

Priestley, M. (2013). The 3-18 Curriculum in Scottish Education. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.), *Scottish Education, 4th edition, Referendum*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

The 3-18 Curriculum in Scottish Education

Mark Priestley

University of Stirling

INTRODUCTION

Scotland's Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) has attracted attention around the world. Its structuring around the notion of four capacities appears to be innovative and radical. The emphasis on active forms of learning and interdisciplinary learning appears to encapsulate pedagogical and curricular principles beloved of progressive educators. And its emphasis on engaging teachers as professional developers of the curriculum and as agents of change appears to offer considerable potential for achieving its oft-stated goal of delivering transformational change. However, there is a need to cast a critical eye over these apparent features of the new curriculum. This chapter offers a critical analysis of the current Scottish curriculum. The chapter first provides an overview of CfE. This is followed by a brief summary of the historical development of the 3-18 curriculum in Scotland. After setting the scene in this fashion, it then addresses the issues outlined in the first paragraph above. It concludes by offering some reflections on the current and likely future development of the 3-18 curriculum.

CURRICULUM FOR EXCELLENCE

CfE is significant in that it is the first systematic attempt to unify what had previously been disparate strands in Scottish curriculum policy. It brings under one roof early years education, primary and secondary schooling, and post-compulsory education (at least in schools and FE colleges, but arguably also permeating discourses in universities). The discourses of the new curriculum are also influencing developments in related spheres such as community education and social care. Thus in this sense at least, CfE represents a major educational reform initiative.

Curriculum structure

CfE was launched in 2004, when the then Scottish Executive published a paper titled *A Curriculum for Excellence: The Curriculum Review Group* (see Education Scotland, 2011, for all official publications related to CfE), following the 2002 National Debate on Education. There are several significant features of this document. The central ideas of CfE are described in terms of values, purposes and principles. Instead of adopting a traditional 'aims and objectives' model of curriculum, CfE starts from a statement of 'the values upon which . . . the curriculum should be based' (p. 8). The words which are inscribed on the mace of the Scottish Parliament - wisdom, justice, compassion and integrity - are invoked and it is argued that both personal development and social responsibility depend on awareness not only 'of the values on which Scottish society is based' (p. 11) but also of 'diverse cultures and beliefs' (p. 11). In relation to purposes – a softer term than either aims or objectives – there is a clear statement of the importance of promoting four key capacities. The curriculum stated that all young people should become:

- successful learners

Priestley, M. (2013). The 3-18 Curriculum in Scottish Education. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.), *Scottish Education, 4th edition, Referendum*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- confident individuals
- responsible citizens
- effective contributors. (p. 12)

These capacities have been subject to little in the way of critical interrogation, tending to become broad slogans. More useful as over-arching purposes of education are the descriptor statements that accompany them; these provide considerable potential as a starting point for curriculum planning. This issue will be revisited in the final section of the chapter.

The 2004 discussion paper did not offer much in the way of extended justification for either its terminology or its recommendations. In this sense it should be regarded as a broad framework or discussion document, designed to form the basis of subsequent policy development, rather than as an extended rationale. Such development was slow to follow initially, but the pace has increased subsequently. The publication of *A Curriculum for Excellence* was accompanied by the *Ministerial Response* (Education Scotland, 2011), which set out future directions for the new curriculum in a more concrete manner than did the review document. This latter paper established, for instance, that the curriculum would be articulated as 'clear statements of the outcomes which each young person should aspire to achieve' (p. 4). Moreover, the response hinted that subjects would continue to be the basis of the curriculum. In 2006, *A Curriculum for Excellence: progress and proposals* (Education Scotland, 2011) started to add meat to these curricular bones, in particular emphasising the importance of engagement by teachers, the centrality of learning and teaching and the unification of the curriculum from 3-18. This document outlined a series of six sequential levels, establishing the principle that 'expectations will be described in terms of experiences as well as broad significant outcomes' and that these would be 'designed to reflect the Four Capacities' (p. 12). Significantly, it was proposed at this stage that experiences and outcomes would be structured using the following areas:

- Health and Wellbeing
- Languages
- Mathematics
- Science
- Social Studies
- Expressive Arts
- Technologies
- Religious and Moral Education

Further guidance has emerged more quickly since 2006. This includes the *Building the Curriculum* series, which for example has provided additional guidance on the eight curricular categories outlined above, the early years curriculum and assessment. These documents have been criticised for their lack of clarity and focus, and as a result were followed in 2010 by summary documents, intended to provide an at-a-glance overview of key principles and concepts.

