

# A PERSPECTIVE ON LEARNING OUTCOMES IN CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT

---

*A series of papers on perspectives on  
learning outcomes in curriculum and  
assessment*

---

Professor Mark Priestley  
University of Stirling



National Council for Curriculum and Assessment  
An Chomhairle Náisiúnta Curaclaim agus Measúnachta



NCCA 2016



Professor Mark Priestley is Deputy Head of the School of Social Sciences, Stirling University. He leads the Curriculum and Pedagogy research group. Professor Priestley started his career in education as a teacher of History, working in a number of secondary schools in England and New Zealand, where he also taught Geography, RE, Humanities and Social Studies. In New Zealand, he was the Coordinating Lecturer of Christchurch College of Education's Nelson campus from January 1999 until June 2000. Since arriving at the former School of Education at Stirling in 2001, he has taken on a number of roles. He was Director of Initial Teacher Education between 2004 and 2007, and Director of the First Year Educational Studies Programme between 2009 and 2011.

## Foreword

This paper is one of a number of short papers on learning outcomes in curriculum design that have been commissioned from a range of authors with a view to informing and supporting curriculum and assessment developments in early childhood, primary, junior cycle and senior cycle. The papers have been commissioned to support dialogue and engagement on the nature of learning outcomes across developments.

The papers are intended to support reflection on the nature of learning outcomes, their relationship with other curriculum components, with existing school culture and in particular their impact on teaching and learning. The papers provide a reference point for clarifying the nature of learning outcomes that will be relevant to the process of curriculum development from early childhood, through primary school to the end of senior cycle. They can provide a strong theoretical basis for the kind of learning outcomes included in curriculum and assessment specifications across these sectors.

The papers represent different perspectives on learning outcomes; critics of learning outcomes approaches have also been commissioned to provide their perspectives. The papers represent the views of the individual author. While these papers have been commissioned by NCCA it should not be implied that the NCCA recommends, endorses or approves these views.

## Introduction

Learning outcomes have become ubiquitous within worldwide curriculum policy in recent years. This move comes with many potential benefits, as it shifts the focus from providers to users of education, and it introduces a common language, addressing issues of progression, transparency and equity (CEDEFOP, 2009). To a large extent, they continue a long tradition of framing curriculum as aims and objectives. One can trace the genesis of the current fashion for defining learning as outcomes in both the objectives movement in the United States (c.f. Bobbitt, Tyler, Bloom etc.), with its roots in Taylorist scientific management, and which became extremely popular in the 1960s. There are also clear lines of descent from the development of competency-based vocational education and training in the UK from the 1980s onwards, through the worldwide extension of this model to national academic qualifications (for example the Scottish, New Zealand and South African qualifications frameworks) in the 1990s (for a fuller account of this, see: Kelly, 2004; Biesta & Priestley, 2013). These developments have introduced a plethora of different – and often confusing and ambiguous – terms and concepts into the arena. They manifest a desire to provide preset definitions of what an educated person might know or do as a result of being educated. For example, according to CEDEFOP (2009), ‘learning outcomes can best be defined as statements of what a learner knows, understands and is able to do after completion of learning’ (p9). This definition clearly illustrates a distinction between outcomes and their predecessors: the shift towards framing education in terms of learners and their development, rather than in terms of what is to be taught. This is not a new distinction, as discussed by Biesta and Priestley (2013). However, it is one that has been given a renewed force by recent developments such as the publication of competency frameworks by organisations such as the OECD and the European Union, as well as by the emergence in the past few years of new approaches to defining national curricula.

The move to defining education through learning outcomes has not been uncontroversial. Issues and questions have been raised in a number of areas. These include:

- Philosophical questions relating, for example, to whether it is ethical in a democracy to predefine what people should learn, and how they should be. While these issues are important, raising questions as to whether we should even be seeking to define education in this way, I do not have the space to discuss them

here. Readers interested in more detailed discussion of them should refer to Kelly (2004), and Biesta and Priestley (2013).

- Conceptual/definitional issues relating to how outcomes should be framed and in what level of detail, and how they might relate to other curriculum components.
- Enactment/implementation issues relating to how teachers make sense of educational policy, and how they enact practice on the basis of this. It is useful here to bear in mind a caveat that policy can only ever act as a statement of intent; curricular practices emerge from teachers' understandings of these intentions, mediated by their prior knowledge, and the structure and cultural resources and constraints afforded by their professional contexts.

