

**CURRICULUM FOR EXCELLENCE  
MANAGEMENT BOARD MEETING**

**24<sup>th</sup> September 2013,  
Atlantic Quay, Glasgow**

**NOTE OF MEETING**

**LIST OF BOARD MEMBERS AND ATTENDEES**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Kay Barnett	EIS
Iain Ellis	National Parent Forum Scotland
John Edward	SCIS
Grant Jarvie	Universities Scotland
Alan Johnston	Scottish Government
Terry Lanagan	ADES
Mhairi Laughlin	College Development Network Scotland
Irene Matier	AHDS
Bill Maxwell	Education Scotland
Ken Muir	GTCS
Craig Munro	Education Scotland
Fiona Robertson	Scottish Government (Chair)
Andy Smith	SLS
<b>Others</b>	
David Cameron	SDS
Mike Corbett	NASUWT
Roddy Gillespie	SQA (in place of Janet Brown)
Robert Nicol	COSLA
<b>Officials</b>	
Julie Anderson	Scottish Government (Secretariat)
Denise Brock	Education Scotland
Jeane Freeman	Scottish Government
Hugh McAloon	Scottish Government
Graham Norris	Education Scotland
Maggie Tierney	Scottish Government
<b>Apologies</b>	
Janet Brown	SQA
Tony Finn	GTCS
David McMurtry	ITE
Jane Peckham	NASUWT

## **1. Welcome & apologies**

1.1 Fiona Robertson (FR) welcomed Board members and noted that there were a few changes in Membership. Duncan Simpson (CLD Standards Council) had retired and Fiona would write to Ashley Pringle regarding his replacement. Christine Pollock (ADES) had also retired and we would be liaising with ADES over an appropriate replacement. FR explained that this was also to be Tony Finn's last Management Board meeting as he was leaving his post at the GTCS the following week, however Tony was unable to attend. Ken Muir would be representing the GTCS on Management Board going forward. Education Scotland would be represented on Management Board by Craig Munro, as well as Bill Maxwell.

1.2 FR also welcomed: Robert Nicol who would be representing COSLA's interests at Management Board going forward; Roddy Gillespie, Head of CfE at SQA who was attending the meeting in place of Janet Brown; and David Cameron, who would be representing SDS at the meeting.

1.3 FR did a brief recap on key developments since June 2013, in particular highlighting: the spending review; exam results; publication of the Great Learning in Scotland leaflet for parents; the Working Group on Tackling Bureaucracy; and the interim report from the Commission for Developing Scotland's Young Workforce.

1.4 Looking ahead, FR emphasised the importance of the year ahead noting that issues around the delivery of Curriculum for Excellence would crystallise with the implementation of the new qualifications. A key role for Management Board was to make sure the first year of Senior Phase implementation was a success and to ensure there was a clear understanding of CfE amongst parents, employers, universities and other key groups.

1.5 The Board agreed the note of the meeting held on 11 June 2013.

## **2. Note and actions from meeting of 11 June 2013**

2.1 Alan Johnston (AJ) provided an update on the actions arising from the June meeting, noting that many of the points would be covered under subsequent items on the agenda.

2.2 Kay Barnett (KB) agreed to give a short update at the next meeting in December on the feedback EIS had received on N4 and N5 course materials.

2.3 It was agreed that the action points on CLD would be revisited at future meetings, when the CLD representative was in attendance.

### 3. CfE Implementation Progress

3.1 Bill Maxwell (BM) introduced paper 3.1, noting that the emphasis now was on looking ahead with the Implementation Plan for 2013/14.

3.3 BM drew attention to the three live issues which related to: variation in the implementation of the Senior Phase and subject choices; parental concerns about curriculum model and subject choice; and questions from the EIS about additional exemplification and training for N4 English. KB noted that EIS had now discussed this third issue further with SQA.

3.4 In terms of risks on the CfE risk register, BM highlighted several risks relating to: the Senior Phase Benchmarking Tool (SPBT) and the need to look beyond its development to supporting its implementation in schools; maintaining the confidence of parents on qualifications; managing variation in Senior Phase approaches; the implementation of National 3 and 4 English Literacy qualifications; and S4 school leavers. BM reassured the Board that the Implementation Group was satisfied that there was appropriate action underway to mitigate all the above risks.