Another significant set of documentation has been the publication since 2007 of the experiences and outcomes (Es & Os) in each of eight curricular areas (Education Scotland, 2011). The writers of the Es & Os sought to combine within simple statements, set out in hierarchical levels, both the expected

Priestley, M. (2013). The 3-18 Curriculum in Scottish Education. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.), *Scottish Education, 4th edition, Referendum*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

outcomes of learning and the experiences through which the outcomes might be achieved. The following examples from Science give a flavour of these.

By contributing to experiments and investigations, I can develop my understanding of models of matter and can apply this to changes of state and the energy involved as they occur in nature. [SCN 2-05a]

Through research on how animals communicate, I can explain how sound vibrations are carried by waves through air, water and other media. [SCN 2-11a]

(Education Scotland, 2011)

Key themes in Curriculum for Excellence

CfE exhibits a number of features that its proponents claim to be new, innovative and distinctive. The main themes are outlined briefly here, and will be explored more critically in the final section of the chapter. A major theme is flexibility. The new curriculum explicitly states that schools will be freed up to develop content and pedagogy to meet local needs, and to provide for the needs of individual learners. There has been a stated aim that the curriculum would be 'decluttered' (Education Scotland, 2011), thereby reducing content and limiting the necessity for teachers to transmit content. The Es & Os reflect such aspirations, framing knowledge in a more generic and less content specific manner than was the case previously, and affirming the importance of skills development. Teachers have been explicitly positioned in this process as agents of change, drawing upon the arguably successful experience of engaging practitioners in pedagogical development during the pilot phases of the earlier *Assessment is for Learning* programme (see Hutchinson & Hayward, 2005).

A second major theme concerns pedagogy. Indeed, it has been suggested that the key change sought by CfE lies in the development of new approaches to learning and teaching. Within these new approaches, learners are required to become more responsible for their own learning. Active learning is promoted by the new curriculum, although there is often little clarity about what this means in practice (it is regularly construed rather narrowly as kinaesthetic learning – see chapter 49 for further discussion). In many local authorities, active learning has been developed using established approaches such as cooperative learning, which have come to complement, or in some cases replace, more traditional forms of didactic teaching, and the commonplace worksheet-based learning that developed through the 1980s and 1990s. Such social forms of learning extend to some extent the notion of active learning, but it is fair to say that more explicit work is needed in this respect, especially in terms of developing the notion of 'active' around concepts such as metacognition and intrinsic motivation.

A third theme relates to the organisation of knowledge. There are various cross-curricular themes: literacy, numeracy and citizenship for instance – which are seen as the responsibility of all teachers. In many secondary schools, there is emerging the systematic development of less fragmented provision of subjects in the years S1 to S3 (now known as the phase of broad, general education). This development is explicitly framed to broaden the curriculum at this stage without the need for pupils to see 15 or more subject teachers in a week, and to facilitate the making of cross-curricular

Priestley, M. (2013). The 3-18 Curriculum in Scottish Education. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.), *Scottish Education, 4th edition, Referendum*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

linkages. Thus, for example, many schools are establishing fully integrated or modular (e.g. one teacher, three subjects) models for the social subjects and science. Other inter-disciplinary approaches have become popular in secondary schools, notably the rich task approach first developed in Queensland, where typically, different subjects come together to constitute an event, for example an Africa themed week. Such work often involves citizenship or global citizenship. The development of inter-disciplinary approaches has been generally well-received in primary schools, which have experience of working in thematic ways. However, some of the development in secondary schools is more problematic (Minty & Priestley, 2012). There is a general lack of knowledge and understanding of theory relating to inter-disciplinary approaches, and many initiatives have been tokenistic (to meet the requirements of CfE) and contrived (for example shoe-horning subjects into a preconceived theme rather than selecting content to meet clearly defined curricular purposes). In some secondary schools, CfE as a whole has been framed within a set period of time each week (e.g. a double period), with the normal business of the school carrying on as usual for the remainder of the week. Furthermore, in the majority of secondary schools, there has been little attempt to change existing timetable structures; and the ubiquitous 30 period week/53 minute period is a major hindrance to developing inter-disciplinary approaches and active pedagogies.

