

APPA Submission to the Australian Government Review of the Australian Curriculum

Introduction

1. This submission provides advice from the Australian Primary Principals Association (APPA) to the Australian Government Review of the Australian Curriculum. The document identifies major issues requiring attention in any review process potentially leading to revision of the curriculum. We note that our response reflects advice provided to ACARA over the entire period of planning and developing the Australian Curriculum. In a number of respects, including curriculum overcrowding, we have provided consistent advice since the beginning of the planning phase in 2008. It is our view that full account has not been taken of this advice in the drafting and completion of learning area documents.
2. We note that APPA's views should be seen in the context of our strong support for the Australian Curriculum. We regard the process as an essential development in Australian education. The issues we raise are intended to support primary schools in achieving a more effective implementation of the initiative, and ensure that the core business of primary schools is enhanced rather than damaged by that implementation.
3. This submission identifies the following issues requiring attention from the Review:
 - Positives in our view of the Australian Curriculum
 - Curriculum overcrowding
 - Introduction of new learning areas, or expansion of existing areas, in the primary curriculum
 - Inappropriate content and language for primary years
 - Unnecessary complexity in curriculum design and document structure
 - Issues to do with assessment
 - Pedagogy, and especially the place of inquiry learning in a content-rich curriculum
 - The place of the three cross curriculum perspectives
 - The place of the seven general capabilities
 - Implementation issues

Positives

4. As part of the Review process, APPA wishes to place on record its strong support for the development of the Australian Curriculum and for the work ACARA has undertaken to achieve the current level of progress. We have consistently argued for the initiative and we believe that the learning area documents are largely sound, well-organised and coherent, accessible to teachers and likely to lead to improved outcomes for children. They address content that ought to form part of the education of an Australian child. They mostly offer an appropriate balance between prescription through the content descriptions and suggestions about more detailed teaching proposals in the elaborations.

5. We do not support the view that there is any significant bias in the curriculum. Our analysis of the incorporation of different perspectives suggests that ACARA has done a good job of representing the range of views in the community. While we have reservations about some aspects of the project, and about some learning areas in particular, these reservations are to do with the capacity of schools to manage the volume of content, the appropriateness of content for specific phases of schooling, the extent to which the documents support depth in learning and similar educational and delivery issues. Our reservations do not concern the ideological balance of content selection, the framing of values in the documents or any imposition of specific views.
6. We support the current structure of cross curriculum priorities. We argue that the three areas all deserve space in the curriculum and are appropriate as emphases in the Australian Curriculum within a broad learning area conceptual framework. While we would agree that there are some occasions in the elaborations where references to the priorities could be seen as perfunctory or formulaic (e.g. in Mathematics), we do not see evidence that there is any distortion in curriculum focus caused by these inclusions. We certainly do not believe that there is any persistent over-emphasis on these areas or on particular political or ideological positions that might be seen as associated with them. We believe that their treatment is balanced, sensitive and helpful to teachers. The fact that the elaborations are not mandatory means that, in any case, schools and teachers can make their own decisions about the extent to which they adopt these specific suggestions.
7. We also support the general capabilities and believe that they have been useful in encouraging writers to broaden the focus of their work in each learning area. They provide an additional level of cohesion across learning areas. Their inclusion in the curriculum documents is likely to have a positive effect on the quality of implementation of the curriculum and on the range of teaching approaches adopted in Australia's classrooms.
8. The comments below on the specific issues that we encourage the Review to address should be seen in the context of our broad support for the Australian Curriculum and the work of ACARA and our view that the set of documents represents, in general, a high quality curriculum. We would particularly reject any attempt to impose an ideological position on the curriculum. In areas that have had some public attention, notably History, we argue that the current document provides a good account of the kind of historical understanding and practice that young Australians should learn. Our careful reading of and detailed responses to drafts and papers over the past six years confirm our view that ACARA and the writers and managers have done an excellent job of providing a balanced, measured and inclusive representation of the curriculum for Australian schools. This approach should be retained.

Curriculum overcrowding

9. The principal issue to which we draw the Review's attention is the effect of the Australian Curriculum in overcrowding the curriculum in primary schools. This imposes unrealistic expectations regarding what can be covered in the primary school year, stretches the expertise of primary trained teachers in covering areas requiring significant new learning, and demands unreasonable amounts of time for schools and school systems to provide effective professional learning to support implementation.
10. From the initiation of the project, APPA has consistently argued that the risks of overcrowding were substantial. In a submission setting out our expectations of the national curriculum in September 2008, we proposed:

The national curriculum should assist in uncrowding the curriculum rather than making it more complex. Before development of subject documents is started, the Board must develop criteria and management controls to ensure that the workload of primary teachers and the volume of national curriculum materials applying to their work are managed effectively.

