

Title

The Foundation Phase in Wales – time to grow up?

Introduction

This article provides an overview of the life of the Foundation Phase in Wales to date. It considers where we have been, where we are now and where we might go, in relation to early years education provision since devolution. With reinforced governmental backing for the future of the Foundation Phase, the article considers what lessons can be taken forward to scaffold the effective longevity of an initiative that, in general terms, enjoys warm support locally and the envious attention of external observers. The article spends some time establishing ‘where we have been’, in order to fully set the context of ‘where we are’ and ‘where we might go’.

Where we have been

Development of the Foundation Phase

The establishment of the National Assembly for Wales (NAfW) in 1999 involved the devolution of responsibility for education within Wales from UK central government. The National Assembly’s vision document *The Learning Country* (NAfW 2001) set out the intention to ‘build stronger foundations for learning in primary schools with a radical improvement for early years provision’ (p.12). The subsequent consultation document: *The Learning Country: Foundation Phase 3–7 years* (NAfW 2003) set out the specifics of the proposals for the Foundation Phase which included developing a curriculum that linked and strengthened the principles and practice embedded in the existing curriculum document for children aged 3-5 years, *Desirable Outcomes for Children’s Learning Before Compulsory School Age* (ACCAC 2000a), with the programmes of study and focus statements in the National Curriculum for Wales Key Stage 1 (ACCAC 2000b),

providing for children aged 5-7 years, to ‘create a rich curriculum under seven Areas of Learning for children in the Foundation Phase’ (Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) 2008 p.3). This radical overhaul of early years education in Wales signaled a shift away from UK central government education policy in that it set out to legislate for the provision of a single phase of education spanning 3-7 years in which play and experiential learning are the pedagogical priorities, rather than continue to mirror policies for the early years in England. It was also predicated upon a concern, supported by research literature, about the ‘detrimental’ (NAFW 2001a p.8) effect of an overly formal approach to early years education for children below the age of 6. The central role of the practitioner within the Foundation Phase was stated to be a ‘facilitator of learning’ (WAG 2008a p.12); where learning was seen as a continuum and the curriculum was planned to meet ‘the needs of the individual children and facilitate progress’ (*ibid.*). This requirement was situated within the broader context of WAG’s overall vision for children and young people as described in *The Learning Country 2: Delivering the Promise* (WAG 2006) and based around seven core aims developed from the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (see WAG 2008 p.3). The Foundation Phase sat within this overarching and emancipatory vision for children and promoted a play-based approach to learning for 3-7 year olds with an emphasis on the centrality of personal development and well-being of the child to provision:

‘Children learn through first-hand experiential activities with the serious business of ‘play’ providing the vehicle. Through their play, children practice and consolidate their learning, play with ideas, experiment, take risks, solve problems, and make decisions individually, in small and in large groups. First-hand experiences allow children to develop an understanding of themselves and the world in which they live. The development of

children's self-image and feelings of self-worth and self-esteem are at the core of this phase' (WAG 2008 p.6).

Seven areas of learning were identified, the first of which was situated 'at the heart of the Foundation Phase' (WAG 2008 p.16):

- Personal and Social Development, Well-Being and Cultural Diversity
- Language, Literacy and Communication Skills
- Mathematical Development
- Welsh Language Development
- Knowledge and Understanding of the World
- Physical Development
- Creative Development.

(ibid.)

This documentation is currently still in place. Educational settings are required to provide children with access to 'indoor and outdoor environments that are fun, exciting, stimulating and safe' and to 'promote children's development and natural curiosity to explore and learn through first-hand experiences' with 'greater emphasis on using the outdoor environment as a resource for children's learning' (WAG 2008 p.4). The Foundation Phase requires that 'there must be a balance between structured learning through child-initiated activities and those directed by practitioners' (2008 p.6). Interaction between adult and child is also centrally placed in the learning process with certain types of interaction specifically highlighted, in particular practitioner involvement in children's play and 'shared and sustained thinking' (WAG 2008 p.6).

The Foundation Phase, then, sought to extend experiential early years pedagogy into the 5-7 age range, ensure that the outdoor space became an integral element in a child's daily experience, shift pedagogy away from a dominance of formal approaches towards one in which children's interests were clearly visible within the curriculum and pedagogical interaction included episodes in which children and adults contributed, on an equal footing, to the development of a shared understanding of experience.

As part of a government-funded evaluation of the Foundation Phase, commissioned in 2011, Maynard *et al.* (2013) retrospectively reviewed the 'official discourse' of the Foundation Phase as outlined by the Welsh Assembly Government at the time of its development in a policy logic model. The model details the main aims of the Foundation Phase as: to raise children's standards of achievement; to enhance their positive attitudes to learning; to address their developing needs; to enable them to benefit from educational opportunities later in their lives; and to help them become active citizens within their communities. It is also noted that '[i]n the official discourse for the Foundation Phase, there are no more detailed objectives or related targets outlined' (Maynard *et al.* 2013 p. iv).