A fourth theme concerns the extension of CfE into age ranges not previously covered by national curriculum guidance. In many cases, this policy evolution reflects existing trends in practice. The formation of the early level brings together pre-school centres and primary schools, hitherto separate institutions governed by different guidance, and arguably quite different culturally and educationally. There is now an expectation that practitioners from a diverse range of pre-school centres will work with and in similar ways to primary school teachers. While this has been welcomed by many practitioners who have longed called for greater integration, it is also challenging, given the previously very different ways of working, underpinning philosophies and educational backgrounds experienced by these two groups of practitioners. Another area where CfE formalises and builds upon existing practices in cross-sectoral working relates to the transition between secondary and further education (FE). FE colleges, like schools are developing approaches to implement CfE, both for their more traditional students (post 16) and for increasing numbers of pre-16 school pupils who follow courses in college as part of collaborative school-college arrangements. Early anecdotal evidence suggests that many colleges are coping with the demands of CfE better than their secondary school counterparts. This can be largely attributed to the existence of mechanisms in colleges for cross-disciplinary working, continuous assessment and moderation and the development of core skills; recent experience of such activity is less well-developed in secondary schools.

A final theme is assessment. New qualifications have been developed to replace the existing level 4 (Standard Grade General or Intermediate 1) and level 5 (Standard Grade Credit or Intermediate 2) with single qualifications. The new qualifications have been designed to meet the needs of CfE, containing for example a large continuous, school-based assessment component (in the case of the new National 4 qualification, this is to be 100% assessed internally, and will not be graded). Levels 3 (continuation of Access qualifications, but discontinuation of Standard Grade Foundation), level 6 (Higher) and level 7 (Advanced Higher) will remain essentially unchanged. Many teachers have criticised what they see as the late arrival of these qualifications in relation to the new curriculum, complaining that they will not know what to teach until they know what is to be assessed. To some extent, such anxieties are understandable; secondary teachers are judged according to their success

Priestley, M. (2013). The 3-18 Curriculum in Scottish Education. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.), *Scottish Education, 4th edition, Referendum*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

in raising attainment, and a lack of clarity in terms of qualifications is a serious concern for many. It remains to be seen whether the revised qualifications will reduce pressures to teach to the test, as is claimed; it may be that continued use of attainment data by local authorities, school managers and inspectors as a proxy measure of school and teacher effectiveness will militate against this. Assessment is also a concern for primary teachers and within the early stages of secondary school. It has become increasingly clear since 2010 that assessment against the Es & Os will be a major feature of teachers' work within CfE. Significantly, early documentation demonstrated a sensitivity towards the dangers of assessment driving the curriculum, however subsequent developments reveal a shift in emphasis, making clear an expectation that the Es & Os are assessment standards. This has been exacerbated by the decision in many local authorities to assess against not only each E & O, but to utilise a three level scale within each level: 1] *Developing*; 2] *Consolidating*; and 3] *Secure* (Minty & Priestley, 2012). Such developments reveal a continued preoccupation with assessment, recording and reporting, which potentially both increases teacher workload and limits the aspirational scope of CfE to broaden education through school-based innovation.

At the time of writing, work on implementing the curriculum is on-going; schools nationally were required to implement the new curriculum up to and including S1 by the end of the 2010-11 school year.

THE SCOTTISH CURRICULUM – HISTORICAL TRENDS

It is a well known axiom in Scottish education that primary schools teach children, whereas secondary schools teach subjects. There is some truth in this statement, as will be revealed through a brief summary of the historical development of the curriculum in Scotland, although as with any such witticism, if taken literally it can obscure important issues. This section briefly focuses on the primary and secondary curricula to illustrate the historical trajectories that have led to CfE. Lack of space precludes discussion of other areas such as early years.

