**Chapter 7**

**Planning and Organising for Learning and Positive Behaviour**

**Francesca Brown-Cornwall**

After reading this chapter, you will be able to:

Plan for children’s care and education with a renewed understanding, underpinned by theoretical and practice-based evidence.

Approach planning equipped with different types of methods, coupled with an enhanced appreciation and approach to inclusive and workable plans.

Plan with a contemporary, flexible, and spontaneous approach involving the team, families, stakeholders in meeting the unique needs of children.

**Introduction**

This chapter discusses how to plan effectively for children’s care and education between the ages of 0-8. The chapter benefits from a range of critically reviewed theories, statutory and non-statutory curricula guidance and practice-based evidence. The chapter also draws from debates and dilemmas when planning for the unique needs of children and promoting positive behaviour. The chapter contains case studies, suggestions for planning and projects, alongside opportunities to pause for thought, reflect and read wider. It is important to note that planning is a distinctive part of practice for each professional and workplace. Students and professionals, should remain responsive to the unique needs of cohorts of children, and equally as responsive to the context in which they are working. There is no one-size-fits-all approach to planning, there is no explicitly wrong or right way to plan, planning is simply that, a plan. Therefore, reading on, the chapter will elicit and provoke new thoughts and ideas for practice pertaining to planning but will not necessarily instruct on the preferential approach to planning – *it is you that writes that part of your chapter.*

**Importance of Planning**

Planning is an integral part of provision in early childhood care and education as it ensures sufficient support for learning, development, and response to unique needs. However, planning should not generate unnecessary paperwork (DfE 2020), nor remove professionals from interacting with the children. The Early Years Foundation Stage (DfE 2020) requirements for learning and development puts a statutory duty upon professionals to shape activities and experiences, help children work towards the early learning goals and make assessment arrangements to measure progress. The National Curriculum (DfE 2014) provides structure in terms of which subjects are compulsory in key stage one (ages 5-7), the tests and assessment opportunities, and the expected good levels of development. As professionals and students, it is important to have a thorough understanding of the statutory curricula backdrop and remain aware of updates and reform to curricula policy and guidance throughout careers post-graduation. Nevertheless, the curricula backdrop is not and should not be the only ‘driver’ of a planning approach.

Traditional theories underpin approaches to planning, project-based learning, or passion-based projects, derive largely from Loris Malaguzzi (1920-1994) as discussed in Cagliari *et al* (2016) and the Reggio Emilia methods. Reggio Emilia methods rely on children having control over their investigations and subsequent learning, they should have ample opportunities to immerse into their environment using all their senses with endless ways to express their ‘100 languages’ – meaning the limitless ways children choose to express themselves. Loris Malaguzzi (1920-1994) as discussed in Cagliari *et al* (2016) felt the role of the adult was to facilitate rather than instruct, professionals and students can adopt this by planning and spontaneously providing invitations and provocations to elicit children’s curiosity and involve them in projects based on their interests and what captures their attention. Professionals and students, then simply guide that journey and capture those learning moments, keeping a document of them. As a result, children have ‘project files’ full of photographs, organic artefacts that they have created, and other multi-media means of capturing genuine learning and development. Commonly heard of approaches include settings using ‘learning vehicles’ or a ‘creative curriculum’ and images of beautifully enticing ‘provocations’ are readily available, and by and large these are a contemporary take on using themes, projects, and professional inventiveness to elicit the same ethos as the Reggio Emilia approach. The Reggio Emilia approach to planning, care and education of children has been researched rigorously by academics, students and professionals for many years, recently Fernández-Santin and Feliu-Torruella (2020) explored how this philosophy of early childhood education can elicit critical thinking skills, they identified that the Reggio Emilia approach sparked enjoyment, participation, emotive expression, experimentation, playfulness and creativity – all of which can be mapped to the curricula backdrop and the wholesome purpose of planning care and education for children 0-8. Similarly, Büșra Kaynak-Ekici et al*.,* (2020) found that small approaches to planning and provision lifted from the Reggio Emilia methods, such as changing the physical environment, providing interesting open-ended sensory materials, engaging in shared thinking with professionals and children, asking questions and making curiosity comments, all create improved learning opportunities which can help children reach milestones, curricula or otherwise.