The Foundation Phase – a significant change in approach?

The early years curricula that preceded the Foundation Phase adopted a developmental view of children's learning in which the role of the adult educator was to manage, in age-related stages, the child's learning and development and to measure this progress against culturally agreed and accepted norms associated with age (Fleer 2006, Wyness 2006). The Foundation Phase requires teachers to take an active, participatory role in children's play and activity, to facilitate

environments that support children's play and exploration and to seek to build on children's interests. The child is viewed as inherently curious and active in the search for meaning. In its introductory pages the Foundation Phase (WAG 2008) promotes an holistic approach to children's development in which practitioners consider children's prior experience as the base from which to develop, rather than assume age-related norms of performance. This approach, alongside the requirement to assess children along a 'continuum' of learning (WAG 2008 p.43), implies a shift away from the dominance of developmental views of the child that were inherent in the previous curriculum (Hall *et al.* 2004). The Foundation Phase (WAG 2008), at the time of its implementation, represented the potential for a significant change in approach (WAG 2010, Wood 2007) in which the construction of the learning child is philosophically altered from that inherent in previous curricula (Aasen and Waters 2006). This approach was in line with international developments in which child development is seen as 'culturally determined' (Edwards 2009 p.82; Brooker 2011), rather than a universally similar process delineated in age-related steps.

So, in requiring a 'significant change in approach and delivery' (WAG 2010 p.1) the Foundation Phase had the *potential* to challenge the dominance of developmental approaches to understanding child development (MacNaughton 2005, Grieshaber 2008) in favour of approaches that have been described as post-developmental (Edwards 2009). Post-developmental approaches challenge 'assumptions about the normative and objective basis of developmentalism ... and the presence of a universal description for development' (Edwards 2009 p.81) in favour of approaches that focus on 'understanding and interpreting the contexts of childhood, development and learning' (Edwards 2009 p.82). These approaches have been described as being based on sociocultural theory (Edwards 2009, Fleer 2003).

However, Maynard *et al.* found that analysis of Foundation Phase documentation revealed that there is *no single clear explanation* for the approach and pedagogy of the Foundation Phase that practitioners could use (2013 p.vii). Indeed, Maynard *et al.* report the approach underpinning the Foundation Phase remains explicitly developmental in places with a clear focus on the individual child, despite implicit messages that are in tension with this position. They argue that the approach put forward broadly relates to a constructivist theory of learning which was also reflected in the discourse associated with expected pedagogy: ‘We find that aspects of suggested pedagogy also reflect constructivist theory although ideas resonating with sociocultural perspectives are emphasised – for example, a clear role is indicated for the practitioner in supporting children’s learning and development’ (*ibid.*). So, it seems that the original Foundation Phase documentation was conflicted with regard to its underpinning principles. Given international evidence that suggests the development of new pedagogies as an alternative to a cognitive-constructivist developmental view of learning is not straightforward (e.g. Fleer 2003, Fleer and Richardson 2004, Fleer and Robbins 2004), it may be unsurprising that there was a lack in coherence regarding Foundation Phase pedagogy during the initial roll-out period (Siraj-Blatchford *et al.* 2005).

The Foundation Phase – the role of the practitioner

The Foundation Phase required a change in practitioner behaviour in order to support play-based, child initiated learning. An initial challenge for practitioners was to identify what is meant by key terminology, including, ‘structured play’, ‘active learning’ and particularly ‘child-initiated’ and ‘practitioner-directed’ learning (Maynard *et al.* 2013 p. vi); further, the Area of Learning descriptors and Foundation Phase guidance documents reflected a commitment to a

developmental approach *and* to constructivist and sociocultural pedagogies ‘rather than one clear underpinning approach’ (*ibid.*) as explained above.

In an early evaluation of the Foundation Phase, commissioned and funded by the Welsh Assembly Government during the pilot stage of implementation, Siraj-Blatchford *et al.* (2005) highlighted the pedagogical practice of the practitioner in the Foundation Phase as problematic. During the pilot stage the Foundation Phase was introduced in 41 settings across the 22 local authorities in Wales for 3-5 year olds; the evaluation found that

‘further support was needed to develop and maintain play-based and experiential pedagogies giving sufficient emphasis to activities that involve adult guided play and learning and interaction with appropriate challenge’ (Siraj-Blatchford *et al.* 2007b p.8-9).

Wood (2004) highlights that in international models of early years curricula where similar play-based approaches are taken, learning through play ‘is not left to chance, but is channelled through complex reciprocal and responsive relationships, and is situated in activities which are socially constructed and mediated’ (Wood 2004 p.20).