The Primary Curriculum

The defining moment for the primary school curriculum occurred in with what has come to be known as the Primary Memorandum (1965). This document laid down some of the defining principles of the primary school. These include child-centredness, active participation by pupils in their own learning, experiential learning, a thematic or inter-disciplinary approach to the curriculum and teachers' active reflection on their work (see Cassidy, 2008). The Memorandum is often described as a sharp break with tradition, but according to Paterson (2003) this is not the case; it is better seen as a reaffirmation of trends that had been emerging since at least the 1930s. Moreover, unlike in England where progressive education was seen as being relatively unstructured, in Scotland the progressivism of the Memorandum was tempered by strongly entrenched notions of structure, hierarchy and the relative positioning of the teacher and the child. Its implementation reflected notions of schooling as the socialisation of 'children into responsible adulthood' (Paterson, 2003, p.127). As such it represented a pragmatic mix of progressivism and conservatism, and a statement of evolutionary development rather than a radical step change.

Priestley, M. (2013). The 3-18 Curriculum in Scottish Education. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.), *Scottish Education, 4th edition, Referendum*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Further change came in the 1980s, due in part to inspectorate criticisms of a narrow basic skills focus in primary schools (Cassidy, 2008), alongside increasing interest on the behalf of government to extend control and accountability into the domain of schooling. The result was the 5-14 Curriculum (for example, articulated in the *Structure and Balance of the Curriculum*), first introduced, following heated debate about the 'Englising' of the curriculum, in 1991. 5-14 did represent a number of changes to the work of primary schools, reflecting the influence of the New Right in British politics. This is especially evident in the introduction of an outcome-based model, organised into sequential levels. This development introduced an overtly technicist element to schooling, allowing assessment to be specified against the curriculum outcomes. The curriculum was framed as guidelines rather than prescription, but in practice primary schools fell into line in implementing it. For the first time primary schools had to work to fixed time allocations. National tests (ostensibly to be only used as a backup to teacher professional judgment and available from a centralised bank) came to be utilised as the main yardstick for pupil attainment, and local authorities were able to collate attainment data from them, used subsequently as a proxy measure for school effectiveness. According to Cassidy (2008), 5-14 exerted a number of detrimental effects on primary education, including a recourse to rigid timetabling structures, curricular fragmentation, and an over-focus on assessment, especially national testing. It is likely that this has contributed to a process of deprofessionalisation in primary schools, and to the development of a culture of accountability and performativity, which has subsequently limited capacity for school-based curriculum development.

The Secondary Curriculum

The evolution of the secondary curriculum exhibits a number of commonalities with its primary counterpart, but also a distinctive set of trends that explain the sharp differences in philosophy between the two sectors. Much of the development of secondary schooling was defined by the debate for the abolition of the selective senior/junior secondary system and the establishment of the comprehensive system. This debate occurred from the 1930s onwards, and widespread development of comprehensive schools became a reality following the election of a Labour government in 1964, and the parallel development of comprehensive education elsewhere in the UK. According to Paterson (2003), this was not simply a case of Scotland following England – indeed Scotland comprehensivised more thoroughly than England, reflecting the gathering momentum of popular support for such a move, fuelled by public and political debate over the previous three decades. The new comprehensive schools were characterised by a persistence of subject hierarchies. There followed a debate about whether academic subjects were suitable for all pupils – something that was to re-emerge in each subsequent curriculum reform. Such questions were tackled by the Munn and Dunning Reports, both published in 1977. The former dealt explicitly with the curriculum, eventually reaffirming the status quo, setting out a 'Hirstian subject-based curriculum with a nod in the direction of cross-curricular courses, but only for the less able' (Boyd, 1997, p.60). After some debate, and some pilot work, the proposals from Munn and Dunning were put into practice in a Development Programme, commencing in 1982, and including the establishment of the long-lasting Standard Grade qualifications.

The secondary curriculum has remained substantially unchanged since this period, although a number of subsequent developments are worthy of mention. First, while 5-14 – intended to bridge the primary/secondary transition – did not have a major effect on secondary schools (with the