I come to this discussion as a former teacher of History, with experience of working within competency-based vocational education. My current interest is in the work of teachers as they enact curriculum. I broadly support the general directions set by modern curriculum policy such as Scotland's Curriculum for Excellence, which sets out clearly what students should become through their education. I advocate approaches to education that focus on developing the capacity of young people to act within the world, and characterised by more dialogical and collaborative pedagogies, continuous approaches to assessment and higher degrees of teacher agency as they act as curriculum developers. I see the move towards learning outcomes as one that potentially brings many benefits in achieving such goals, but it is an approach that is also rife with risks, which need careful consideration as policy is developed. As CEDEFOP (2009, p2) remind us,

*more and more stakeholders warn that the learning outcomes perspective can easily be reduced to mere rhetoric having little effect on education, training and learning practises. Some go even further stating that uncritical use of the learning outcomes perspective may prove harmful and represent a distraction.*

The following sections will outline some of these issues in greater detail.

### Issues relating to learning outcomes

While learning outcomes have been developed to bring a welcome clarity to a field characterised by multiple understandings of terms such as competence (for a fuller discussion, see CEDEFOP, 2009), there remains considerable ambiguity in a number of areas. A major issue

concerns the degree to which outcomes should be specific or generic. For example, outcomes can be framed as high-level, generic statements of intent, such as the Four Capacities of Scotland's Curriculum for Excellence (CfE)<sup>1</sup>, the Key Competences of The New Zealand Curriculum Framework (NZCF)<sup>2</sup> or the Statements of Learning in Ireland's Junior Cycle Framework<sup>3</sup>. Or they can be much more specific sets of statements, divided into different subject grouping and often articulated as linear and hierarchical levels of progression (e.g. the Experiences and Outcomes of CfE<sup>4</sup> or the Learning Objectives of the NZQF<sup>5</sup>). Many curricula combine both, which has been claimed to send mixed messages about curriculum development (see Priestley & Humes, 2010).

This issue raises an important question: whether outcomes should be seen as long term goals of education – as broad statements of what young people should be able to know and do at the end of a stage of education; or whether they should they be seen as more proximal goals, set out as detailed grids of statements. My firm view is that they should be the former. The latter conception is associated with a range of problems, well documented in the literature.

- Detailed statements of outcome have a tendency to become assessment standards, even where this was not intended originally. According to CEDEFOP (2009, p38) 'recently, there has been considerable emphasis on performance and bureaucratic models of learning which focus on measurable skills and attainment targets'. Early thinking behind CfE in Scotland clearly recognised this danger, which blighted the former 5-14 Curriculum, leading to excessive teaching to the test. However, CfE has been subject to mission creep and is commonly accepted now to be assessment-driven (see Priestley, 2013).
- There is a tendency for outcomes to become subject to what Wolf (1995) termed a spiral of specification. This has been evident in CfE: at an early stage in policy, through

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/thecurriculum/whatiscurriculumforexcellence/>

<sup>2</sup> <http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/The-New-Zealand-Curriculum/Key-competencies>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.education.ie/en/Publications/Policy-Reports/A-Framework-for-Junior-Cycle-Full-Report.pdf>

<sup>4</sup>

<http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/thecurriculum/howisthecurriculumorganised/experiencesandoutcomes/index.asp>

<sup>5</sup> <http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/The-New-Zealand-Curriculum/Learning-areas>

the translation of the generic Four Capacities into the more detailed grid of learning outcomes (the E's and O's), which have subsequently come to be used as assessment standards; and in practice, as teachers used to the more detailed and specific outcomes of the 5-14 curriculum devised levels within levels (developing, consolidating and secure. See Priestley & Minty, 2012; Priestley, 2013).

