

Routes for Learning:
Feedback questions

**Routemap**

1. As part of the feedback received during summer 2019, it has been suggested that some of the route descriptors included on the Routemap need to be clarified and updated.

A small group of researchers, practitioners and terminologists met recently and have recommended changes to the Routemap in both English and Welsh. The recommended changes to the English version can be found below. (If you would like to see the recommended changes to the Welsh version they can be found at [hwb.llyw.cymru/cwricwlwm-i-gymru/ar-drywydd-dysgu](https://hwb.llyw.cymru/cwricwlwm-i-gymru/ar-drywydd-dysgu).)

What are your views on the following?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Route descriptor included on the Routemap published in April 2019** | **Recommended text** | **Do you agree with the recommendation? Please explain your response.** |
| 1 | Noticesstimuli | *No change* |  |
| 2 | Reacts to close contact with familiar adult | Senses close contact with familiar adult |  |
| 3 | Responds to veryobvious stimulus | *No change* |  |
| 4 | Demonstrates briefmemory for previouslypresented stimulus | Recognises a stimulus on immediate re-presentation |  |
| 5 | Responds to familiar voice or other personal identifier | *No change* |  |
| 6 | Responds to rangeof stimuli | *No change* |  |
| 7 | Aided 1:1turn-takingwith adult | Supported 1:1 turn-taking with adult*While we originally proposed the change to ‘Aided 1:1 turn-taking with adult’ in April 2019, wider discussions regarding the consistent use of language across the Routemap has led the group to recommend that we return to ‘Supported 1:1 turn-taking with adult’ as included on the original version.* |  |
| 8 | Responds consistentlyto one stimulus | *No change* |  |
| 9 | Briefly followsmoving stimulus | *No change* |  |
| 10 | Shows behaviour which can beinterpreted as rejection to some stimuli | Responds to some stimuli in a way that can be interpreted as rejection |  |
| 11 | Responds differentlyto different stimuli | *No change* |  |
| 12 | Terminates interactionwith adult | *No change* |  |
| 13 | Anticipates repetitivelypresented stimulus | *No change* |  |
| 14 | Objects to terminationof interaction | *No change* |  |
| 15 | Aided explorationof the environment | With support explores immediate environment |  |
| 16 | Anticipates withinsocial routines | Anticipates within familiar social routines |  |
| 17 | Redirects attentionto second object | Redirects attention to a second object*Minor grammatical change* |  |
| 18 | Random activitiescause effect | Accidental actions cause effect |  |
| 19 | Looks briefly afterdisappearing object | Looks briefly after object disappearing from their field of vision |  |
| 20 | Action onreactive environment | In a reactive environment repeats action which obtains feedback |  |
| 21 | Communicates‘more’ | *No change* |  |
| 22 | Contingencyresponding | Respond to cause and effect |  |
| 23 | Purposeful action on everydayenvironment | In an everyday environment repeats action which obtains feedback |  |
| 24 | Changes behaviour in response tointerestingevent nearby | *No change* |  |
| 25 | Contingencyawareness | Awareness of cause and effect |  |
| 26 | Intentional exploration ofthe environment | Begins to explore immediate environment independently |  |
| 27 | Communicates ‘more’/‘no more’through two differentconsistent actions | *No change* |  |
| 28 | ‘Looks’ backwards/forwardsbetween two objects (knows two objects are present) | ‘Looks’ backwards and forwards between two objects (knows two objects are present) *Minor grammatical change* |  |
| 29 | Perseveres by repeatingaction for reward insocial game | In the context of a familiar social game, perseveres by repeating action in order to get reward |  |
| 30 | Repeats actionwhen first attemptunsuccessful | *No change*  |  |
| 31 | Attractsattention | *No change* |  |
| 32 | Initiatessocial game | *No change* |  |
| 33 | Objectpermanence | *No change* |  |
| 34 | Does two differentactions in sequenceto get reward | *No change* |  |
| 35 | Selects from twoor more items | *No change* |  |
| 36 | Communicates choice toattentive adult | *No change* |  |
| 37 | Modifies actionwhen repeating action does notwork | *No change* |  |
| 38 | Deliberately gains attention of another person to satisfy need**4** | Deliberately attracts attention of another person in order to communicate need |  |
| 39 | Sharedattention | Joint attention  |  |
| 40 | Expresses preferencefor items notpresent viasymbolic means | *No change* |  |
| 41 | Early problemsolving – tries newstrategy whenold one fails | *No change* |  |
| 42 | Initiates actions toachieve desired result (exerting autonomy in variety of contexts) | Initiates strategies to achieve desired results in a variety of contexts (exercises autonomy) |  |