Priestley, M. (2013). The 3-18 Curriculum in Scottish Education. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.), *Scottish Education, 4th edition, Referendum*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

possible exception of Maths and English where national testing became the norm), it did reignite the subjects vs. inter-disciplinary debate, for example through its grouping of the social subjects into a common strand as part of the Environmental Science curriculum. It is however fair to say that such discourses did not greatly impact upon practice, with, for instance, the identified problem of fragmentation in S1 and S2 being addressed through subject rotations rather than integrated curriculum design. Second, there was lively debate, exemplified by the 1992 Howie report, about the place of vocational subjects in the senior curriculum. Howie's suggestion of a twin track academic/vocational curriculum was rejected, but the debate, combined with development of vocational (SCOTVEC) modules and influence of the TVEI programme at this time, meant that the issue of narrowness in the curriculum continued to be widely acknowledged. This ultimately proved to be a contributory factor in the subsequent development of Higher Still. During this period, secondary education continued to be defined by the end point of external exams in academic subjects: the structure of the lower secondary courses has been driven by pupil choices and competition between departments for these pupils; and teacher effectiveness has been largely judged by attainment statistics – the ubiquitous Standard Tables and Charts (STACS) data. As with primary schools, a continual focus on attainment has led to a culture of performativity, often driven by perverse incentives. One example of this is the increasing tendency for students doing Higher courses (SCQF level 6) to be relegated to Intermediate 2 (SCQF level 5) even where they already have the equivalent Standard Grade Credit qualification (in 2009, nearly 6000 pupils with an existing qualification in Standard Grade Credit English, sat Intermediate 2 English – see *Priestley et al.*, in press). This is often justified as being in the student's best interest, and is certainly helpful to the school in terms of boosting the proportion of students passing Higher.

CRITICAL ISSUES IN THE SCOTTISH CURRICULUM

The above discussion suggests that there are a number of critical issues that require further analysis. To some extent this is a challenging task: there has been no systematic funded research programme for CfE – in contrast to earlier curricular development. This has been exacerbated by a decline in research funding generally within the universities, meaning that rigorous empirical evidence is hard to come by. There are a number of key questions, which will be addressed in this final part of the chapter. First, one might ask whether CfE is indeed as original, innovative and radical in principle as some might claim; or is it more typical of other contemporary curriculum developments across the world? Second, one might pose the question of whether CfE is original, innovative and radical in terms of its position in the recent (and not so recent) history of curriculum development in Scotland. Third, it is interesting to examine the model, and associated educational policies that give shape to CfE, inquiring into issues of internal coherence, and whether or not the new curriculum takes account of curricular theory in forming a conceptual frame for educational practices. Finally, a critical observer might question whether the aspirational goals of CfE are realisable in practice, and whether the initiative will lead to lasting and meaningful changes in practices in Scottish schools and other educational centres.

CfE: an original concept?

While CfE is widely seen as being distinctive, a look at parallel development from around the world suggests otherwise. There has been recent worldwide development of similar new models of

Priestley, M. (2013). The 3-18 Curriculum in Scottish Education. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.), *Scottish Education, 4th edition, Referendum*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

national curriculum. The New Zealand Curriculum and recent changes to England's National Curriculum (pre-2010 election, which has of course heralded another seismic shift) provide parallel examples of this emergence of a set of common trends in curriculum prescription. As in Scotland, the architects state that they provide both central guidance for schools (thus ensuring the maintenance of national standards), and sufficient flexibility for schools and teachers to take account of local needs in designing programmes of education. Thus they seek to combine what is claimed to be the best features of top-down and bottom-up approaches to curriculum planning. Such curricula are characterised by various common features, notably a structural basis in outcomes sequenced into linear levels, and a focus on generic skills or capacities instead of a detailed specification of knowledge/content. As such, they have been criticised for stripping knowledge out of the curriculum (Young, 2009).

The outcomes tend to be predicated on what students are able to experience in their learning and/or do as a result of such learning. The following examples from the science curriculum in New Zealand (Ministry of Education, 2010) and CfE (Education Scotland, 2011) illustrate both the similarities, as well as a difference that seems to be idiosyncratic in Scotland – an enhanced focus on experience within the statement:

Students will recognise that there are life processes common to all living things and that these occur in different ways. (Level 4, Life Processes, New Zealand Science Curriculum)

I can sample and identify living things from different habitats to compare their biodiversity and can suggest reasons for their distribution. (SCN 3-01a, CfE)

Linked to the stripping out of knowledge/content from curricular outcomes, is the framing of the new curricula around generic capacities or core/key competencies. The pre-2010 development in England posited three of Scotland's Four Capacities as its curricular aims, omitting Effective Contributors. New Zealand has adopted slightly different language in its Key Competencies, although the generic tone is similar: Thinking; Using Language, Symbols and Texts; Managing Self; Relating to Others; and Participating and Contributing.