- Detailed specification can lead to a growth of bureaucracy, as schools develop methods to assess, record and report against outcomes. This has been a particular problem in Scotland, leading to the establishment of a government task force to tackle the issue. Such bureaucracy tends to be a by-product of the cultures of performativity (Wilkins, 2011) that can develop when outcomes-steering (Biesta, 2004) is used for accountability purposes. Bureaucracy (often evidence gathering to mitigate risk) is only one of the many documented effects of performativity; others include fabrication of image, transmissive teaching to the test, and even cheating (Sahlberg, 2010). This is ironic, as learning outcomes are often associated, in policy rhetoric at least, with more divergent, developmental approaches to education; and yet the effect can be to close down practices to comply with what are seen as external demands on schools, and reduce curriculum development to a process of evidencing outcomes.
- There is a related tendency for detailed learning outcomes to become statements of content to be mastered – what Kelly (2004) refers to as a mastery curriculum. As suggested by CEDEFOP (2009, p89), 'in this case subject content steers the intended outcomes for the learner, often supported by traditional, 'pencil-and-paper' types of tests'. In Scotland, this has led to schools, especially in the secondary sector, engaging in strategic curriculum change, as they audit existing content and methods against the outcomes of the new curriculum, making minimal changes where necessary (see Priestley & Minty, 2013; Priestley, Minty & Eager, 2014). It usually means the assessment of outcomes, within competency-based exam syllabi, by written tests rather than more suitable methods, such as portfolio assessment. This is a good example of existing, institutional logics being applied uncritically to new policy designed to reform schooling. According to CEDEFOP (2009, p10), there should be an emphasis, when framing outcomes, 'on defining learning outcomes to shape the



learner's experience, rather than giving primacy to the content of the subjects that make up the curriculum.'

- Such an approach, a performance mode of pedagogic practice (Bernstein, 1996), potentially leads to atomised and fragmented provision, which loses sight of the wider aims of education and reduces schooling to the digestion of 'bite-sized' chunks of content and the dominance of the metaphor 'delivery to describe educational practice (Kelly, 2004)

The former conception – of learning outcomes as broad generic statements – is also not unproblematic. A particular issue lies in the charge that such outcomes are vague and woolly, and thus do not provide a detailed enough specification of what is expected of teachers as they engage in curriculum development (for a discussion of this in relation to CfE, see: Priestley & Minty, 2012; Priestley & Minty, 2013). However, to follow this logic takes us back into the territory explored above, with its attendant problems. A more productive line of inquiry is to explore how learning outcomes might relate to other curriculum components, such as statements of content, guidance on pedagogy and processes for engagement with policy). In particular, we need to view them as part of a systematic curriculum planning approach, which entails some consideration of which curriculum planning model is most appropriate to enact them into practice in particular contexts.

### Learning outcomes and curriculum development

The development of a systematic approach to curriculum planning in tandem with learning outcomes has clear implications for the framing of policy at a macro-level, the role of meso-level policy development agencies, and practitioners engaging in school-based curriculum development at a micro-level. Before outlining these implications, it is worth making several points. Framing a curriculum purely as outcomes implies that it does not matter how teachers develop the curriculum, so long as the outcomes are achieved. There are two problems with taking this view.

- First, learning outcomes constitute output regulation of teaching, in that they provide potentially measurable outputs from the process of education. Framing a curriculum purely as outcomes/outputs runs the risk of ignoring other curriculum components. These include input regulation (e.g. statements of content), the processes of learning

(pedagogies), the organisation of learning (provision), as well as consideration of the cultural and structural contexts within which curriculum is contextualised, recontextualised and enacted.

- Second, consideration needs to be given to the curriculum planning model adopted. Kelly (2004) has identified three discrete and distinctive models. These are the content, objectives and process approaches. Many modern curricula hybridise and conflate these models (e.g. see Priestley & Humes, 2010), but this is highly problematic: the models are not mix-and-match approaches but in fact represent different starting points for curriculum planning; and different starting points have clear implications for the sorts of emerging practices that occur as schools develop the curriculum. In particular, the type of learning outcomes specified will impact upon the manner in which – and the starting point from which – schools engage in curriculum development.

For example, as mentioned above in the case of Scotland, many schools have started with the detailed E's and O's and conducted an audit of current practice. In many such cases, there has been performative approach to curriculum development– based upon a need to tick boxes and evidence outcomes. This approach typifies what Kelly (2004) would class as an objectives curriculum planning model. In other cases, schools have started with a consideration of the broader, generic outcomes under the headings of the Four Capacities, adopting a process curriculum planning model. In such schools, the process has involved sense-making (what do the outcomes mean?), the development of fit-for-purpose practices (content and methods), and the institution of a systematic collaborative professional enquiry process to enact the practices. In the former approach, emergent practice often lacks coherence and is disconnected from big-picture ideas. In the latter approach, research suggests that more holistic and coherent practice emerges from teachers' engagement with learning outcomes (Drew & Priestley, 2014).

As stated above, there are clear implications here for policy and practice at the macro-, meso- and micro-levels of curriculum development.