**Pause for thought**

* *How much of the Reggio Emilia approach do you already adopt in your practice?*
* *Can this element of your practice be maximised even more?*
* *Ask yourself the following: do I take time to provide and build projects based on unique interests which scope over longer periods of time e.g. days, weeks, terms?*
* *Is my approach to collecting evidence of learning compiled of genuine learning artefacts by the child, or the results of adult initiated activity?*
* *How much of the physical environment is designed, created and chosen by the child?*
* *How much time do children get to freely plan their own learning and play in reception and beyond?*
* *What aspects of Reggio Emilia can be lifted and implemented beyond reception to the end of key stage 1?*

Another traditional theory still influential is the Montessori method (Montessori 1914). This method equally places the child at the centre of the planning process, and the professional’s role once again is to facilitate learning based upon the child’s interests. A large part of the professionals planning role is observation. The professional should spend time immersing into the background of the environment, simply observing with all their senses what the children are doing. This requires little to no intervention from the professional, the very ethos of the Montessori method is to let the child lead, be patient, humble and avoid trying to ‘manage’ or ‘control’ the child. Even in ‘error’ the professional is encouraged to use mistakes as an opportunity to construct and scaffold learning in methods which avoid correction. The professional role is to help the child construct their learning and behaviours by equipping them with the tools needed to do so, and there are specific recommended Montessori learning materials advocated to do some of this. Using the valuable evidence from thorough observation, the professional can plan a bespoke response and use activities, the environment and care and education strategies to support learning, development and behaviours. L ‘Ecuyer et al.,(2020) explored the Montessori methods of planning and their support for current advances in understanding of neuroscience, and the findings are incredibly noteworthy. L‘Ecuyer et al., (2020) highlighted that according to Montessori,

*Preschool children should be provided with a prepared environment to promote education of the senses through spontaneous repetition, and indeed this approach is consistent with current understanding of neurodevelopment processes, such as early development of sensory and motor cortices, and synaptic pruning in attention‐related brain areas occurring at sensitive periods of development.* (p 331).

This traditional theory, being evidenced from advances in neuroscience, gives a reasonable rationale to adopt this approach in contemporary provision.

**Pause for thought**

* + *How much of your current practice pertaining to planning, embodies Montessori type methods?*
  + *Try adopting a Montessori approach to observation, sitting silently in a room and observe for a prolonged period of time. Take the time to digest what you discover and respond via your planning according to what you have found out. Reflect on the quality of your observation and your subsequent practice as a result.*

Froebelian approaches to planning are arguably so engrained in practice that it can go unnoticed how influenced by them provisions are. Froebel (1895) championed the parts of the day which are now routine for children in their early years, just as he envisaged. Story time, singing and rhymes, role play, outdoor play, wooden blocks (the gifts), significance of feeling loved and valued – all important factors which planning should facilitate.

Steiner-Waldorf as discussed by Okomuto (2019) is a form of education providing an alternative set of flexible pedagogical guidelines to support planning, focussed on the child, according to Okomutu (2019) the Steiner-Waldorf approach gives holistic attention to the whole child and all areas of development in creative ways. Okomutu (2019) research explored language acquisition, spirituality and the embodiment of learning in accordance to the Steiner-Waldorf approach, and the research notes that art, culture, spirituality are all given the same attention as language and maths, often delivered via themes, thus all development in these areas are interlinked. Speech and cognition, support spiritual identity which is embodied in a childs physical being, therefore adopting the Steiner-Waldorf approaches to planning elicits creativity from the professional to break free from curricula constructs and how society typically views development and learning.

**Pause for thought**

* + *Why do you think it is important not to focus on the curricula as a sole driver for your planning?*
  + *In what ways does your planning support spiritual identity concurrently with typical areas of development and subjects?*
  + *Could mindful creativity such as meditative dance or art be added to your offering?*

Finally, the HighScope approach, initially implemented in USA underpinned by a landmark project ‘The Perry Project’ (1962-1967) as discussed by HighScope (2021), discovered that early childhood experiences, whereby children led the planning via a ‘plan, do, review’ process resulted in extended prosocial behaviours in areas of extremely high poverty and social deviance. This favourable impact on life outcomes conveys the significance an approach to planning can have. As a result, many settings adopt this as a curricula, or practice strategy concurrently with the UK curriculum.

Therefore, it is important that students and professionals draw from traditional theory, contemporary research and supplementary curricula guidance. For example, the Early Years Foundation Phase (2021) has supplementary guidance ‘Birth to Five Matters’ and the work of Grenier (2020) which can help professionals and students facilitate planning in the best way suited to their cohort of children and context of provision.