CfE: back to the future?

If CfE is not terribly distinctive in worldwide terms, it is perhaps distinctive in terms of being a new and radical development within Scotland. It is clear from the above section that CfE is indicative of new trends in the specification of curriculum – a recourse to new types of outcome, and a shift to genericism in terms of specifying knowledge/content. In terms of pedagogy, it is widely claimed that CfE is taking Scotland in new pedagogical directions. It is certainly true that Scotland has witnessed the development over the last 10 years of much pedagogical innovation. These include cooperative forms of learning, and formative assessment. However, two points must be made here. First, such changes were starting to happen anyway (for example under the influence of AifL). Thus, as with previously milestones such as the Primary Memorandum, there is a case for arguing that the policy is to some extent an affirmation of emerging forms of practice. And second, such pedagogical innovations are not new – cooperative learning, for instance was developed in the 1970s and has been widely used across the world since then.

Priestley, M. (2013). The 3-18 Curriculum in Scottish Education. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.), *Scottish Education, 4th edition, Referendum*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

There is then an argument that CfE represents, or at least heralds fairly radical shifts in some elements of teachers' practice. But it is debateable whether it heralds a similarly radical shift in policy intention. For example, Brown and Munn (1985) identified five main features of the 1982 Development Programme for secondary third and fourth year curriculum and assessment:

1. School-based curriculum development by teachers.
2. Assessment as an integral part of teaching and learning.
3. New qualifications
4. New ways of defining and organising knowledge (for example inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary approaches).
5. A research programme to support and inform development.

It is interesting to note the similarity of these features with CfE (with the obvious exception of the research programme, which has been manifestly absent from CfE). Moreover, similar rhetoric is evident in other policy such as the Primary Memorandum (see Paterson, 2003; Cassidy, 2008). One might make the case that CfE is a shift in lexicon more than a shift in substance.

CfE: a coherent model?

CfE has been criticised for a lack of coherence of its underpinning model. Priestley and Humes (2010) have suggested that the architects of CfE have largely ignored a significant body of curriculum theory. The result, in their view, is a mix-and-match curriculum; a combination of a process curriculum (based upon the articulation of broad educational goals and processes or methods that are fit for purpose) and an outcomes curriculum (framed around the tight specification of large numbers of predetermined objectives). They claim that these models are incompatible. CfE, they suggest, offers two conflicting starting points for curriculum development: the big ideas encapsulated in the Four Capacities and their underpinning statements offer long term goals for the curriculum, in line with the notion of a process curriculum; the Es & Os offer more short-term, instrumental objectives for curriculum development that are more in tune with the outcomes model. According to Priestley and Humes, this is a problem because it offers conflicting starting points for school-based curriculum development, with the danger that schools will choose the easier option of auditing current practice against the Es & Os, making minimal changes where necessary, and losing sight of the big ideas. Subsequent empirical evidence suggests that these dangers are real, and that the audit approach is the predominant starting point of school-based curriculum development (e.g. Minty & Priestley, 2012).

CfE: theory into practice

The big question is whether CfE will lead to a transformational change in Scottish education. Recent research from two projects (e.g. Minty & Priestley, 2012; Priestley *et al.*, 2012) suggests that the big ideas underpinning CfE are widely welcomed by the teaching profession. Survey data from one local authority (Minty & Priestley, 2012) clearly indicate that this is the case across the profession – primary as well as secondary, experienced teachers and new entrants to the profession, school leaders and non-promoted colleagues. And yet the data also show a considerable level of discontent

Priestley, M. (2013). The 3-18 Curriculum in Scottish Education. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.), *Scottish Education, 4th edition, Referendum*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

with the process of implementation. Such research illustrates the conscientiousness of Scottish teachers, but also the very real difficulties they often face in enacting their practice.