- At a macro-level, we need policy which is coherent, which makes the connection between outcomes, content and processes. Careful consideration needs to be given to how aspects of policy enable rather than constrain teacher agency and

professionalism, for example ensuring that there are not tensions within policy which can encourage the development of performative cultures in schools.

- At a meso-level, policy development activity and materials need to be carefully formulated so that they support direct engagement with the big ideas and messages in high macro-level policy. A particular problem in Scotland has been the proliferation of mid-level guidance, by national agencies and local authorities, which dilutes and distorts these messages through successive reinterpretation of policy. This can create an implementation gap between policy and practice (Supovitz, 2009).
- At a local, micro-level, teachers need to be supported and resourced to engage in meaningful curriculum development processes. Where possible, detailed decisions about content and methods should be made at this local level, rather than prescribed from above, but they need to be clearly related to curricular purposes and learning outcomes.

Thus, learning outcomes are best framed in a generic fashion, supported by additional broad specification of appropriate content and methods, and clear identification of meaningful processes to facilitate engagement with policy. We should avoid the detailed specification of multiple levels of statements of outcome, which can quickly become, as described above, bureaucratic standards for assessment.

Such an approach has been described by CEDEFOP (2009, p144). It is an approach which:

*identifies holistically the learning outcomes that the learner should typically achieve by the end of a phase, or the whole of school education. These are associated with the agreed aims and objectives of the education system. Only then are appropriate subjects and groupings of subjects identified or brought into play. In this case, new possibilities open up to include new ways of thinking about the learning process in the overall planning of learning programmes. We can expect these approaches to open up new challenges for pedagogy and for school organisation.*

This is an approach which I would endorse. Learning outcomes have great potential to facilitate better learning and teaching. But they also have the potential, if inappropriately framed, over-prescriptive and/or inadequately conceptualised (as part of a process for curriculum development) to deform, distort and reduce the process of education.

## References

Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, research, critique*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Biesta, G.J.J. (2004). Education, accountability and the ethical demand. Can the democratic potential of accountability be regained? *Educational Theory*, 54, 233-250.

Biesta, G.J.J. & Priestley, M. (2013). Capacities and the curriculum. In M. Priestley & G.J.J. Biesta (Eds.), *Reinventing the curriculum: new trends in curriculum policy and practice*. London: Bloomsbury.

CEDEFOP (2009). *The shift to learning outcomes: policies and practices in Europe*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Drew, V. & Priestley, M., (2014). *School-based Curriculum Development Through Collaborative Professional Enquiry*. A paper presented at the European Conference for Educational Research, 3 September 2014, Porto.

Kelly, A.V. (2004). *The Curriculum: theory and practice*, 5th edition. London: Sage.

Kuiper, W., & Berkvens, J. (eds.) (2013). *Balancing curriculum regulation and freedom across Europe*. CIDREE Yearbook 2013. Enschede, the Netherlands: SLO.

Priestley, M. (2013). The 3-18 Curriculum in Scottish Education. In T.G.K. Bryce, W.M. Humes, D. Gillies & A. Kennedy (eds.), *Scottish Education*, 4th edition, Referendum, 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. & Minty, S. (2012). *Developing Curriculum for Excellence: Summary of findings from research undertaken in a Scottish local authority*. Stirling: University of Stirling.

Priestley, M. & Minty, S. (2013). Curriculum for Excellence: 'A brilliant idea, but...'. *Scottish Educational Review*, 45[1], 39-52.

Priestley, M., Minty, S. & Eager, M. (2014). School-based curriculum development in Scotland: Curriculum policy and enactment. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 22[2], 189-211.

Sahlberg, P. (2010). Rethinking accountability in a knowledge society. *Journal of Educational Change*, 11, 45-61.

Supovitz, J.A. (2008). Implementation as Iterative Refraction. In J.A. Supovitz & E.H. Weinbaum (eds.), *The Implementation Gap: understanding reform in high schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.)

Wilkins, C. (2011). Professionalism and the post-performative teacher: new teachers reflect on autonomy and accountability in the English school system. *Professional Development in Education*, 37, 389-409.

Wolf, A. (1995). *Competence-Based Assessment*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

National Council for Curriculum and Assessment

35 Fitzwilliam Square, Dublin 2

T +353 1 661 7177

F +353 1 661 7180

[info@ncca.ie](mailto:info@ncca.ie)

[www.ncca.ie](http://www.ncca.ie)

2016