This suggests that, in Wales, the Foundation Phase practitioner needed to adopt a pedagogy based on a theoretical understanding of the child which is informed by sociocultural theory. The role of the practitioner in international models is to be both proactive - in the creation of the learning environment, and responsive – to the children’s interests and learning styles (Wood 2004). This represents a significant change from previous pedagogical approaches that were adopted to prepare children for formal learning between ages 3-5 years (ACCAC 2000a, Aubrey 2004), and then to deliver a directive, content driven National Curriculum (ACCAC 2000b) between the ages of 5-7 years. Aasen and Waters argued, at the time, that without time and

support to recognise, accommodate and appropriate such philosophical and practical changes practitioners are left with little choice but to maintain a ‘fallback position’ (2006 p.128) in their own pedagogical practice that reflects (developmental) approaches inherent in the previous curricula.

Fleer and Robbins’ research with early years practitioners highlights the complexities involved in the transition from enacting pedagogies informed by developmentalism to those informed by sociocultural theory (2004). Similarly, the findings of a number of projects in the UK, undertaken as part of the Teaching and Learning Research Programme (TLRP) in the first decade of the new century, suggest that in order to fully evaluate, understand, embrace and enact significant pedagogic change teachers need time and adequate support; this is particularly the case when the change involves a review of underpinning philosophies of practice (see, for example, Maynard *et al.* 2010). In addition, Siraj-Blatchford *et al.* (2007) report ‘mixed messages’ (p.56) being received regarding play within the Foundation Phase ‘seemingly as a result of the Welsh Assembly Government’s Play Policy’ (*ibid.*), resulting in a *laissez faire* approach to children’s play in which ‘less attention was paid to adult pedagogy and ... some staff were not always gainfully and appropriately deployed’ (*op cit.*) and this position is also supported by the comments of practitioners involved in small scale projects early in the implementation of the Foundation Phase (*e.g.* see Maynard *et al.* 2009).

The Foundation Phase – play-based approaches

The Foundation Phase framework (WAG 2008) can be aligned with international approaches to the education and care of early years children that are predicated upon a commitment to play (Brooker 2011). Wood (2007) identifies that a shift from a pedagogy based on achievement of specific curriculum outcomes to one that requires a play-based approach is significant and full of

inherent tensions. These tensions centre on the problematic nature of how ‘play’ is understood (*e.g.* Wood and Attfield 2005), the regulation of play within early childhood curriculum frameworks (Wood 2007, 2007a) and the reification of play within early years practice (Cannella 1997, Stephen 2012).

Wood and Attfield claim that ‘play cannot easily be defined or categorized because it is always context dependent, and the contexts are varied’ (2005 p. 5). In a review of the attempts made by play theorists to define ‘play’ Wood and Attfield highlight the diverse range of behaviours that may be classed as play and the diverse range of contexts in which play may take place highlighting that both may have ‘multiple meaning for children and adults’ (p.2) and that ‘clear definitions of play have proved elusive’ (p.3). It is not the intention here to unpick these complexities or provide a definition of play but to highlight that the treatment of the term ‘play’ in curriculum documentation as one that has a shared and agreed meaning is problematic.

The ambiguity inherent in the claims made in Foundation Phase documentation for ‘well planned play’ (WAG 2008c p.5), ‘free play’ (WAG 2008c p.5) and play that is ‘structured with clear aims for children’s learning’ (WAG 2008c p.7), without any differentiation between these play forms, may illustrate further the challenges facing practitioners seeking to implement the Foundation Phase during its pilot and roll-out phases.

Where we are now

Welsh Government have made an explicit commitment to retaining the Foundation Phase (Lewis 2014) and have recently funded two evaluation projects, one long term evaluation undertaken by the Wales Institute of Social and Economic Research, Data and Methods (‘WISERD’, WG 2015) and one short term independent ‘Stocktake’ undertaken by Professor Iram Siraj of the UCL

Institute of Education, University College London (Siraj 2014). Some key messages appear to be broadly aligned between these two evaluations.

The aims of the Stocktake, undertaken between September 2013 and March 2014, and reported in December 2014, were agreed and laid out in the terms of reference:

- Understand how well the Foundation Phase is being implemented across Wales
- Clarify how language development, literacy and numeracy skills are embedded across all Areas of Learning (AOLs) in both maintained and funded non-maintained settings across the whole age range
- Gauge how well the Foundation Phase addresses raising the quality of learning for children subject to socio-economic deprivation
- Establish how and when children enter the Foundation Phase and how progression, particularly from Flying Start to the Foundation Phase and then to Key Stage 2, is or can be demonstrated
- Identify where there is variability in quality focussing on leadership, workforce and the experience of the child
- Establish how well the Foundation Phase principles and requirements are embedded in Initial Teacher Training (ITT) and on-going Continued Professional Development (CPD)
- Make recommendations for improvement

The final publication reports on each aspect and notes the ‘fundamental change in culture’ (Siraj 2014 p.3) required of staff working within Foundation Phase settings in order to effectively implement the Foundation Phase in future. Siraj reports that about a fifth of settings have achieved effective implementation to date: ‘The implementation of the Foundation Phase is

variable within and between maintained schools and funded non-maintained settings, however there appears to be a general move in the right direction with this very complex change process' (*ibid.*). In reporting the findings of the Stocktake, Siraj refers to misconceptions about the Foundation Phase approach leading to a 'watering down' of pedagogy, concern over standards, and reversion to more formal approaches, likened to a 'pendulum effect' (Siraj 2015). The Stocktake makes 23 recommendations for Welsh government, 9 of which are related to 'training'; the training proposed is for leaders of Foundation Phase settings as well as Foundation Phase practitioners with a focus on understanding the *theory and practice* implications of the Foundation Phase and the development of appropriate pedagogies that support progression for all children. There is an emphasis on understanding the role of the adult in supporting learning as well as exemplification and sharing of best practice and the provision of appropriate playful learning environments to support children's early literacy and numeracy.