Part of the difficulty lies in the issue discussed above – the lack of coherence in the policy itself, its widely perceived vagueness (Minty & Priestley, 2012) and the lack of a clearly articulated process for development. The research suggests that many teachers have struggled to make sense of the new curriculum, a situation exacerbated by a lack of time and resources at a point when education services are facing serious cuts. A tension ridden policy landscape also forms part of the problem. Teachers are expected to be agents of change in implementing CfE, but such decisions and subsequent actions are often fraught with risk. Innovation is a risky business in the culture of accountability that is the lived experience of teachers in modern schools. The risks of adversely affecting attainment are simply too great for many, and the clear imperative is to play safe. These pragmatic issues are thus clearly significant in shaping teacher agency (see Priestley *et al.*, 2012).

A second issue lies in capacity – of teachers, local authorities and other agencies such as universities – to engage in school-based curriculum development. This is partly due to the erosion of teacher professionalism and the disappearance in recent years of particular types of craft knowledge (for instance around assessment and moderation), as a result of the extension of central control over education over the last two decades. A related issue is the socialisation of teachers into the discourses of accountability. Research (Minty & Priestley 2012) suggests strongly that teachers' responses to the new curriculum are framed to a large extent around the need to assess, record and report. As such, such responses to the challenges posed by CfE are necessarily circumscribed – the teachers participating in one of the research projects often lacked a sufficiently broad repertoire for manoeuvre to be able to respond in a flexible, agentic manner to the complex situations in which they found themselves (Priestley *et al.*, 2012). In both projects, there was significant evidence that many teachers face daily dilemmas, as a culture of accountability leads them to make decisions that are in tension with their fundamental values as professionals. It is significant that teachers who were able to strongly express their educational values, were also able to articulate a clear vision for CfE. This was especially the case where strong collegial relationships existed, and where teachers were not working in isolation.

This research raises important and uncomfortable questions about how policy makers might frame policy to facilitate teacher agency in curriculum-making, rather than seeking to control implementation processes or outcomes. It raises important questions about how school leaders might shape their schools to be places where teachers are able to contribute to the development of a good education, through school-based curriculum development, that is focussed on the needs of students rather than upon the performance of the school. This, in conclusion, suggests that it is one thing for policy to frame teachers as agents of change. It is quite another to enable this to actually happen in the practices that make up their everyday lives.

REFERENCES

Boyd, B. (1997) The statutory years of secondary education: Change and progress. In M.M. Clark & P. Munn (eds.), *Education in Scotland: Policy and practice from pre-school to secondary* (London, Routledge)

- Priestley, M.** (2013). The 3-18 Curriculum in Scottish Education. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.), *Scottish Education, 4th edition, Referendum*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cassidy, C. (2008). Scottish primary education: Philosophy and Practice. In T.G.K. Bryce & W.M. Humes (eds.), *Scottish Education, Third Edition: Beyond Devolution* (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press).
- Education Scotland (2011). *Understanding the curriculum*. Online at <http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/understandingthecurriculum/index.asp> (accessed 22/12/11). This website includes direct links to all of the CfE documentation cited in the chapter)
- Hutchinson, C. & Hayward, L. (2005). The journey so far: Assessment for learning in Scotland. *The Curriculum Journal*, 16(2), 225-248
- Ministry of Education (2010). *Science Curriculum Achievement Aims and Objectives*. <http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/Curriculum-documents/The-New-Zealand-Curriculum/Learning-areas/Science/Science-curriculum-achievement-aims-and-objectives> (accessed July 15, 2010)
- Minty, S. & Priestley, M. (2012). *Developing Curriculum for Excellence: Summary of research findings from a Scottish local authority*. Stirling: University of Stirling.
- Paterson, L. (2003). *Scottish education in the twentieth century* (Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press).
- Priestley, M. & Humes, W. (2010) The Development of Scotland's Curriculum for Excellence: Amnesia and déjà vu. *Oxford Review of Education*, 36[3], 345-361.
- Priestley, M, Robinson, S. & Biesta, G. (2012). Teacher agency, performativity and curriculum change: Reinventing the teacher in the Scottish Curriculum for Excellence? In B. Jeffrey & G. Troman (Eds.), *Performativity across UK education: Ethnographic cases of its effects, agency and reconstructions*. Painswick: E&E Publishing.
- Young, M. 2009. *Alternative educational futures for a knowledge society. Socialism and education*. <http://socialismandeducation.wordpress.com/2009/12/06/alternative-educational-futures-for-a-knowledge-society> (accessed on January 1, 2010).