**Positive Behaviour**

Planning not only facilitates development and learning, but positive dispositions for learning and positive behaviours. For many years planning, policy and practice pertaining to behaviour has been based upon traditional theories. Behaviourism concentrates on the behaviour itself and arguably does not look into what is causing the behaviour, the context of the behaviour or any antecedent or influential factors. Behaviourism is based upon the work of theorists such as Bandura and Skinner for example, whereby role modelling, imitation and subsequently reinforcement is used to elicit more positive behaviour and chastise negative behaviour (Lally and French 2019). Cognitivism builds upon this work and considers the thinking and thought processes which have occurred and led to the behaviours exhibited (Ertermer and Newby 2013). Constructivism is arguably a more wholesome look at behaviour, where context, environment and wider influential factors are reflected upon to help unpick behaviours and support individuals, constructivism perhaps ‘constructs a bridge’ between both behaviourism and cognitivism to help students and professionals develop a broad view of behaviour (Lally and French 2019).

Nevertheless, these are still dated when we consider the advances in neuroscience. We understand that behaviour is communication from the five domains of self-regulation (biological, cognitive, prosocial, social and emotional) and that behaviour is an outward sign of an inward dynamic interplay in the limbic system (National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, 2010). The limbic system sets the blueprint for future behaviours, so it is important in early childhood planning, that we provide positive experiences to imprint positively onto this area of the brain. Students and professionals can successfully contribute to this by serve and return practices and planning and preparing basic positive care giving practices across the entire 0-8 age range. When we are served ‘negative’ behaviour, we need to return this with planning and practice which cultivates emotional intelligence and competency. Conkbayir (2017) recommends as professionals, we reflect on ourselves first, our mindset, our practices and our behaviours. Furthermore, we must not return a child’s serve with punishment, and alternatively plan to share coping strategies, role model healthy mindset and positive relationships. Herein lays a necessary change in practice, reward and sanction methods are dated, they do not return the correct response when a child serves *negative* behaviour. Behaviour is not to be conditioned or managed, neuroscience tells us it is to be cared for, we must role model, show professional love, investigate the influences of behaviour.

**Debate and dilemma**

*Self-regulation is a vast area of psychological research, and the EYFS has been criticised for considering this from a superficial perspective, and, expecting those as young as two to self-regulate.*

*What are your thoughts on this?*

* + *Do you feel you know enough about self-regulation to adequately*

*support this area of provision?*

* + *Do you promote positive dispositions for learning, or do you ‘manage’ behaviour?*

**Approaches to Planning**

Planning happens in various ways, most frequently we plan forwards or in the moment, and sometimes this happens retrospectively. Commonplace is to also begin with a blank page, which simply is added to as children lead their day and professionals respond to this by capturing evidence and artefacts of the organic learning which is mapped to curricula guidance in retrospect. Ephgrave (2018) discusses this approach thoroughly when sharing evidence-based reflections on In the Moment planning with children across the early years (ages 2-7). Ephgrave (2018) acknowledges that key parts of the planning should include close attention to organising time, environments and resources, adults and interactions to ensure deep level engagement, notable Ephgrave (2018) does not mention paperwork as a priority planning factor. Equally the Early Years Learning Alliance (2018) noted paperwork was taking professionals and students away from children and meaningful interactions, therefore, students and professionals need to be mindful that planning paperwork does not become burdensome. As aforementioned, there is no explicitly wrong or right way to plan, and neither the EYFS nor NC curricula statutory guidance, propose an approach or template to use. Therefore, as a professional you will have to decide upon the planning approach and means of documentation that works best for personal cohorts and contexts.

To help with this, the below figures convey examples of planning typically seen in nursery and reception classes.

*Fig. 1 Prime Planning Template Example*

*Fig. 2 Specific Planning Template Example*

*Fig 3 Continuous Provision Enhancements Example*

Once a child is in year 1 and 2, planning becomes increasingly subject specific and likely to be mapped across terms and assessment points. Nevertheless, forwards, in the moment and retrospect approaches are all still benefitted from.