In short, Siraj reports that there are significant professional learning implications inherent in the future development of the Foundation Phase:

'moving towards the Foundation Phase pedagogy is likely to involve many maintained schools and funded non-maintained settings in making a complete change in approach and practices and a fundamental shift in philosophy, understanding and knowledge of how children learn, which needs to be reflected in the training and support they are given, to enhance the adult role in supporting the Foundation Phase' (2014 p.22).

The three year evaluation undertaken by WISERD (2011-2014) had four main aims:

- to evaluate how well the Foundation Phase is being implemented and highlight ways in which improvement can be made (the process evaluation);

- to evaluate what impact the Foundation Phase has had to date (the outcome evaluation);
- to assess the value for money of the Foundation Phase (the economic evaluation); and
- to put in place an evaluation framework for the future tracking of; outputs and outcomes of the Foundation Phase (the evaluation framework). (WG 2015a)

Broadly speaking the evaluation finds that the introduction of the Foundation Phase in Wales is associated with positive and improving children's outcomes regarding pupil attainment at 7 and 11, improved pupil wellbeing and increased pupil attendance, though there is no evidence that inequalities in attainment at the end of Key Stage 2 are being reduced. The positive findings are tempered by a similar acknowledgment to that found by Siraj (2014) that practice varies greatly across the nation and that the positive outcomes are associated with 'greater use of Foundation Phase pedagogies' (WG 2015a p.3).

Central to the findings of the Foundation Phase Evaluation are twelve 'pedagogical elements for teaching and learning practice' that the research team believe 'embody the principles and guidance of the Foundation Phase' (WG 2015a p.22). These pedagogical elements were identified by the evaluation team based on 'systematic analysis of Foundation Phase documentation [and] previous expertise in early years education ... ratified by other experts and stakeholders on the evaluation's Advisory groups' (p.23). *Foundation Phase practice*, in the evaluation, is defined by these twelve pedagogical elements. It will be important, as policy makers, practitioners and researchers take forward early years education in Wales to critically consider the origins, and on-going validity, of these twelve elements which are listed in Appendix 1 for reference. Interesting to note is the absence of the word 'play' in these elements. Given the previously mentioned difficulties in defining play in educative practice this may be purposeful, but it requires some further consideration that is beyond the scope, and word limit, of

this article. The pedagogical elements broadly describe what children and practitioners may do in, and what types of environment may be described as, *Foundation Phase practice*. However, what must be guarded against in the future is an instrumental approach that is focused on *enacting* these pedagogical elements without recourse to asking *why* these pedagogical elements should be fore-fronted in early years practice in Wales. Both the Stocktake and Foundation Phase Evaluations recommend that training and guidance, for practitioners, head teachers, the inspectorate and policy makers, is critical to further development of the Foundation Phase, however the Evaluation tends to make recommendations that imply changes in pedagogical practice come about by being *shown how*; rather than *understanding why*. International experience and research suggests that pedagogical change is more likely and more robustly embedded when educators are involved in *understanding why* their actions with early years children have an impact on children's learning and development (see, for example, Professional Development in Education Early Years Special Issue, 2015; Early Years Special Issue, 2015 and associated editorials: Waters and Payler 2015; Oberhuemer 2015).

It is important to remember that the Foundation Phase curriculum is enacted in maintained nursery, infant and primary schools as well as non-maintained settings that may variously cater for the 0-5, 2-5 or 3-5 age group. Establishing consistently high pedagogic practice within and across the variety of early years education providers is a common challenge for governments at an international level (OECD 2012) and this challenge is no less significant in Wales. A 'wicked problem' (Kolko 2012) faced by policy-makers is that related to the professional status and accreditation of those working in the early years sector. In Wales there is no specialist route to early years teacher accreditation, however the Minister has reiterated the value placed on the qualified status of all teachers in Wales (Lewis 2015). This means that those children receiving

the Foundation Phase in maintained school settings will continue to be learning with practitioners who hold qualified teacher status ‘QTS’, though many will have undertaken a generalist primary route to qualification and will not necessarily have specialized, in initial teacher education, in early years provision. Outside of the school sector the range and variety of qualifications held by those working in the early years sector is significant; these practitioners often work in an environment that lacks the funding and structural support of a school setting and they may be working with children in communities that face challenging circumstances. The evidence available indicates that the better qualified the adult working with early years children in educative settings, the better the outcomes for the children (Sylva *et al.* 2010).

