

Education (General Provisions) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2024

Submission No: 1202
Submitted by: Georgia Magoulas
Publication: Making the submission and your name public
Attachments: No attachment

Submitter Comments:

As a current teacher and homeschooling family, I object to the proposed changes to homeschooling in Queensland. My first concern is that all homeschooling families will be required to follow the national curriculum; this is an extreme overreach of parental rights and defeats the purpose of homeschooling. As a previous mainstream schooling family, the decision made to homeschool my child was due to the lack of interest in learning due to the content taught. This resulted in poor performance results and my son was consistently criticised that he was "behind" and "something was wrong because he couldn't sit on the floor for more than 5 minutes". This inevitably made my son dislike learning and did not want to attend school. As soon as we started homeschooling at a Grade 1 level and the learning undertaken was based around HIS interests, his love for learning resurfaced and now, after 1 year of homeschooling, he is already at a grade 3 level. Secondly, "to plan and report on all subjects"; if the government wants the homeschooling families to provide the best education for their children, how much learning time will planning and reporting across ALL subjects take? Wouldn't that time be best spent teaching the child? Making time for excursions, trips, science projects etc, would be more appropriate and engaging for the child. Furthermore, who will be reading ALL of these plans and reports? That is, if anyone will actually be doing so. Thirdly, as parent, why do I need to "prove" that homeschooling is in the best interest of MY child? And who will this person be that decides whether they think it is best for MY child? A child they have never met or have no idea about. Can you please explain the logic of this? Lastly, I'd also like to express my concern of the lack of representative consultation. I do believe that Amanda Bartle and Patricia Fitzgerald, two people representing the people directly, well known to the EGPA review team and directors, were actively excluded. I feel that I was not represented at all in the second round of consultation because of this. Please explain who exactly represented us the people? Did we have a voice?