The planning approach across the 0-8 age range must take into account the continuum of adult led activities, intentional teaching and child led, free play opportunities. Children’s access to play and recreational activities is recognised internationally as a fundamental human right. Article 31(1) of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC): ‘States Parties recognise the right of the child to rest and leisure, to engage in play and recreational activities appropriate to the age of the child and to participate freely in cultural life and the arts.’ A child can realise this right through any play type, and as professionals and students, play is a crucial part of approaching planning. Lester and Russell (2008) identify two groups for functions of play: Instrumental – play is a mechanism for learning, and development. Autotelic/intrinsic – play is important for its own sake. Moreover, Davy and Lundy (2011) argue that a rights-based approach to play, incorporates both Instrumental and Autotelic functions of play, rather than play being for either/or, play is significant for learning, development and for its own sake.

To offer a range of play opportunities via a continuum of adult to child led planned approaches, students and professionals can benefit from a cyclical process of planning. This cycle can be followed quickly and, in the moment, or, over a longer period.

*Figure 4 An Example of a Planning Cycle (Adapted from Grenier 2019 p. 36)*

By following such a cyclical process, professionals and students can continually improve practice and meet the unique needs of children.

It is significant that all aspects are considered when responding to unique needs, arguably too often areas of practice are not planned effectively for, representation for example does not always account for LGBTQIA+, anti-racist practice, SEND, diverse cultures, religions and socio-economic contexts. Cyclical planning and reflective practice can help planning to celebrate difference, get to know the uniqueness of children and families, create an enabling environment for all, and tackle stereotypes and exclusion (Stonewall 2019).

Henry-Allain and Lloyd-Rose (2021) advocate starting our planning process with a look inwardly at ourselves to question reflexively our thoughts and intentions for being anti-racist and inclusive in our planning and practice. Once students and professionals have engaged in such reflection, provision pertaining to planning and responding to childrens needs is improved.

A rights-based approach is also significant to equal and inclusive plans. The Equality Act 2010, SEND code of practice, statutory requirements of curricula guidance, to name but a few provide the legal duty of care and education underpinning the approach to planning.

**Pause for thought**

* *How does your planning approach act as a vehicle to reflect a diverse society?*
* *Could you audit the quality of diverse representation in your planning from the past 6 months? What do you notice? Any evident strengths and weaknesses?*

A contemporary area of planning for the 0-8s age range is that of STEAM provision (Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Mathematics) and how these subjects can be combined in exciting, innovative and interesting projects, stand-alone activities or immersive environments. If we use the current curricula guidance to help us tease out what STEAM looks like for the 0-8 age range, it could be summarised as follows: Science is a way of thinking through observation and investigation, questioning ‘how and why’ things work and events happen. Technology is a resource to be explored or a means of thinking computationally and doing and documenting. Engineering is a way of combining materials to design and create structures and working apparatus. Art is an outward expression of internal creation, thinking and feelings. Maths is a way of measuring, sequencing, patterning and classifying. Reflecting on the theorists previously noted in this chapter, all champion the innate, exploratory nature of babies and young children, and have helped us to facilitate learning via plentiful sensory, open-ended and investigative opportunities with the child at the centre – certainly something planning for STEAM can advocate. Conkbayir (2017) notes that advancements in neuroscience have also confi­rmed that the birth to ­five age range is the most sensitive period as during this period more synapses in the brain are fi­ring and responding, thus, neurological connections are being made, and physical pathways are paved. Moomaw (2012) questions that this time of rapid development and learning, with organic interest in the world around them, and keenness to explore, is surely the most suitable time to harness a lasting wonderment of STEAM subjects. There are cautions however pertaining to technology use in 0-8 age range, that sedentary behaviour can increase and social and emotional competence decrease (Kucirkova and Livingstone, 2017). However, students and professionals can consider technology not only as devices and apps, but as a way of thinking computationally. The four cornerstones of such computational thinking are described by Barefoot (2014) as:

• Decomposition – breaking down problem/task into steps.

• Pattern recognition – noticing re-occurrences and sequences.

• Abstraction – sieving important information from the less important.

• Algorithm – a set of instructions.

With this in mind, technological activities could be ‘unplugged’ and disassociated with a screen or sedentary behaviours. Activities, such as: creating and navigating around labyrinths, a touch of orienteering, or playing with handmade puzzles, ball drops or marble mazes, could each prompt computational thinking skills appropriate for the 0-8 age range.

An explicit approach to facilitating STEAM planning could be a five step DDIDD model that encourages children to determine and debate an area of interest before investigating it in their way, professionals documenting the learning and deducing what they found out with the children.