That submission referred to the potential for:

progressive and unplanned development of a volume of materials across all learning areas and subjects, leading to a crowded curriculum that is impossible for primary teachers to implement successfully.

It is our view that this potential has come to pass. The Australian Curriculum as it now stands is difficult to implement (and impossible to implement fully effectively) in any primary school.

11. APPA's original 2008 submission also argued that:

The national curriculum ought to constitute substantially less than the whole curriculum in the subjects included, leaving room for additions to reflect local circumstances, traditions and interests. Specific elements of the national curriculum will be filled out and given substance locally.

This is echoed in the most recent version of *The Shape of the Australian Curriculum*, which claims:

The Australian Curriculum provides for rigorous, in-depth study, preferring depth to breadth wherever a choice needs to be made, with consideration also being given to the overall teaching and learning time available (ACARA, 2012: p10).

This suggests that ACARA intends to limit the scope of the curriculum to allow for study in depth. The Shape document also proposes that ‘School authorities will be able to offer curriculum beyond that specified in the Australian curriculum’ (Ibid., p13), and notes that one of the assumptions on which the curriculum is based is that:

The teaching and learning programs offered by schools are based on the Australian Curriculum, in conjunction with state or territory curriculum, and other learning opportunities and activities determined by the school (Ibid., p26).

The document also indicates that:

...the Australian Curriculum is written so that it should not take up more than 80 per cent of the total teaching time available in schools, with this proportion peaking in Years 7 and 8.... (Ibid., p26)

If these claims were to be justified, the Australian Curriculum ought to leave time and space for the addition of further material. APPA argues that this is clearly not the case.

12. The effect of the overcrowding is to reduce the effectiveness of primary schools in their core areas of responsibility. Primary schools have a central responsibility to ensure that every child becomes literate and numerate. This requires significant time. As a result of the implementation of the Australian Curriculum, the time available for literacy and numeracy have been inevitably reduced. This is problematic in any school. In schools with a large proportion of disadvantaged students, including those in remote Indigenous communities and those more recent arrivals with little exposure to English, the effect is that the full implementation of the Australian Curriculum could mean that some children will fail to gain the foundational learning that underpins future success. The Review should take action to ensure that the workload of primary teachers and the volume of Australian Curriculum requirements applying to their work are managed effectively.
13. The suite of documents should be designed to reduce the crowding of the curriculum and should take account of what can be covered in a day or week in a primary school. The critical focus of primary schools on literacy and numeracy, especially in the early years, should not continue to be put at risk by the inclusion of excessive expectations in other subject areas. It is APPA’s position that the core elements of the primary curriculum are literacy, numeracy, science and social education.
14. Even in the English and Mathematics curricula, we believe that the volume of content proposed is somewhat greater than would have been the case in the state and territory documents they replace. There has been an expansion in English for example, in visual literacy elements by comparison with some jurisdictional curricula, and some material that was introduced at secondary level is now part of the primary curriculum. In both

learning areas there is an enhanced focus on the use of technologies in the classroom. We note the cumulative effect of such increases in volume.

15. APPA has argued consistently that no History curriculum should be developed for the first three years of schooling and the Australian Curriculum: Science should be very limited in scope in the first three years. The volume of material in Science and History, especially in the upper primary years, will be impossible to teach in most schools. It is unrealistic to provide a mandatory outline of content that would be demonstrably impossible to deliver in many schools (especially those with a student population many of whom experience multiple factors of disadvantage) and probably impossible in any school. In areas such as History and the sciences, the early years undertake at most a limited range of preparatory work. Even in the upper primary years, these subjects are a significantly lower priority than English and Mathematics.
16. In some areas, the growing demands across learning areas are inimical to good primary education. The dramatic expansion of the general area of social education has already had the effect of crowding out the key responsibilities of primary schools. In this area, which in most states and territories comprised one primary years learning area under previous curriculum structures, there are now four areas under the Australian Curriculum: History, Geography, Civics and Citizenship and Economics and Business. A generalist teacher in a primary school classroom cannot properly address these areas at Years 5 and 6 (and Year 7 in some schools). ACARA itself proposes in its notional time allocations that these areas should comprise 12% of the curriculum, with Economics and Business taking up 2%. Originally, ACARA provided advice in the framing documents that suggested that History alone should take up 10% of curriculum time.
17. It is our view that the subsequent additions of subject areas have not addressed the implications for content volume. The volume of material and the achievement expectations in the current frameworks make clear that these learning areas could not be effectively taught in the time allocated. The impression conveyed by the documents is that each subject has taken over-full advantage of the time available, and has ignored the primary school focus on literacy and numeracy, the injunction to define less than the total curriculum in the subject and the requirements of the other elements of a rounded curriculum.
18. The volume and complexity of the material proposed, especially in Civics and Citizenship and Economics and Business, implies considerable teaching time in these areas. This is true for each of the areas of social education. APPA's view is that, as a result, the four areas now comprise far more content than can realistically be covered. In addition, the development of additional discrete learning areas means that teachers are obliged not only to teach, but also to assess and report on a much wider range of learning areas than was previously the case. The effect on the workload of primary teachers will be dramatic.

