The Into the Future — National Curriculum Forum was held at the Hilton Melbourne Airport Hotel on Friday 27 June 2008. The forum was organised by the National Curriculum Board as an important initial consultation event. This event record was prepared by Vic Zbar from Zbar Consulting.
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BACKGROUND TO THE FORUM

The National Curriculum Board met for the first time in Canberra on 23 April 2008 and started its important work of developing national curriculum in earnest. One important first objective was to involve experienced visionary educators across Australia as early as possible in the curriculum development process. This was achieved at the forum.

Stakeholders invited to the first national consultation involved practising teachers, representatives of national professional teaching associations, academics, parent groups, principals, Indigenous leaders, unions, business and industry groups, youth, as well as government, Catholic and independent sectors at state/territory and national level.

The forum included substantial workshop sessions facilitated by Board members, at which participants contributed to scoping the task of developing national curriculum.

Forum development paper

Participants were provided with a development paper aimed at informing discussion through the day. This paper raised key issues on which the National Curriculum Board (the Board) will need to form a clear view in order to develop writing guidelines for drafting curriculum documents. The issues raised included the role of national curriculum in building Australia’s future, principles for developing national curriculum, national curriculum content and achievement standards, cross-curriculum learnings, the developmental process to be used for the national curriculum, and associated issues of communication, consultation and engagement.

The development paper was supplemented by attachments outlining an indicative comparison of age groups covered, and stages/junctures/bands used in some curriculum documents across Australia K–12, a sample of content and standards in international curriculums, the remit for the Board, and the membership of the interim Board. Participants were invited to read Federalist Paper 2: The Future of Schooling in Australia which they could access online.

The purpose of this record

The purpose of this record is to inform forum participants and other interested parties about the outcomes of the forum, drawn from the keynote addresses, workshop sessions and a facilitated panel session to draw it all together. The record follows the structure of the forum program.

'Professional and community engagement will be essential for success in developing national curriculum.'
Forum opening

After an acknowledgement of country from Professor Barry McGaw AO (Chair, National Curriculum Board) and a brief introduction outlining the background to the national curriculum and the scope of the Board’s work, forum facilitator Tony Mackay (Deputy Chair, National Curriculum Board) described how the day would unfold.

McGaw noted that this was the Board’s first consultation. The Board has only met twice and ‘we have begun to determine the way in which we will work’. More importantly, he explained, ‘we have begun to clarify questions which we need to answer before we can clearly define the work we will want done by the experts to whom we will remit the task of drafting the curriculum’.

The forum in this context was designed to gain advice on how ‘our key current questions might be answered’. In addition, the Board is inviting participants to identify ‘further questions that you think we ought to be addressing’.

Cause for optimism

This is, according to McGaw, ‘an exciting time in Australian curriculum development that offers the possibility of a more thoroughgoing collaboration across the nation on curriculum issues than we have achieved before’; acknowledging, as he did, that previous efforts provided an important base on which to build. ‘It’s not the first time we have thought to say, as a country, ‘Can we think about what young people ought to learn and can we do it collaboratively?’’

McGaw conceded that he may be ‘unduly optimistic as we start this new round. But education is surely a profession that is borne of optimism. We believe that individuals can develop and we believe that well-based professional practice can facilitate that development’. And these are beliefs that are built on professional experience and the evidence of research.

The Council of the Australian Federation, the Council of Australian Governments (COAG), and the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA), he noted in this context, all have committed themselves to national collaboration in curriculum development. ‘They might have differed in the terms with which they described their goal - national curriculum, nationally consistent curriculum - but they all envisaged working together in a national effort across boundaries between states and territories and between school systems’.

The Board’s role

The initial task of the Board, McGaw explained, is to develop national curriculum for all year levels (K–12) in English, mathematics, the sciences, and history by the end of 2010. The Board is also to develop continua of learning for literacy and numeracy. In a second phase, it will work on geography and on languages other than English.

It is not, however, starting ‘with a blank page’. In developing the new national curriculum the Board will:

• build on the best of what is already being done in Australia, which we know from all sorts of international comparisons is very good

• learn from the practices and experiences of other countries, particularly those that currently outperform us

• pay careful attention to research evidence on pedagogy and learning, and on what works best in educational practice.

Initial scoping work has been undertaken by the Board and participants received details in the attachment to the development paper for the day.
There are, of course, what McGaw referred to as ‘very important broad considerations of purposes and goals of schooling that must shape our work’. Those considerations are being undertaken elsewhere and the Board will not seek to duplicate them. There is, for example, a MCEETYA taskforce working on a new national statement on the goals of schooling, and the important thing from the Board’s perspective is to connect and influence this, while recognising that it is not part of its own remit.

The Board, he added, understands that English, mathematics, the sciences and history are only part of the whole curriculum. What it does must ‘clearly leave room for the rest and must be effectively connected with it’.