The Welsh Government, in trying to address the qualification issues facing the early years workforce have consulted on a 10 year early years workforce development plan that aims to ‘support individuals and address the workforce development needs of all types of registered early years, childcare and play provision, in both the maintained and non-maintained sectors’ (Lewis 2014b). This initiative responds to workforce and training recommendations from the Independent Stocktake of the Foundation Phase (Siraj 2014), and the Independent Review of Childcare and Early Education Registration, Regulation and Inspection (Graham Review), led by Professor Karen Graham (2014). It is worth noting here that in reporting the findings of the Stocktake Siraj refers to a fifth of Foundation Phase settings implementing the Foundation Phase well (Siraj 2015); that is, the positive outcomes indicated by the Stocktake (Siraj 2014) and the national evaluation (WG 2015) may only be realized in less than a quarter of settings currently. The workforce plan addresses three key themes: leadership, the quality of new entrants to the early years sector and the need to raise skills and standards across the existing workforce. This medium-to-long term view of workforce development may provide a strategy by which messages

related to high expectation for the future can be practically and coherently supported by central government initiative. It will be essential, given the international evidence cited above (see also Nelson and O’Beirne, NFER, 2014), that workforce development is planned in such a way that all those involved in early years provision have access to meaningful professional learning experiences that explore the *why* of pedagogy as well as the *what*; experiences that ‘challenge the traditional ‘theory’ and ‘practice’ divide [and] go beyond either/or ways of thinking to both/and approaches’ (Oberhuemer 2015).

Further, following a tendering process and award of contract in July 2013, an Early Years Development Assessment Framework (EYDAF) is under development. This development responds to the recognition that currently there is no consistent assessment framework to inform and support progression and transition within the early years and Foundation Phase in Wales (*e.g.* see Siraj 2014). The EYDAF will provide ‘a single overarching 0-7 assessment framework and a suite of linked assessment tools which can be used to chart children’s progress, longitudinally, across the early years’ (Lewis 2014b). In March 2014 the Minister for Education announced that the tool will be used in schools on a statutory basis from September 2015. Siraj notes that significant training will be required to support the use of the EYDAF:

‘Such training should emphasise teacher and practitioner assessment and will require training in the use of observation as a way of measuring impact and children’s progress, as well as supporting ongoing and future teaching and learning’ (2014 p.51).

Siraj notes, too, that it is important that all relevant staff are equally competent in using the EYDAF and that moderation is rigorous, whether those staff work in maintained/school settings or non-maintained settings.

Both the workforce plan and the EYDAF may be taken to imply that the period of a child's life from 0-7 years is increasingly considered, in policy terms, as a coherent phase by Welsh Government. The Foundation Phase supports learning and development within the period 3-7 years whether or not the child is in a maintained school setting and, in order that the coherence of the 0-7 period is maintained, it will be important that the Foundation Phase profile, currently in use to report children's attainment through the Foundation Phase is closely aligned to the EYDAF.

Where we might go

So, those working with early years children in education contexts face a number of challenges including:

The challenge to better implement the Foundation Phase by increasing the theoretical and practical understanding of how children learn in a play-based manner while supported by adults who have a critical role to play in that learning;

The implementation of a new and wide-ranging assessment framework and the better management of transitions of young children into and out of various early years settings; and

Workforce development that, while welcome, requires mature and sensitive management in order to avoid the errors of the past, where some 'training' lacked theoretical underpinning and hence resulted in mixed and variable quality of practice, and to ensure coherence of high quality early years provision within and across the nation.

Alongside these challenges, the educational landscape in Wales may be about to undertake a dramatic change in the shape of a major curriculum review (see Donaldson, this edition; Donaldson 2015). While curriculum reform as a result of the Donaldson review (2015) is likely

to be less dramatic in the early years phase of education than in those following it, the extent of change within the system will require firm leadership at all levels to ensure that the focus on pedagogical development within the Foundation Phase is maintained.

Throughout this period of possibly intense change and development it will be important to keep in mind what is increasingly known about effective early years provision. Extensive and well-reported longitudinal studies have shown that effective early years pedagogy includes instructional modes of teaching such as demonstration, explanation, questioning and modelling, as well as opportunities for child-initiated and playful activity, and the engagement of adult and child in co-construction of knowledge (for example, Siraj-Blatchford *et al.* 2003, Sylva *et al.* 2010; Siraj 2015). Sustained shared thinking between adult and child, and practitioners asking open-ended questions that build on children's interests in playful learning environments, lead to better outcomes for children and young people (Siraj-Blatchford *et al.* 2002; Sylva *et al.* 2014).