19. We argue that the addition of Economics and Business to the primary curriculum is entirely unnecessary and inappropriate. Accordingly, we propose that this area be removed from the primary curriculum. In other areas of social education, we argue for a significant reduction in the volume of material to be covered.
20. In the case of Civics and Citizenship, we are also concerned about the relationship between depth and breadth in teaching. The document takes a positive and explicit approach to the use of inquiry approaches, which APPA supports. These approaches, however, take longer than direct instruction or equivalents, so the volume of content specified must be reduced to allow for study in depth. In the case of Civics and Citizenship, the volume of content, if taught in the time available, could not be addressed in depth through inquiry approaches.
21. This is particularly important if the requirement to focus on depth of learning rather than breadth of coverage is to be taken seriously. The Australian Curriculum represented an important opportunity to shift the consciousness of all those involved in school education to teaching for deep understanding. But grasping this opportunity meant that the managers and writers in each area had to exercise self-discipline and limit the material proposed for coverage. This would also have required them to leave out some material to ensure that depth was possible. This has not occurred.
22. In our earlier responses to ACARA, we noted the tendency in learning areas for new material to be introduced without any clarity about what is to be reduced to make way for the new. The History document introduces a substantial body of material which is not usually taught in primary schools, and which implies a large time allocation. ACARA should have accepted the responsibility to state explicitly what this new material replaces, and to carry through the intention to take practical steps to reduce crowding in the curriculum.
23. The issues here are not about the content, which is mostly desirable and clearly stated. They concern the point in schooling at which these ideas are to be introduced, and the volume of material, and therefore teaching time, proposed. The risk for ACARA in the general area of social education is that the excessive volume of content will lead to some neglect of the new curriculum because it makes impossible demands on teachers and children. Alternatively, teachers will be driven to teach in a way that skates across the surface of content and ignores depth of learning and inquiry approaches. APPA is strongly of the view that these issues require a major review of the four social education areas, involving:
 - an evaluation of the time they would require to teach effectively;
 - an evaluation of teacher workload issues in teaching, assessing and reporting on an increased number of learning areas and a greatly expanded body of knowledge and skills;

- an examination of the feasibility and time requirements of adopting inquiry methods to teach in these areas;
 - a substantial reduction in the amount of content; and
 - a shift of complex concepts to later points in the sequence of schooling.
24. We are concerned that the volume of material to be covered in the Languages curriculum is also excessive given the time proposed for teaching and the existence of multiple competing demands. Each phase of learning consists of 24 content statements supplemented with about 80 elaborations. Some of the content statements indicate substantial bodies of content learning. Our view is that teaching the quantity of content outlined would be impossible in the time available. In ACARA's own terms, teaching at Stage 3 will require approximately 2.5 hours per week in an area newly mandated for some schools. In realistic terms this equates to half a teaching day.
25. We note that the Arts curriculum includes five separate subjects. It will be impossible for virtually all primary schools to offer a coherent program across these areas, especially given the other competing demands in the Australian Curriculum. We note, in addition, that this curriculum area has brought specialist elements into the primary curriculum, such as the teaching of musical notation, which is not part of the training of primary teachers.
26. The Technologies area now includes a major component to do with the social consequences and implications of the use of technologies. This overlaps materially with the social education curriculum and again expands the volume of content to be taught.
27. The limitation of curriculum coverage will be assisted by a rigorous focus only on what it is essential for every Australian child to learn. At present, we calculate that there are 16 separate subject areas proposed for study in the primary school curriculum. This is demonstrably beyond the capacity of primary schools to deliver.
28. We urge the Review to address the issue of overcrowding and to support an analysis of the feasibility of delivering the Australian Curriculum as currently specified in a normal primary school classroom.