1. There has been some discussion about how to refer to the boxes on the Routemap, with general agreement that the orange boxes should be ‘milestones’. However, the blue boxes have been referred to as ‘steps’ or simply ‘boxes’. As ‘steps’ seem to suggest a linear journey, and not all learners will follow the same route through the Routemap, the terminology group suggests the following:
* orange boxes – milestones
* blue boxes – boxes.

Do you agree with this proposal? If not, could you suggest an alternative?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. In April 2019, we recommended removing ‘Respond to own name’ from the Routemap because experience has shown that learners do not achieve this box independently at such an early point. While it was agreed that it was located in the wrong place on the original Routemap, some of the feedback received suggests that it should be moved rather than removed completely.

We would therefore like to suggest that ‘Respond to own name’ is
re-introduced to the Routemap and is included between box 25 (Contingency awareness) and box 26 (Intentional exploration of the environment).

1. Do you agree with this recommendation? Please explain your answer.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

There has been some discussion about the impact re-introducing ‘Respond to own name’ may have on the numbering of the boxes on the Routemap. Should it be re-introduced, the following options have been considered.

* Keep the numbering up to box 25 as it appears on the current version of
the Routemap (as published on 28 January and available at [hwb.gov.wales/curriculum-for-wales/routes-for-learning](https://hwb.gov.wales/curriculum-for-wales/routes-for-learning)) but change the numbering on the bottom part, from box 26 onwards. ‘Respond to own name’ would become box 26, ‘Intentional exploration of the environment’ would become box 27 and so on.
* Revert to the numbering used in the original version of the Routemap (as published in 2006 and available at [hwb.gov.wales/storage/2bbe3615-64d0-48c6-8002-a65239fb6ee9/routes-for-learning-routemap.pdf](https://hwb.gov.wales/storage/2bbe3615-64d0-48c6-8002-a65239fb6ee9/routes-for-learning-routemap.pdf)) and simply move ‘Respond to own name’ with its original number (box 8) to be placed lower down on the Routemap (between box 25 and box 26).
1. If ‘Respond to own name’ should be re-introduced, which of the above options would you prefer?

Please explain your answer.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Are there any other changes that you would like to see made to the Routemap?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

\* Please be aware that any changes made to the Routemap will be reflected across the rest of the Routes for Learning suite of materials – including the exemplification videos and guidance document.

**Exemplification videos**

1. Ten further videos have been uploaded in order to exemplify some of the boxes and milestones included on the Routemap. We are in the process of preparing videos to exemplify all of the route descriptors with the aim of embedding them in an interactive Routemap.
2. Do you feel that these videos are appropriate to support practitioner understanding of the relevant route descriptors?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Are there any changes you would like to suggest?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Routes for Learning draft guidance**

1. Do you think that the relevant areas have been addressed in the guidance? Is there anything that we have missed?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Are there any sections within the guidance that you would like to have more information or clarification about? Would additional case studies help with such clarification?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. In Appendix 1 of the guidance, you will see a draft definition of profound and multiple learning difficulties (PMLD)? Do you agree with this definition? Are there any changes you would like to suggest?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Do you feel that the relationship between this guidance and the Curriculum for Wales guidance is clear and that appropriate links with other curriculum and assessment guidance have been made?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Is the structure and flow of this guidance appropriate? If not, what changes would you recommend?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Do you think the language and terminology used in this guidance is appropriate and accessible?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. By summer 2020, we intend to provide an electronic/online version of the guidance. What can we do to ensure this version of the document is easy to navigate, e.g. ability to access stand-alone sections, links to exemplification videos and other materials, etc?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Please send your response to** **assessment@gov.wales** **by 6 March 2020.**