3.5 Terry Lanagan (TL) raised a concern in relation to the Senior Phase Benchmarking Tool and the Senior Phase models that were emerging. He felt that the SPBT should be something that changed thinking and encouraged people to move away from traditional approaches. However, if the tool only measures a simple cumulative total of tariff points at the point of leaving school, this would encourage schools to continue to offer 8 qualifications in S4. The Board noted that the SPBT development team were looking actively at how best to address this issue and agreed that is very important to avoid creating incentives which might encourage schools to continue to take traditional approaches rather than move their curriculum in more progressive directions.

3.7 Craig Munro (CM) noted that the plan was to put out the current SPBT model and road test it, then use the results of this testing to revisit the underlying statistical model.

3.8 Mike Corbett welcomed the fact that examples had been published in 4 out of 8 curriculum areas and enquired as to when the remaining exemplars would be out. BM indicated that Graham Norris (GN) or CM would get back to him with this information.

3.9 Mhairi Laughlin asked if there would be an opportunity to pilot some work looking at mitigating actions for Xmas leavers and expressed an interest in being involved in this. BM thanked her for the offer and agreed to consider.

3.10 In relation to the inclusion of literacy in N3/4 English, Iain Ellis (IE) advised that SQA needed to be careful in how this was explained to parents. RG noted that

the use of scribes was a complex issue and shared a leaflet that had been developed for teachers and schools. He pointed out that there was a great deal of extra support that could be given to learners, and this document attempted to clarify this. However, he acknowledged that further advice was needed for parents.

3.11 IE went on to talk through the short update paper he had produced for the Board. He highlighted recent activity including the Nationals in a Nutshell and the Great Learning in Scotland Leaflet, which he felt would be well received. He expressed concerns that young people were being left out. He suggested that there was a need to consult with S4 pupils on how they feel about the changes.

3.12 In terms of the other challenges highlighted in his paper, IE emphasised that his biggest concern was around full cohort early presentation. He explained that he was aware of a few schools where whole departments were being presented early.

3.13 CM stated that he was not aware of any school doing full cohort early presentation and quoted the position on early presentation as outlined in Building the Curriculum 3 and in BM's letter from March 2012.

3.14 TL noted that ADES very much supported these guidelines and that he would like to know of any large groups of pupils being presented early in 2013. It was agreed that SQA would provide the data.

3.15 BM noted that there was a legacy from cohorts of young people who started early presentation a few years back who needed to complete their programmes of study. However, he emphasised that guidance was clear that this would not be acceptable, going forward. CM acknowledged that this seemed to be an ongoing issue which Education Scotland would need to look at and welcomed intelligence from other members of the Board in relation to this.

3.16 BM also raised the issue of progression to the new Highers, noting that there had been a previous letter outlining expectations around this and suggesting that it might be timely now to have a further letter from the Implementation Group re-emphasising expectations around the implementation of the new qualifications.

3.17 IE flagged that schools needed to be clear with parents about changes to appeals and that there should be worksheets and other materials for parents to use at home for the new qualifications. FR suggested that there was scope for a further discussion between the NPFS and the Implementation Group on this.

3.18 It was agreed that work would be done to: look at the intelligence around early presentation with the aim of clarifying where it was happening not on an individual basis; consider how the message is re-emphasised to the system; and to consider if any further correspondence would be appropriate at this point. It was agreed that work should be undertaken to bring this together in advance of the next Implementation Group, which would be shared with Management Board in correspondence.

3.19 In relation to IE's point about engaging with young people, BM agreed that there could be a specific focus on S4 young people as the year progresses and a snapshot analysis could be drawn out. GN added that young people had been involved in the Senior Phase work but acknowledged that more could be done.

#### **4. Communications & Engagement Update**

4.1 Denise Brock (DB) presented paper 4.1, noting that *Great Learning in Scotland* had set out the overarching themes for the year. She noted that there was a Senior Phase focus but emphasised the importance of exemplifying good practice from early years and primary schools as well.

4.2 DB explained that the Communications Group had met recently and looked at the year ahead, identifying a range of opportunities and channels to be used. She also noted that it had been a very positive experience working with the NPFS on the *Great Learning in Scotland* leaflet and she was keen to build on this when exemplifying good practice across the country.

4.3 DB also informed the Board that Education Scotland was working with ADES, SQA and NPFS to look at how people navigate the range of resources from across the different organisations, building on feedback that a graphic was needed to show all resources available and how they fit together. The intention was to produce a list of existing materials and forthcoming ones. KB noted this piece of work with interest, as she said that teachers often get the different organisations muddled and there was an issue about accessing materials amongst the large volume out there. In that sense she welcomed this piece of work, but felt it wouldn't address the underlying questions about what next.