Whilst a planning document would not be necessary, it maybe helpful when new to cross-curricula planning or STEAM subjects to use the following process and associated template:

Determine - What is the investigation focussing upon? What are the potential aims, objectives or anticipated outcomes?

Debate - What are the open-ended questions you will ask?

Investigate - How will you go about implementing the activity? How will you investigate specific aspects such as computational thinking, mathematical measurements, classical science?

Document - How can you collect evidence of the activity and subsequent learning?

Deduce - Evaluate the outcome, leading to next steps

*Figure 5 DDIDD model of STEAM Planning (Cornwall 2018)*

**Pause for thought**

* *How are STEAM subjects available in your provision concurrently?*
* *Can you think of STEAM activities or projects for the following age ranges;*
  + *0-1*
  + *1-2*
  + *2-3*
  + *3-5*
  + *5-7*
  + *7-8*

**Collaborative Working**

Connectedness empowers learning for all of those involved, not least the children, their families and students and professionals. However, when we consider how we collaborate with others, we can often mistake cooperation (whereby the onus is on working together effectively rather than the outcome), coordination (delegated, or individual responsibilities) and colocation (multiple services in a single place) as genuine and deep level collaboration, yet these are indeed different. Planning can act as a vehicle for increased meaningful collaborations to champion a level of connectedness that truly empowers learning and benefits all stakeholders no matter the location, the necessary coordination or relational cooperation. Most importantly, collaborative approaches to planning can help to meet the unique needs of children more effectively than solo efforts.

When considering the features of how children learn, we can summarise three key features of development during our lifespan, and most significantly during the 0-8 age range:

1. Nature versus nurture – there is constant communication between our genes and the environment.

2. Continuous versus discontinuous development – development and learning is a series of progression as well as stagnation and regression.

3. Universal versus cultural – some areas of development are universally profound and cultivated equally worldwide (prime areas of development), whereas others are culture and time specific, and are cultivated differently depending upon what is perceived as ‘important’ in that place and time (specific areas of development).

Bronfenbrenner (1975 and 2005) bio-ecological systems theory identifies how many direct and indirect influences have an impact on child development. Influences and relationships from the micro-level including the childs immediate family to the macro-level including wider societal culture and the chrono-level meaning the significance of socio-historic context can all influence progression, stagnation or regression. Students and professionals therefore need to cultivate as many positive relationships around the child to account for all of those potential influencing factors. Partnering with parents and carers at the micro level, and engaging with communities of practice or national agendas at the macro level help to increase collaborative working and subsequent effective planning of provision.

The early years and education sector has a role in facilitating social mobility, and increasing childrens social and cultural capital via collaborative working. Putnam (2000) identifies social capital as having a direct impact on educational outcomes for children. Parents, teachers and the child social richness is directly linked to development, lifelong learning, and positive communities. The Social Mobility Commission (2016) replicated the work of Putnam (2000) to help tackle some of the controversial issues in the UK, and inform policy and practice. The Social Mobility Commission (2016) findings echoed Putnam (2000) and discovered that the connectedness and social, cultural capital of parents/carers and professionals around children indeed influenced their development, thus recommending that collaboration and rich engagement with society around us is significant. As professionals and students this means opportunities to collaborate and seek collaboration must be maximised upon. Cultural capital became particularly poignant for school based provision when added to the Ofsted (2022) Education Inspection Framework, nevertheless, Ofsted should not be the driver for collaborative working, but rather, the benefits it can have for meeting needs of children in planning.

**Pause for thought**

* + *How do you currently collaborate with local business to enhance your provision?*
  + *How are you involved in your local community? Could this be improved or enhanced?*
  + *When planning, how frequently do your consult services, professionals or networks outside of your own provision?*
  + *How involved are families with planning?*

**Organising it all**

Whilst planning is an important part of the role, organisation is fundamental to all best thought-out plans and students and professionals can often feel overwhelmed with the workload in early years and education. The joint project between Early Years Alliance, DfE and Ofsted in 2019 acknowledged this issue and recommended that paperwork does not need to be prepared for Ofsted and copious amounts of observations and ‘evidence’ are not required. Students and professionals can therefore look to alleviate workload pressures in planning, if it feels too much, then it probably is. The basic needs and interactions with children are the priority, therefore benefiting from a needs-based approach to organisation can help (Bryce-Clegg 2015).