We also know that the early years Home Learning Environment (HLE) is critical to children's long term outcomes (Siraj-Blatchford 2010). Guidance offered to settings from Welsh Government has emphasized the need to support positive transition from home to school and between early years providers and to support the development of positive HLEs in the early years by engaging early with parents and the community, by building respectful relationships and by making the school an accessible and welcoming environment for families (WG 2013, Estyn 2014, Chicken *et al.* 2015). Further, there is a significant opportunity to build on the research and development of professional learning tools that have emanated from within the UK. For example, the 4children publication 'What to expect, when?' (2015) is a valuable vehicle for supporting positive HLE in collaboration with parents and carers; adaptation of such materials for the Welsh context and associated evaluation of their use may support sustainable and

transferable models of change with regard to practice that supports child-focused and positive home-school relationships.

We know too, about the importance of teachers supporting and encouraging ‘vulnerable’ children and avoiding negative expectations and stereotypes (see also Egan, this issue, Siraj 2015). This is especially important when evidence indicates that teachers, as the general population, tend to hold negative bias about the potential attainment of those from socio-economically deprived backgrounds (Campbell 2013, 2015). Such bias can induce a self-fulfilling prophecy of low attainment by children with such backgrounds; Campbell suggests that an increased focus on tackling the process of stereotyping and associated low expectation may lead to greater parity and a narrowing of attainment gaps (2015). It is sensible, given the long lasting impact of early years education and care (OECD 2012), that this issue is taken seriously by the early years community and that professional learning includes aspects of development in this regard.

As stated above, *talk* in early years settings has been established as a critical factor in high quality provision (see also Siraj, Kingston and Mehuish 2015). There are significant development opportunities for individuals, schools and non-maintained setting leaders to engage in critical evaluation of current practice in the light of research evidence. It is suggested here that, in responding to the need to support significant professional learning in the sector, the Welsh Government should seek out opportunities to embed such enquiry-based context-relevant action research in professional learning opportunities.

It is to be hoped, then, that the anticipated period of professional learning, let’s not call it ‘training’, for early years professionals supports those working in, managing and inspecting the

early years sector to understand that children's development requires that we consider the kind of talk that takes place in our settings, the role of the adult in young children's learning, the links we make with our communities and families and a good understanding of *why* certain pedagogical choices are more effective than others. To paraphrase Professor Graham Donaldson during one of the 'great debates' about the future of the curriculum in Wales, undertaken during early 2015; exemplification of best practice can lead to 'copying'; and copying from one context to another without enquiring *why* can lead to poor quality pedagogic decisions being made by staff who lack confidence in their professional knowledge. Let's make sure that we all avoid that.

References

Aasen, W. & Waters, J. (2006) The New Curriculum in Wales: a new view of the child?

Education 3 – 13 **34** (2) 123 – 129.

ACCAC (2000a) *Desirable Outcomes for Children's Learning Before Compulsory School Age*.

Cardiff: ACCAC.

ACCAC (2000b) *National Curriculum for Wales Key Stage 1*. Cardiff ACCAC.

Aubrey 2004

Brooker, L. (2011) Taking Children Seriously: an alternative agenda for research? *Journal of*

Early Childhood Research **9** (2) 137-149.

Campbell, T. (2013) *Stereotyped at seven? Biases in teacher judgements of pupils' ability and attainment*. CLS working paper 2013/8. London: Centre for Longitudinal Studies

Campbell, T. (2015) Stereotyped at Seven? Biases in Teacher Judgement of Pupils' Ability and Attainment *Journal of Social Policy* 44 (03) 517 - 547

Cannella, G.S. (1997) *Deconstructing Early Childhood Education: social justice bad revolution*. New York: Peter Lang.

Chicken, S., Egan, D. and Waters, J. (2015) *Making Effective Use of the Early Years Pupil Deprivation Grant: A Resource for Leaders and Practitioners*. Cardiff: Wales Centre for Equity in Education.

Edwards, S. (2009) Beyond Developmentalism. In S. Edwards & J. Nuttall [Eds.] *Professional Learning in Early Childhood Settings*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Estyn (2014) *Tackling deprivation and raising standards: Pupil deprivation May 2014* Cardiff: Estyn.

Fleer, M. (2003) Early Childhood Education as an evolving 'community of practice' or as lived 'social reproduction': researching the 'taken-for-granted'. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 4 (1) 64-79.

Fleer, M. (2006) The Cultural Construction of Child Development: creating institutional and cultural intersubjectivity. *International Journal of Early Years Education* 14 (2) 127 – 140.

Fleer, M. & Richardson, C. (2004) *Observing and Planning in Early Childhood Setting: using a socio-cultural approach*. Canberra: Early Childhood Australia.

Fleer, M. & Robbins, J. (2004) 'Yeah that's what they teach you at uni, it's just rubbish': The participatory appropriation of new cultural tools as early childhood student teachers move from a developmental to a socio-cultural framework for observing and planning. *Journal of Australian Research in Early Childhood Education* **11** (1) 47-62.

Graham, K. (2014) *Review of childcare and early education registration, regulation and inspection*. Cardiff: Welsh Government.