4.4 FR emphasised the need to make sure we are hitting all the key audiences over the next 6 to 9 months, ensuring their understanding of CfE was enhanced.

#### **5. CfE Benefits Realisation/ Evaluation**

5.1 AJ gave a presentation outlining plans for an overarching evaluation strategy for Curriculum for Excellence, the aim of which is to ensure that Scotland had an education system, which itself learns and adapts over time. He emphasised that this would be led by and involving the system itself; designed to directly inform policy and practice, and would include a strong independent dimension. AJ outlined 4 key elements of the strategy: the OECD review; the 3-18 Curriculum, Learning, Teaching and Assessment (CLTA) National Forums; ongoing inspections; and independent research and evaluation. In terms of governance, AJ explained that Management Board would be the natural group to own this process but may form a sub-group, with co-opted specialists and should look for substantial input from the academic community.

5.2 GN provided an update on the work that Education Scotland had been doing to establish the CLTA National Forums, explaining that they were in the initial planning stages and were looking for feedback from Management Board before doing any further, external consultation on this.

5.3 TL was content with GN's proposals around the CLTAs but felt that the remit for the OECD work was quite vague. He also felt that the timing of the OECD work in 2015 could be problematic. The first CfE cohort would be going through S5, so if the point was to gauge the end products then we wouldn't necessarily see this until 2016 as most young people stay on until S6. TL felt that further clarity was needed on what the OECD would be measuring.

5.4 DC asked how this would link to the previous OECD review, as this would provide a helpful framework and show how this was part of an ongoing process – a progress check rather than an end of term exam. He also suggested that it would be good to have an overlap in membership with the previous review. Jeane Freeman (JF) felt that this was a very helpful suggestion, as it was important that people understood that this was about continual review and learning in the system. She also noted that employers, universities and colleges had a key interest in how young people were learning and what the end product would be. As such it was important that they were also involved in this process. JF expressed some concern about who the National Forums would feed into and suggested that careful thought be given to how this sits alongside Ministers' role.

5.5 CM flagged that *Synergies for Better Learning* (April 2013) was also a key document from the OECD and would be important to make the link in this work. BM also highlighted that Scotland had been involved in the OECD review of vocational education across Europe and that there was an important message to be shared about Scotland continually taking on board external views and input.

5.6 KB indicated that she was happy with the overall aims but would need a lot more detail before she firmed up an exact response. She felt it would be good to get stakeholder reaction to the plans for the national forums and she didn't want it to be about ticking boxes. She agreed that Management Board should be the Group to oversee this area of work.

5.7 FR thanked Board members for their helpful feedback and noted that this would be used to guide further work in this area, which would include the development of a more detailed paper. AJ added that this paper would include further details on the CLTA fora, further information on the OECD review and a clear overall strategy. This would be developed and brought back to the Board or a sub Group of the Board.

## **6. Commission for Developing Scotland's Young Workforce**

6.1 FR set the context for the work of the Commission and explained that the interim report had been published at the beginning of September. It hadn't been possible to set up a meeting with Sir Ian and the Management Board members

earlier but it was felt that this was a helpful point at which to discuss the interim report. FR introduced Hugh McAloon (HM), Head of Secretariat to the Commission and Maggie Tierney (MT), who was working with Hugh on early implementation issues.

6.2 HM explained that the Commission had already engaged with many of the Management Board members and some had had a major impact on the thinking of the Commission around the opportunities that Curriculum for Excellence presented. He explained that the aim of the Commission had been asked to provide advice on: how Vocational Education could be improved; how to get employers to make a contribution to Curriculum for Excellence; College education; and the Modern Apprenticeship Programme. It was not looking at Higher Education.

6.3 HM explained that, in the interim report, the key drivers in education were seen to be: the transformation of education through Curriculum for Excellence; the flexibility in the Senior Phase which meant young people could be offered a wider range of tailored opportunities; the real opportunities presented by the College regionalisation agenda around coherent planning of education at a local and regional level; and the growth in the Modern Apprenticeship programme, which offered an appealing work based option for school leavers.

