had focused in culture change and communications. Colin Sutherland had been leading a series of visits across the country and was happy to speak to anyone who requested it. The current priority was on agreeing which qualifications would sit under the raising attainment quadrant. MT suggested this was where non SQA qualifications and awards from other providers would sit.

6.3 In discussing the Tool, Management Board members noted the following points:

- DS asked where wider achievement would fit in and MT explained that quantifiable activities would sit in the 3rd quadrant (raising attainment for all), in which there was a toolbar with a range of indicators on Health and Wellbeing, GIRFEC etc. Schools could choose what to include within this toolbar. DS expressed concerns that if it was too difficult to include wider achievement then people would not do it. He noted that to focus purely on the quantifiable activities would go against the purpose of CfE.
- TL suggested that “raising achievement for all” might be a better title for this quadrant and noted that the Learner Journey Sub Group had been looking at the SCQF My Skills/ My Future document, which might be a useful tool here.
- JB suggested that non-national qualifications would sit under wider achievement and that it was better to use the term award rather than qualification.
- AJ noted that there would be a demonstration of the tool at the June meeting.

7. Recent NPFS engagement activities

7.1 Iain Ellis was unable to attend the meeting so it was agreed that this item would be covered at the meeting in June.

8. AOB

8.1 It was agreed that the next meeting would cover:

- The CfE Progress Report and Implementation Group Action Plan 2013-14
- Progress with the development of a Benefits Realisation Strategy
- The Community Learning and Development Strategy Paper
- An update from the NPFS
- A demonstration of the Senior Phase Benchmarking Tool
- An update on the work of the Commission for Developing Scotland's Young workforce

9. Date of next meeting

9.1 The date of the next meeting had been agreed as Tuesday 11 June 2013 from 14.30 to 16.30. As there would be a full agenda for that meeting, it was agreed that it would not involve a visit to a learning establishment.

9.2 The venue for the meeting has since been agreed as Clerwood House, Edinburgh.