A joint enterprise

The Board, McGaw explained, ‘seeks to make its journey a genuinely collaborative effort’. It will not be a case of the Australian government setting down a national curriculum and seeking to tell the jurisdictions and states and territories what to do. Rather, if it is going to work and make a difference, it has to be ‘all of Australia working together to achieve not just world-class curriculum, but a world-best curriculum’, in the same way as on the sporting field we don’t want to settle for silver or bronze.

Preventing young people for their life ahead, he acknowledged, is a great responsibility. ‘Most children who commence school in 2011 and stay as long as we want them to, will probably be there until 2023. What will that world look like? How can we ensure that the knowledge, skills and understandings that they develop are the ones that they will need or that will give them the basis to acquire and develop the ones they need? How do we take account of individual differences and the great variation in rates of student development and still maintain challenging expectations for all?’

Beyond this, he argued, curriculum must take account of the ‘realities of the professional lives of teachers’; which is why the Board was insistent that practising teachers form a significant component of participants in the day. The national curriculum must be based on ‘reasonable expectations of time and resources available to teachers and on respect for their professional skills.’ And what that means for the nature and extent of prescription in the curriculum is something the Board must determine, and is among the issues on which the advice of the forum was sought.

McGaw said that, through the forum, ‘we seek not only your advice on how our questions might be answered, but also your questions as well’. In that sense, it was also an opportunity for forum participants to put their concerns on the table through the workshops, and afterwards through the Board’s website www.ncb.org.au which went live on the previous day and is being developed in ways that encourage interaction between the Board and interested participants.

Important as the forum is to the Board, it is only a start in what he called ‘sustained collaboration’. Later in the year, the Board plans to hold separate national forums to explore detailed questions for curriculum in each of English, mathematics, the sciences and history. Beyond that, it has set out a mechanism and set of strategies to work with people across the country. Information on this was included in the development paper participants received.

Chris Wardlaw
Hong Kong Dept of Education

‘Curriculum must take account of real circumstances in the classroom.’
Chris Wardlaw (Deputy Secretary, Education Bureau, Hong Kong) began by providing an outline of some key characteristics of the education system in Hong Kong because ‘context is everything’, though he cautioned against taking that too far, since ‘you can drown in your own context and fail to learn from the experiences of others’. Some of the major factors to which he pointed are that:

• an effort is being made to progressively ensure that all teachers are graduates and trained and, although this is yet to be achieved, the numbers have dramatically increased over the past decade

• students are allocated centrally to secondary schools, from secondary 1 to secondary 6, according to parent choice and test results

• class sizes tend to be around 30–40 and are coming down

• there is non-secular subvention from the Bureau for non-government schools

• primary education is subject-based

• there is specialised teaching of Chinese, English and mathematics

• both English and Chinese are used as the medium of instruction in schools with some schools specifically designated as Chinese as the Medium of Instruction (CMI) and others as English as the Medium of Instruction (EMI).

Twenty-four per cent of the Hong Kong budget is invested in public education, which accounts for more than 4.5 percent of their gross domestic product. Wardlaw then described the investment in terms of expenditure on different types of education providers and staff. Hong Kong, he noted in this context, never talks of ‘spending’ on education, but sees it as an ‘investment’ instead.
A focus on learning reform

Learning and curriculum, Wardlaw explained, are at the heart of education reform in Hong Kong, as depicted in Figure 1. ‘You can’t transform the curriculum and learning without the other four parts, but student-focused curriculum and learning are what it is all about.’
The fundamental principles underpinning Hong Kong’s efforts, which Wardlaw suggested ‘resonate’ with those developed by the National Curriculum Board, are that:

- all students have opportunities to learn and should not be screened out early
- lifelong learning capabilities, such as independent thinking, learning to learn/self-directed learning, inter/intra personal skills, values/ethics, and a broad knowledge base as a foundation for expertise, are needed for present-day and future worlds
- there is a need for whole-person development for enhancing not only the quality of the economy, but also the culture and overall life in society
- changing conceptions of knowledge need to be taken into account, such as the need for cross-disciplinary knowledge to complement disciplinary knowledge and the fact that knowledge often is co-constructed
- structural changes are required to facilitate opportunities and pathways for all young people; unlike in Australia, he observed, where a lot of the structural work already has been done.

These principles, Wardlaw noted, are manifest in an approach to learning reform since 2000 which brings together the three elements of curriculum (‘what is worth learning’), pedagogy (‘how students learn and teachers teach’), and assessment (‘how to know students have learned’) in an aligned way so that student learning is enhanced. ‘Alignment’ is a word that is used ‘every day and in all our documents to bring these features out all of the time’.