Inappropriate or poorly managed content for primary years

29. APPA is concerned that in some areas the writers have proposed content that is far too ambitious or inappropriate for primary schools. As one of the respondents said of Civics and Citizenship during our consultation process: 'Too much, too soon, too complex'. The curriculum proposed for the primary years contains too much material, some of the material is presented much earlier in the sequence of schooling than is appropriate, and as a result the content is too complex for the target student audience.

30. In the cases of Civics and Citizenship and Economics and Business, the unnecessary complexity at the primary years will make effective teaching unlikely. The inclusion of Economics and Business as a new learning area in primary schools is not appropriate. The addition of Economics and Business exacerbates the overcrowding problem noted above. It also requires a primary teacher to plan, teach and assess a largely new body of knowledge and skills without any corresponding reduction in other areas. Those elements, for example, that are more technical, involve specialist Economics concepts, address business practices at the national and global levels, or involve detailed analysis of work and work relationships are all beyond the scope of the primary curriculum. There are some elements of technical language (e.g. ‘opportunity cost’, ‘cost-benefit analysis’, ‘signals to the market’, ‘trade-offs’) for which some teachers would not be able to provide a definition consistent with their use in Economics, making their delivery in the classroom problematic. One content description that causes particular difficulty is:

The role and motives of businesses/producers in providing goods and services to satisfy needs and wants (page 18).

The elaborations for this description cover such matters as ‘businesses...weighing up the costs and benefits of producing goods and services’, and ‘exploring the ways businesses interact or work with businesses in other regions such as the Asia region’. These are well outside the scope of what would usually be covered in the primary classroom. We strongly oppose the view that the content outlined for Years 5-6 is appropriate, and we take the view that a significant proportion of the content described is not taught at present in the later primary years.

31. The content description concerned with how businesses are structured (page 24) includes elaborations exploring sole trader, partnership, company or franchise structures and how these enable efficient production of goods and services. This focus goes very far beyond anything that is likely to be undertaken in a primary school classroom, and involves matters well outside the experience or training of many primary teachers.
32. There are some elements of the Geography curriculum elaborations for Years 1-5 that are possibly too demanding for children at these stages of schooling, and represent an excess of content. We would like to see the document reviewed for the level of demand and volume of material at each primary level. At most of the primary years the elaborations propose far too much content. We recognise that they are intended to be suggestive rather than prescriptive, but they should be reduced in scope.
33. The Technologies curriculum includes, for example, cyber safety in the initial phase of schooling. This is unlikely to be appropriate in the first year or so of schooling. There

are significant elements of this curriculum that are introduced too early for many primary children. The concept of algorithms is introduced first at Years 3 and 4 and again at Years 5 and 6.

34. In History, we are concerned that while the Magna Carta is introduced at Year 5, there is no simultaneous introduction of key events in the Australian history of democracy.
35. The English curriculum contains a detailed glossary, and teachers report that they need to use the glossary regularly. This suggests that the general language of the document might be inappropriate for some teachers.
36. In Science, we note that elements of earth science to do with day-night axes and the solar system are introduced at Year 3 and not again until Year 5 and Year 7. This phasing of related content is unlikely to be effective in generating continuing learning.

Assessment and reporting

37. In the area of assessment we support ACARA's broad conception of assessment of, for and as learning. This broadens the focus from the award of grades to assessment as part of the learning process. This broader expectation is also, of course time-consuming and in order for such an approach to assessment to be implemented effectively it is essential to limit the occasions for assessment. This has not been done within the Australian Curriculum.
38. It is not yet clear what level of assessment and reporting will be required in some areas. In areas including the Arts and Languages, the expectations are not yet clear. Until the full suite of learning areas is developed and the requirements clearly stated, it is difficult to be certain about the feasibility and desirability of the approach.
39. The response noted above that on one count there are 16 subject areas in the primary curriculum. We are particularly concerned that this will lead to an excessive and unnecessary focus on assessment and reporting at the expense of effective teaching for deep understanding. This is particularly problematic in the Arts and the four social education learning areas. APPA argues that there is a need to reduce the assessment load in primary schools and limit reporting requirements. In some (but by no means all) areas in primary school, it might be appropriate to reduce the reporting requirement to focus on participation rather than generating gradings and assessment against complex criteria.
40. It is important that assessment and reporting requirements should be both manageable and rigorous. Members of APPA reported that in a conversation with ACARA officials, responding to issues about the volume of reporting, the suggestion was made that