Bryce-Clegg (2015) recommends that students and professionals consider basic needs and basic provision first, followed by continuous and enhanced provision. After all, it is commonly known that if basic needs are not met, then a child is unlikely to be in a positive disposition for learning. The key arguably here, is having a daily routine which works for your cohort of children, and to remain flexible and responsive to their unique needs. Once the daily routine is established yet agile, plans can build upon enhancing and continually improving provision with extra embellishments such as projects, special interest days, events and such like. Organisation can certainly take the Maslow (1943) hierarchy of needs approach and focus on routines which prioritise physiological needs such as nutrition and rest, followed by safety needs such as independence and self-care, then belongingness and relationships can form, leading to self-esteem rising and learning and positive progression facilitated.

**Pause for thought**

* *Do you plan explicitly for activities or projects which facilitate learning and development via meeting and exploring physiological needs?*
* *Does your daily routine get reflected upon often enough? Is this working for you in terms of time, space and resource?*
* *How organised is your planning? Is there too little/much paperwork? Is there adequate time in the routine to focus on planning how you’d like?*
* *Are there ‘pinch points’ in your workload which can be alleviated?*

**Debates and Dilemmas**

*Hard (2005) highlights that being ‘nice’ in early years is seen as important in the workforce. However, prioritising self-care and preservation and alleviating workload does require an element of assertiveness. Hard (2005) highlights that being assertive in early years and education can feel in contrast with the ‘nice’ ethos, yet Early Years Alliance, DfE and Ofsted (2019) all acknowledge the wellbeing of professionals is at stake.*

* *Is being ‘nice’ seen as important to you?*
* *Are you ever a victim of ‘niceness’?*
* *What ways can your routine or planning be workable and concurrently consider the needs of students and professionals, as well as children and families?*

**Evaluation and reflection**

Regardless of what approach to planning students and professionals take, a significant part of the process is evaluating and reflecting on the benefits and limitations of the implemented plan. Without evaluating, students and professional can never be sure whether plans produce the intended impact, nor can they continually respond and improve. Evaluation can also help organisation, act as a vehicle for collaboration, and elicit new ideas and opportunities for all stakeholders. Students and professionals working with the EYFS must reflect on their strategies to support teaching and learning and consider the three characteristics of effective teaching and learning.

*• playing and exploring - children investigate and experience things, and ‘have a go’*

*• active learning - children concentrate and keep on trying if they encounter difficulties, and enjoy achievements*

*• creating and thinking critically - children have and develop their own ideas, make links between ideas, and develop strategies for doing things*

*(DfE 2021, p.9)*

Students and professionals working with the NC must reflect upon the quality of the core and foundation subject delivery, and monitor, moderate and forecast levels of development.

Reflection and evaluation of either curricula can and should involve collaboration, children’s voice and views of families and stakeholders as these multiple perspectives add depth and meaning to any follow up plans and practice. Involving others in evaluation and reflection can elicit even more investment from others for the benefit of the children and spark better relationships around the children.

**Pause for thought**

* *It would be extremely difficult to collaboratively evaluate everything. What ways do you evaluate currently? Is there room for more collaboration for specific purposes?*
* *What ways are the views and voices of children taken into account when you evaluate?*

It is always valuable to seek reminders of what evaluation is not. Evaluation is not a comparison between children, a checklist against ‘linear norms’ or ‘milestones’, subjectivity and objectivity both have their limitations and benefits – therefore situational perspective is helpful, and finally, evaluation does not need to be burdensome, we can often simply ask, ‘What went well? Better if?’ to find value and recommendations from our plans.

**Final thoughts**

Planning for organisation, behaviour and fulfilling the unique needs of children via workable, inclusive approaches, whilst simultaneously avoiding labour intensive methods seems a daunting responsibility. However, there is no end destination, nor a one-size fits all, nor an explicitly wrong or right way to plan. Dip in and out of this chapter as frequently as needed, remain flexible, agile and reflective and enjoy the process not the product – just like the children.

**Further Reading**

DfE (2014) *Statutory Guidance, National Curriculum in England: Framework for key stages 1 to 4*. [National curriculum in England: framework for key stages 1 to 4 - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-framework-for-key-stages-1-to-4/the-national-curriculum-in-england-framework-for-key-stages-1-to-4) (accesse. 10.06.21).

Students and professionals may find it useful to consult the curricula guidance for beyond the 0-8 age range in the following key stages to help in planning transitions, and to respond to any gifted and talented children.
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