Grieshaber, S. (2008). Equity issues in research design. In G. Mac Naughton, S. Rocco and I. Siraj-Blatchford (Eds.), *Doing early childhood research: International perspectives on theory and practice*. Maidenhead: OUP.

Hall, K., Collins, J., Benjamin, S., Nind, M. & Sheehy, K. (2004) SATurated Models of Pupildom: assessment and inclusion/exclusion. *British Educational Research Journal* **30** (6) 801-816.

Kolko, J. (2012) *Wicked problems: problems worth solving*. Austin Centre for Design

Lewis, H. (2014) Written statement: *Progress on the review of curriculum and assessment arrangements in Wales* 17-10-14. Available:

<http://wales.gov.uk/about/cabinet/cabinetstatements/2014/curricreview/?lang=en> date accessed 23-02-15.

WJE article final with revisions August 2015
Future Education System in Wales: FP

Lewis, H. (2014b) Written statement: Early Years Development and Assessment Framework 27-03-14. Available: <http://wales.gov.uk/about/cabinet/cabinetstatements/2014/earlyyears/?lang=en>
date accessed 23-02-15.

Lewis, H. (2015) *Welsh Government's initial response to Teaching Tomorrow's Teachers – Options for the Future of Initial Teacher Education in Wales* Statement by Welsh government 23-06-15. Summary available:
<http://gov.wales/newsroom/educationandskills/2015/10292704/?lang=en> [Accessed 24-06-15]

Maynard, T., Morgan, A., Waters, J. & Williams, J. (2010) The Foundation Phase. In J. Furlong [Ed] *The Teaching and Learning Research Programme (TLRP) in Wales*. Cardiff: WERN/ESRC/WAG.

Maynard, T., Taylor, C., Waldron, S., Rhys, M., Smith, R., Power, S. and Clement, J. (2013) *Evaluating the Foundation Phase: Policy Logic Model and Programme Theory*. Welsh Government Social Research, ISBN 978-0-7504-8080-2

Maynard, T., Waters, J. and Cridland, J. (2009) *Making sense of the Foundation Phase: the challenges of multiple meanings*. Paper presented at the 19th annual European Early Childhood Education Research Association (EECERA) conference; Strasbourg, France: 26-29th August 2009

MacNaughton, G. (2005) *Doing Foucault in Early Childhood Studies: applying poststructuralist ideas*. London: Routledge.

WJE article final with revisions August 2015
Future Education System in Wales: FP

NAfW (2001) *The Learning Country: A paving document*. Cardiff: NAfW. Available online at:

http://www.elwa.ac.uk/doc_bin/SkillsObservatory/learning_country_paving_document.pdf

[Accessed 23/06/10].

NAfW (2001a) *Laying the Foundations: early years provision for three year olds*. Cardiff:

NAfW. Available online at:

<http://www.assemblywales.org/hompdfviewer?url=3a9cd2320001c6b0000005440000000>

[Accessed 22/06/10].

NAfW (2003) *The Learning Country: The Foundation Phase - 3-7 years*. Cardiff: NAfW.

Available online at: http://wales.gov.uk/dcells/publications/policy_strategy_and_planning/early-wales/whatisfoundation/fprelateddocuments/foundationconsultatione.pdf?lang=en [Accessed

20.01.10].

Nelson, J. & O'Beirne, C. (2014) *Using Evidence in the Classroom: what works and why?*

Slough: NfER.

OECD (2012) *Starting Strong III: a quality toolbox for early childhood education and care*.

OECD. Available online at: <http://www.oecd.org/edu/school/startingstrongiii-aqualitytoolboxforearlychildhoodeducationandcare.htm> [Accessed 02-06-15]

Siraj, I. (2014) *An independent stocktake of the Foundation Phase in Wales*. Cardiff: Welsh Government.

Siraj, I. (2015) *Key Findings from the Independent Stocktake of the Foundation Phase and Evidence from Research*. Keynote speech: Children in Wales Conference, Cardiff (20-01-15)

Siraj-Blatchford, I. (2010) Learning in the home and at school: how working class children 'succeed against the odds' *British Educational Research Journal*, 36 (3), 463-482, DOI: 10.1080/01411920902989201

Siraj, I., Kingston, D. & Melhuish, E. (2015) *Assessing Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care: SSTEW scale for 2-5year olds provision*. London. IOE Press

Siraj-Blatchford, I., Sylva, K., Laugharne, J., Milton, E. & Charles, F. (2005) *Monitoring and evaluation of the effective implementation of the foundation phase project across Wales: final report of year 1 pilot – roll out age 3-5 years*. Available online www.dera.ioe.ac.uk/6281/1/meeifp.pdf [Accessed March 2015].

Siraj-Blatchford, I., Sylva, K., Muttock, S., Gilden, R. & Bell, D. (2002) *Researching Effective Pedagogy in the Early Years [REPEY]; Research Report 356*. Norwich HMSO; DfES.