assessment requirements for Economics and Business might be met through the conduct of a school fair or small business event in which children took a range of roles. This is clearly inadequate to the assessment needs of the learning area, given that each child is unlikely to play a wide enough range of roles to meet all expectations, but may well reflect a concern within ACARA itself that there is an excessive assessment load in the primary years. In Health and Physical Education there are occasions where teachers are expected to assess children in relation to such issues as their understanding of the varying depth of emotional responses. This is likely to be problematic.

41. The Achievement Standards do not always provide adequate guidance to teachers in designing assessment tasks. The Economics and Business standard for Year 6 requires students to 'discuss the nature of trade-offs' and 'explain the way businesses are structured and the choices they make to produce goods and services most efficiently'. Many primary teachers will find it difficult to construct tasks to assess these elements.
42. The issue of A-E grades is an additional load for teachers. In particular we note the need to provide more specific advice and criteria to support teachers in making critical judgments, especially between the allocation of an A or B grade. Portfolios and annotations provide some guidance but more explicit support is needed.

Pedagogy

43. APPA is concerned that the volume of material across the Australian Curriculum in the primary years of schooling could have a significantly negative effect on the quality of teaching in many schools. This is because the kind of teaching needed to achieve depth in understanding cannot be rushed. It requires careful and detailed attention to specific concepts and elements of content so that children come to understand them in depth. This can only be done effectively if content areas are limited in scope. An excessive volume of content and unnecessary breadth in curriculum prescription will force teachers to skim the surface of much content, making the achievement of rich understanding among students unlikely. We argue that this is the position that has been reached in the Australian Curriculum. Our starting point is that the curriculum should foster and facilitate good teaching. While we believe that ACARA accepts and supports this position in principle, in practice the curriculum does not achieve the outcome.
44. It is likely that much of the content in the Geography curriculum may be formally present in school and classroom programs, but may not be taught in depth. Year 5 includes a volume of content that is unlikely to be manageable in most primary classrooms. This is also true of Economics and Business. In History there are excellent examples of rich content, but the volume will preclude effective classroom exploration and inquiry leading to deep understanding. In Science, similarly, our view is that the

amount of content across the four science domains will preclude depth of understanding.

45. By contrast the Languages curriculum includes a substantial volume of explicitly factual content regarding language acquisition but is less effective in examining the cultural relationships of language in depth. This is a weakness of a different kind, underplaying essential elements of the pedagogy of language teaching.
46. APPA has taken the view consistently that the Australian Curriculum should see a deliberate reduction in the number of topics and concepts included in the curriculum, and a recognition of the need for teachers to be free to spend more time working with their students on each key concept or topic. This has not occurred.
47. To some extent the difficulties outlined here can be ameliorated through the use of integrated approaches to teaching. While this can sometimes be an effective means of addressing content elements from different learning areas, we are also concerned that integration can lead to a de facto focus on some rather than all curriculum areas since in some hands it can focus attention on areas with which teachers feel more comfortable. We would encourage ACARA to develop support materials illustrating how the curriculum can realistically be delivered with a focus on depth of learning. These materials could show, among other possibilities, how an integrated approach could be used to deliver core learning in depth across learning areas.
48. There needs to be clarification around the number of hours allocated to the Technologies curriculum particularly in light of the content demands from all areas of the curriculum. Work on the integration of Technologies education across the curriculum during the primary years would be useful. The orientation of the document is supportive of this integrated approach.

The place of the three cross curriculum priorities

49. As was noted above, we strongly support the continued use of the three cross curriculum priorities. While there have been some reservations expressed about the potential distortion of these priorities on ideological grounds, we do not believe that this has occurred. Our view is that the priorities have been incorporated, largely through the elaborations, in a balanced way. They will support a broader and more relevant curriculum where they identify relevant connections and will assist in the development of inquiry approaches to learning and the expansion of children's understanding.
50. We do accept the view that there are occasions on which one or other of the priorities has been represented in a somewhat perfunctory way, or has been included out of a

sense of duty rather than reflecting an important aspect of the possible treatment. This is the case in Mathematics, where some of the issues have been well publicised. We believe there are other examples in Science and Technologies where the writers have responded to the expectation that the priorities should be reflected across all learning areas, but without a sufficient basis for their inclusion in every case. Some of the sustainability and Asia examples in English may also be questionable.

