



Should we redesign the curriculum to provide students with more time and space to be creative?

"The great engine of academic creativity is intellectual curiosity - the desire to find out, understand, explain, prove or disprove something or simply to imagine something different"

Jackson et al, 2006



"Schools teach how to answer, not to question"

Csikszentmihali, 2006

In the early stage of science education we unconsciously discourage students from questioning by indoctrinate them with facts and certainty

Jenny Waller, 2016

"For students of particular disciplines, the invisible, takenfor-granted nature of paradigms has obvious functional advantages since it means they can work within their chosen field without wasting time attempting to redefine or defect the 'hypothetical rules of the game'."

Kuhn, 1974

Kuhn, 1974

"Creativity is inhibited by predictive outcome-based course designs, which sets out what students will be expected to have learned with no room for unanticipated or studentdetermined outcomes"

Jackson, 2006

We have been teaching science this way for centuries so why should we change this approach now?

NDFIC

"Interdisciplinary view original thinkers and problem solvers"

Principles of practice based arts teaching

Teach method, not content

Principles of practice based arts teaching

Encourages exploration and experimentation

Principles of practice based arts teaching

Assessments focused on process not outcome

Principles of practice based arts teaching

Educators are tutors; role is as a facilitator rather than teacher

Can we adopt similar approaches within the sciences?

Summary

Traditional teaching approaches often provide limited opportunities for creativity

Redesign of the curriculum can reawaken curiosity and tap into intrinsic motivation to learn

Expand opportunities for original thinking and problem-solving

Requires time and space in the curriculum as well as a safe environment to fail