Siraj- Blatchford, I., Sylva, K., Taggart, B., Sammons, P. & Melhuish, E. & Elliot, K. (2003) The Effective Provision of Pre-School Education [EPPE] Project. Technical Paper 10. *Intensive Case Studies of Practice across the Foundation Stage* (October, 2003). London: Institute of Education University of London.

Siraj-Blatchford, I., Milton, E., Sylva, K. Laugharne, J. and Charles, F. (2007) Developing the Foundation Phase in Wales. *The Welsh Journal of Education* **14** (summer 2007) 43-68.

WJE article final with revisions August 2015
Future Education System in Wales: FP

Sylva, K.; Melhuish, E.; Sammons, P.; Siraj-Blatchford, I. & Taggart, B. (2010) *Early Childhood Matters: evidence from the Effective Pre-school and Primary Education project*. London: Routledge.

Sylva, K., Melhuish, E.C., Sammons, P., Siraj, I. and Taggart, B. with Smees, R., Toth, K. & Welcomme W. (2014) *Effective Pre-school, Primary and Secondary Education 3-16 Project (EPPSE 3-16) Students' educational and developmental outcomes at age 16*. Department for Education Research Report RR354

Stephen, C. (2012) *Looking for Theory in Preschool Education*. *Studies in Philosophy and Education* **31** 227–238. DOI 10.1007/s11217-012-9288-5

WAG (2003) *The Learning Country: Foundation Phase 3-7 years*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government.

WAG (2006) *The Learning Country 2: delivering the promise*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government.

WAG (2008) *Foundation Phase Framework for Children's Learning for 3-7 years olds in Wales*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government.

WAG (2008a) *Learning and Teaching Pedagogy: foundation phase guidance material*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government.

WAG (2008c) *Play/ active learning: overview for 3-7 year olds*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government.

WJE article final with revisions August 2015
Future Education System in Wales: FP

WAG (2009) *Foundation Phase Outdoor Learning Handbook* Cardiff: WAG. Available online:
<http://wales.gov.uk/docs/dcells/publications/091125outdoorlearninghandbooken.pdf> [Accessed
26/06/10].

WAG (2010) *Why Introduce the Foundation Phase?* Available online at:
http://wales.gov.uk/topics/educationandskills/policy_strategy_and_planning/104009-wag/foundation_phase/whyintroducefoundation/?jsessionid=06XzMgccmKdQcsJtG12BT9hNLTv6JFLlsZmTRZvbJKTFTvzkQL1h!-463154188?lang=en [Accessed 22/06/10].

Waters, J. and Payler, J. (2015) Editorial: The professional development of Early Years Educators – achieving systematic, sustainable and transformative change *Professional Development in Education* 41 (2) 161-168 Early Years Special Issue.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2014.1000503>

Welsh Government (2013) *Pupil Deprivation Grant Short guidance for practitioners*. Cardiff: Welsh Government.

Welsh Government (2015) *Early Years Pupil Deprivation Grant Guidance for regional consortia, local authorities, schools, nurseries, playgroups and childminders*. Cardiff: Welsh Government.

Welsh Government (2015a) *Evaluating the Foundation Phase: Final Report*. Welsh Government Social Research. Cardiff: Welsh Government..

Wood, E. (2004) Developing a pedagogy of play. In A. Anning, J. Cullen and M. Flear [Eds] *Early Childhood Education: society and culture*. London: Sage.

Wood, E. (2007) New Directions in Play: consensus or collision? *Education 3-13* **35** (4) 309-320.

Wood, E. (2007a) Reconceptualising Child-Centred Education: contemporary directions in policy, theory and practice in early childhood. *FORUM* **49** (1&2) 119-133.

Wood, E. & Attfield, J. (2005) *Play, learning and the early childhood curriculum* [2nd Edition]. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Wyness, M. (2006) *Childhood and Society* Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Appendix 1

The twelve pedagogical elements to the Foundation Phase, as identified by the Foundation

Phase evaluation (WG 2015a p.23):

- a. Child choice/participation – children involved in initiating and directing their own learning;
- b. Exploration – children learning by exploring and experimenting;
- c. First-hand – children learning from first-hand and direct experiences;
- d. Practical – children learning from practical hands-on activities;
- e. Stage not age – children should be appropriately challenged and supported according to their stage (not age) of learning;
- f. Balance of continuous/enhanced/focussed activities – for the majority of learning there is an array of different activities constantly available that provides continuous learning provision, this is enhanced by the occasional provision of specific activities within continuous provision that

provide enhanced learning (i.e. by scaffolding children's learning), and very occasionally focussed learning activities are provided to ensure particular learning tasks are achieved;

g. Open questioning – questions to children invite open discursive responses rather than one-word closed responses;

h. Reflection – children are prompted to think about their own learning experiences;

i. Physical activity – children have the opportunity to move around whilst learning;

j. Outdoor learning – learning takes place in indoor and outdoor learning environments;

k. Observation of children – children's learning should be monitored predominantly through regular observations;

l. Learning zones – the learning environment offers a variety of different learning areas/activities for children to engage with.