

## Education (General Provisions) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2024

**Submission No:** 277  
**Submitted by:** Pippa Doran  
**Publication:** Making the submission and your name public  
**Attachments:** No attachment

### Submitter Comments:

I wish to submit my views on the proposed amendments contained in the Education (General Provisions) And Other Legislation Bill 2024. In particular, I wish to outline why I disagree with Clause 68 of the Bill relating to amendment of s 217(1)(b) of the Education (General Provisions) Act 2006. The proposed amendment alters the current requirement for home educators to provide evidence of a 'high quality education' in their home education program and instead replaces it with a more prescriptive standard of being 'consistent with an approved education and training program'. This is defined as being the Australian National Curriculum (ANC), an approved Senior Syllabus subject or vocational education course. It is my submission that the requirement in s 217(1)(b)(ii) for a Home Education program to be 'consistent' with the ANC is entirely inconsistent with both the reality of home education and the objectives of the legislation and should either be omitted in its entirety or amended so as to be less prescriptive. As a registered home-educating parent of four children over 12 years, I have had experience in meeting the statutory reporting requirements of the Home Education Unit and also applying these to my children's education throughout the year. In practice, I have always sought to ensure that my children were not being disadvantaged by our choice to home-educate and so have had regard to the ANC when writing our yearly program. I have not, however, always followed the subject content and sequencing of the ANC, for a number of reasons. Firstly, as I have access to a vast array of educational resources from around the globe, I have often used high quality resources which are not strictly 'consistent' with the learning outcomes of my child's grade level in the ANC. For example, over the years we have tried a number of mathematics curriculums (including those which are aligned with the ANC) and I have found, through trial and error, that my children have learnt more thoroughly by using a curriculum which requires repetition and mastery of one mathematical operation at a time. This is not consistent with the approach taken under the ANC, which has strands of learning covering a range of mathematical concepts each year. My preferred curriculum still covers all ANC mathematical content over the duration of my children's schooling; it is just structured in a different order. Arguably, under the proposed amendment, I would not be able to utilise such a resource, despite my observations that my children had better learning outcomes when using it. Secondly, I have at times chosen to use curriculum which is more consistent with my personal ethics and worldview. For example, it is my personal view that a solid grounding in world history is essential for understanding current events. As such, I have always chosen to teach world history chronologically and in great depth. This is contrary to the ANC, which emphasises Australian history over world history. Under the proposed amendment, I would be unable to choose the manner in which my children learn history. Lastly, one of the benefits of home-education is the capacity to tailor each child's educational program according to their interests and passions. In practice, this has meant that I have allowed for more study in areas which align with a child's interests and talents, and less in those that do not. For example, it was apparent early on that one of my children was talented in the creative arts and so I added more content in this area to his program. Another child was more focused on coding and information technology, and so more time was allotted to this activity. As a parent, I am uniquely placed to observe my children's academic and dispositional strengths and tailor their education accordingly. However, this tailored approach would also not be 'consistent' with the ANC, as it requires a standardised coverage of all 8 subject areas each year. In conclusion, I believe that legislating a prescriptive standard of what a home-educated child must be taught by requiring 'consistency' with the ANC not only removes all flexibility, creativity and joy from the home-school environment, it is also inconsistent with the objectives of s 5 Education (General Provisions) Act

2006. These objectives include 'making available to each Queensland child a high quality education that will help maximise his or her education potential and enable him or her to become an effective and informed member of the community.' These objects are to be met by 'ensuring educational programs are responsive to the individual needs of young people' and 'encouraging a parent's involvement in his or her education.' In my opinion, by removing a parent's discretion to create a tailored educational program which is not entirely consistent with the ANC, this hinders parental involvement and their responsiveness to the individual needs of their child. In doing so, it detracts from the unique educational benefits which can only be realised in a home educational environment.