51. One example of the inappropriate treatment of Indigenous experience is evidenced in the elaboration on page 18 of the draft Economics and Business curriculum:

Investigating the past and present nature of trade relationships and exchanges within and between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, and between these communities and others.

This elaborates the content statement:

The role and motives of businesses/producers in providing goods and services to satisfy needs and wants

This is an entirely inappropriate content category for a discussion of Indigenous cultural practices regarding property exchanges. It assumes that the relationships are driven by essentially commercial motives. It ignores the ceremonial routes along which exchanges took place and the cultural and religious values that accompanied those exchanges. The purpose of trading was generally much broader than an exchange of goods, taking in exchanges of ideas, technology and cultural information. If Indigenous trade is to be examined in Economics and Business it should be done on a sound conceptual basis that reflects the culture of the trade.

52. Our principal concern is that the inclusion of questionable examples of the cross curriculum priorities in a relatively small number of cases will expose the curriculum to unjustified accusations of bias or lack of balance the kind that have been levelled by some commentators. It is important to reflect the priorities strongly in the curriculum where it is appropriate, but to avoid cases where ACARA could be accused of paying lip-service to important issues or engaging in tokenism.

The place of the seven general capabilities

53. APPA strongly supports the role of the general capabilities as an essential element of the Australian Curriculum. We regard them as the pointer to higher order thinking and generic skills. They refer to the most important elements of what children should gain from their schooling: the capacity to generalise beyond specific content learning and to apply that learning in new circumstances and to solve new problems.

54. We note a minor issue in the potential for confusion between English and literacy and Mathematics and numeracy. This potential is not new in education and we support ACARA in developing advice and support for teachers in maintaining these important distinctions.
55. One minor improvement would arise from a greater level of discrimination in deciding where the symbols for each general capability should be placed in documents. At present they are littered throughout the documents. The symbols should be used where there is a distinctive opportunity to emphasise the capabilities, rather than wherever they could conceivably be used. Excessive references diminish the value of each reference.

Implementation issues

56. APPA argues that ACARA should continue to play a key coordination role nationally during the implementation phase of the Australian Curriculum. It is important that there is a degree of fidelity to the intentions of the project throughout implementation. While ACARA has no authority over implementation, the agency should play a role in supporting, advising and coordinating a task that is broadly similar in each jurisdiction. We do not believe that ACARA should have legislative responsibility, but we do support a role in supporting and influencing implementation.
57. APPA is concerned about the assumption that teachers in primary schools can adopt new areas of the curriculum without extensive training and support. This is not the case at present, and is unlikely to be the case in the foreseeable future. There will need to be programs of professional learning, time to adapt to new curricula and appropriate levels of resourcing to support quality teaching.
58. While APPA supports the presence of History in primary schools as part of a broader social education program, and recognises the value of Geography along with some limited role for Civics and Citizenship, it is critical to recognise that these are relatively new or expanded areas of content coverage for which many primary teachers are not as well-equipped or supported.
59. The area of Economics and Business constitutes an even stronger case, since there would be significant numbers of primary schools that have not included this content in their program in the past and few primary teachers would have specialist knowledge appropriate to teaching this area. The kinds of resources and teaching materials that will be needed are not currently available in primary schools. We do not support this learning area for delivery in primary schools.

60. There will be many primary teachers who lack the specialist knowledge and skills required to effectively deliver the whole of the Technologies curriculum. There are also assumptions in the curriculum document about access to hardware and software and the expectation that students at all year levels including Foundation will have Internet access. If these expectations are not met, delivery of the curriculum will be impeded.
61. The Languages curriculum clearly requires the services of specialist language teachers. Where such teachers are not available, it is not feasible for generalist teachers to deliver the curriculum. APPA is also concerned about the time requirements to deliver Languages and the feasibility of delivering the curriculum within the constraints of school timetables.
62. In Health and Physical Education, the expectations about aquatics and water-based activities generally will be difficult for some schools to meet in practice.
63. In addition to learning area-specific resourcing requirements, there are some general requirements. These particularly affect the use of technology including the Internet to deliver or explore the curriculum. This is part of a long-term shift in Australian education, which we strongly support. It is important, however, that teachers in primary schools are not expected to adopt practices and use technologies that are not yet supported with resources or for which professional learning has not been made available.

Bibliography

Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA). October 2012. *The Shape of the Australian Curriculum Version 4.0*. ACARA, Sydney.