That the reforms are already yielding results is evident in Hong Kong’s improved performance and hence standing in terms of international results. In the PISA results for 15-year-olds in 2006, for instance, Hong Kong came 2nd in science having been 3rd in 2003, 1st with three others in mathematics compared with five others in 2003, 3rd in reading after coming 5th with 14 others in 2003, and 1st with five others in problem solving in 2003. The upshot is that Hong Kong, like Australia, scores in the ‘High average performance/High social equity’ quadrant, but is closer to the preferred edge of the quadrant and hence the world leader, Finland, than Australia is.

Similarly, Wardlaw pointed to a ‘quantum leap in reading’ arising from a priority focus on ‘reading to learn’ that encompasses the school development plan, current curriculum guidelines, targeted professional development and quality assessment feedback, and which saw Hong Kong leap from 14th in 2001 in the Primary International Reading Literacy Study, to 2nd in 2006.

Important in this context has been the ‘power’ of the data for informing decision making, as evidenced by the finding that Hong Kong students who do well in science have more of an interest in the environment and sustainability than others, which has implications for curriculum content.

The upshot of all this improvement is that Hong Kong provided one of the case studies for McKinsey’s report on the world’s best-performing school systems and, when Hong Kong looked at the report’s annex on ‘key questions and parameters in system development’, they found they ticked most of the boxes it contained; though not all, which is where they are focusing their attention next.
The data generally confirms, then, that Hong Kong has high and improving standards. But, Wardlaw cautioned, ‘there is no room for complacency’.

So how, he rhetorically asked, ‘do we explain high standards, high quality and improvement?’ Is it simply a matter of ‘culture’? The answer, he observed, must be ‘yes’. But the answer also is ‘no’, since if you say that it all is culturally bound, then you just end up being trapped.

What Hong Kong does well in his view is that it has a coherent curriculum with high expectations, and it ‘treasures the training of basic skills and the grasp of fundamental concepts at the basic education level’. The Chinese culture, he noted, ‘values learning and provides extra incentives for students’. Beyond this, Hong Kong teachers have ‘strong pedagogical content knowledge’ and are supported by other important factors such as general societal expectations that Hong Kong be a knowledge-based city of the world, parental involvement and pressure, textbooks good and bad that provide a safety net for teachers who need them to get through the curriculum, and learning behaviour that emphasises time-on-task, structured teaching and homework.

That said there are some significant concerns. Some student attitudinal factors, according to Wardlaw, are comparatively weak. The percentage of students who are confident in maths at Grade 8 in the Trends in International Maths and Science Study (TIMSS), for instance, is below the average international level, though it is better than the outcome in Japan. This, together with a range of other data collected in Hong Kong, illustrates some weaknesses in terms of low student self-efficacy and self-concept, and low levels of connectedness to school, albeit with large differences evident between schools. There is a Hong Kong saying he quoted that ‘US students do bad, feel good; Hong Kong students do good, feel bad’.

One of the primary concerns about the education system in Hong Kong over recent years, which helps account for these attitudinal results, has been the small proportion of students who actually make it through to the end of the senior years. The senior secondary system that Hong Kong inherited from the UK required students to study academic subjects for two years before taking a public examination, the HKCEE. About a third are then selected to pursue two further years of academic study before taking another public examination, the A-levels. About half of these students are then admitted to university, with the result that more than 80 per cent of students are excluded along the way - made up of the 66 percent of students who do not make Secondary 6 and the 50 per cent of students of Secondary 7 who do not make it to university.
These participation rates, depicted in Figure 2, are low by international standards and out of kilter with the growing need to nurture the talents of all young people rather than just a few, so that Hong Kong’s human resources and competitiveness can be built up. By contrast, the current reform program will see 100 percent of students going through to the end of senior secondary schooling by 2011.

We are making this change, Wardlaw explained, because ‘we simply can’t stand still’, which he illustrated by referring to four ‘fragments’ of how knowledge constantly shifts:

• the moon landing in 1969 occurred without a single microprocessor in sight

• there was recently an advertisement for nine global professorships at the University of New South Wales in such areas as Brain Science, Health and the Built Environment, and Sustainable Habitats

• an advertisement for a Sydney-based chief financial officer required fluency in Cantonese and/or Mandarin

• Pluto, which most present remembered as their ‘favourite’ planet, no longer meets the criteria to qualify as a planet, because of new developments in research.
Figure 2: Hong Kong schooling participation rates ('The Pyramid')

THE PYRAMID

(number of students)

- Kindergarten: 14,769
- S1 (1999): 29,800
- S1 (1995): 78,600
- S1 (1993): 79,500
- Degree (2006): 66,917

Legend:
- Gray: Kindergarten
- Blue: S1 (1999)
- Light Blue: S1 (1995)
- Green: Degree (2006)
Hong Kong’s school curriculum framework since 2001

**Core subjects**
Chinese Language, English Language, Mathematics, Liberal Studies (45–55%)

**Elective subjects**
2–3 Elective subjects chosen from 20 NSS elective subjects, Applied Learning Courses and other language courses (20–30%)