6.4 HM noted that the main recommendations for school and colleges were about: providing the opportunity to study industry recognised vocational qualifications alongside academic; having a focus on employability across the Secondary school curriculum; providing better careers advice and labour market intelligence; and looking at how schools' performance is assessed so that we look at vocational results, alongside academic.

6.5 The next steps for the Commission would be to engage with employers and to look at inequalities. There was an open consultation on the interim report which would close on 31 October 2013. HM emphasised that the Government was committed to working in partnership with COSLA to consider the recommendations and their implications and once the final report was published in April 2014, then further work would be done to look at the implications.

6.6 FR invited the Board to offer views or ask questions. TL explained that HM had attended the Learner Journey Sub Group on 10 September and that the Group welcomed the interim report. In particular they found the ideas around joining up the system and the idea of HNCs in schools interesting. However, they did flag a few points that they felt were missing from the interim report - the value of vocational education for academic students and cost implications. On the former, the Sub-Group felt that in order to get parity of esteem you needed to show that vocational education was for everyone, even young people going on to higher Education. On the latter, the report noted that costs would be transitional but clearly this needed resourcing, so it would be important to tease out what exactly this means in the final report.

6.7 ML explained that the College Sector had welcomed the report, especially the points about joining up the system. She emphasised that vocational qualifications needed to be part of the Senior Phase Benchmarking Tool from the outset.

6.8 DC welcomed the report and the call for earlier careers advice and guidance within the Broad General Education. He is happy that this is in line with work SDS is doing to identify good practice in Scotland and beyond and to develop a set of standards.

6.9 IE agreed with the previous points and also felt that the report was helpful. He expressed some concerns around the role of Education Scotland and the financial implications of greater college involvement in teaching school age young people.

6.10 Ken Muir (KM) highlighted the importance of recommendation 2 for teachers' professional development and emphasised the importance of the Commission having further dialogue with the Teacher Education Institutes, given the major implications for them.

6.11 Grant Jarvie explained that at the last meeting of the Universities and Colleges Parliamentary Cross-Party Group, the previous week, they had received a presentation on the contribution of HE to employability. At the meeting they agreed to have someone along from the Commission to speak to the next meeting. He also flagged that universities themselves were major employers and referred to employability case studies on Robert Gordon University.

6.12 In relation to the earlier points on the SPBT, BM suggested that a plan was needed for a second phase of the tool. At present it looked at what young people were achieving in school but it should look at what every 18 year old was achieving wherever they were learning.

6.13 HM explained that the target date for the final report was April 2014 but it was hoped that it would be completed sooner. He thanked the Board for their helpful feedback and noted that on the question of resourcing, it had been felt that this was a question for the Scottish Government and local authorities and that it wasn't within the remit of the Commission to come up with detailed costs. HM agreed that TL's point on vocational education for academic young people was very important. On the SPBT, he noted that vocational learning was covered in the tool but suggested that it needed to be more explicit. HM agreed to pass on GJ's invite to attend the University/ College joint group.

6.14 FR emphasised the importance of continued engagement between the Board and the Commission on this work and suggested that HM or Sir Ian Wood should attend the Board prior to publication of the final report.

## **7. Update on Exit Profile scoping work**

7.1 TL provided the Board with an update on work around Exit Profiles, based on a paper that had been presented to the Learner Journey Sub Group meeting on 10/09/13. He noted that work was progressing and highlighted the following points:

- It was felt that the term Exit Profiling had too much focus on the end point and as such it was decided to change the language to Profiling in the Senior Phase
- It was agreed there was an urgency to this work as young people were already in the Senior Phase but profiling was not something many schools were thinking about at that stage
- Scottish Government and Education Scotland were engaging with key stakeholders about joining up profiling and processes for entering HE, FE and employment
- The profile should be learner lead and schools would determine the format
- Education Scotland were working on developing exemplars by December 2013
- The Scottish Government and Education Scotland were developing a communications plan around Profiling in the Senior Phase.

7.2 BM noted that whilst there should not be a national version, there needed to be some local consistency of approach.

7.3 Irene Matier (IM) welcomed TL's update and noted that secondary teachers had already been attending primary school events on profiling, to ensure consistency and smooth transitions.

## **8. AOB**

8.1 FR noted that this was IM's last meeting and thanked her for her service to the Board over the past 7 years.

## **9. Date of next meetings**

Dates for further meetings in school session 13-14 have been agreed as:

Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> January – am

Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> March – pm

Tuesday 17<sup>th</sup> June – pm