**Other learning experiences**
Moral and Civic Education, Intellectual Development, Community Service, Physical & Aesthetic Development, Career-related Experiences (15–35%)

**5 ESSENTIAL LEARNING EXPERIENCES**
- Moral and Civic Education
- Intellectual Development
- Community Service
- Physical & Aesthetic Development
- Career-related Experiences

**VALUE & ATTITUDE**

**GENERIC SKILL**

**P1-S3**

**LEARNING AREAS**
- Chinese Language Education
- English Language Education
- Mathematics Education
- Personal, Social and Humanities Education
- Science Education
- Technology Education
- Arts Education
- Physical Education

**KEY**
The basic framework of the reform program is illustrated in Figure 3 and started with the early (P1–S3) years.

Central to this framework is an effort to develop students’ values, attitudes and 21st century generic skills, and to explicitly embed them in ‘everything we do’. More specifically, the curriculum framework is designed to develop the:

- generic skills of collaboration, communication, creativity, critical thinking, information technology, numeracy, problem solving, self-management, and study
- values and attitudes of perseverance, respect for others, responsibility, national identity and commitment.
In response to the need to ensure that all rather than just a few young people proceed to senior secondary education in a modern, globalised, knowledge-based world, Hong Kong has been moving towards the introduction of a new senior academic structure from 2009, as depicted in Figure 4.

### MOVING TOWARDS A NEW ACADEMIC STRUCTURE IN 2009

**CURRENT STRUCTURE**

**NEW STRUCTURE (334)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Undergraduate Degree</th>
<th>Secondary 7</th>
<th>Secondary 6</th>
<th>Secondary 5</th>
<th>Secondary 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HKALE (30% of students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKCEE (98% of students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Undergraduate Degree</th>
<th>Secondary 3</th>
<th>Secondary 2</th>
<th>Secondary 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/16 SCHOOL YEAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Undergraduate Degree</th>
<th>Secondary 3</th>
<th>Secondary 2</th>
<th>Secondary 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011/12 SCHOOL YEAR NEW SENIOR SECONDARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Undergraduate Degree</th>
<th>Secondary 3</th>
<th>Secondary 2</th>
<th>Secondary 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006/07 SCHOOL YEAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is, according to Wardlaw, ‘a huge structural change’. The new senior secondary curriculum in 2009, Wardlaw explained, will comprise:

- the ‘core’ subjects of Chinese language, English language, mathematics, and the new subject, liberal studies, accounting for 45–55% of program time

- elective subjects - 2 or 3 electives chosen from 20 subjects, applied learning courses and other language courses - taking 20–30% of the time

- other learning experiences - covering moral & civic education, community service, aesthetic development, physical development, and career-related experiences - for the remaining 15–35% of available time.

In response to McGaw’s earlier implied question about time and the room for curriculum other than English, mathematics, the sciences and history, and associated issues of crowding and balance, Hong Kong has been explicit about a ‘range of hours’ for the different components of its curriculum. This ensures that all students experience the whole of the curriculum and ‘do not stream themselves out of things at too early a stage’.

Hong Kong also conducted a major benchmarking exercise on 47 subjects and collapsed them into the following 24:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core/elective subjects 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese language education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chinese language (core subject)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chinese literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• English language (core subject)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Literature in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mathematics (core subject + two extensions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal, social and humanities education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chinese history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ethics &amp; religious studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tourism &amp; hospitality studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Science (integrated, combined)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business, accounting &amp; financial studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information &amp; communication technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technology &amp; living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design &amp; applied technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health management &amp; social care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visual arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Performance arts (to be developed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Six areas of study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The six applied learning areas of study for levels 5 and 6 in the new senior secondary program are applied science; business, management & law; creative studies; engineering & production; media & communication; and services.
21st century vocabulary and challenges

Wardlaw then turned his attention to what he described as four key elements of ‘21st century vocabulary’ that ‘crop up everywhere and permeate a lot of work we all are doing around the world in various ways’ - creativity, communication, critical thinking, and values.

Developing creativity, he argued, is a ‘demanding process of teaching’ that is difficult to make routine. Hong Kong is working hard to create space in its curriculum and provide curriculum documents that help teachers get students to go beyond simply giving information. This in turn depends on giving students time to think, using strategies and thinking techniques which involve creation, and rewarding and valuing creative efforts.

Wardlaw then showed a map contrasting the English-speaking countries with countries where Chinese is spoken to underscore the goal in Hong Kong that students be tri-literate in English, Mandarin and Cantonese and communicate better as a result. The research in this regard, he noted, shows that ‘it’s not so much a question of time as intensity’, and that the Education Bureau is seeking to make room in the curriculum for this to occur. Maths is being made compulsory in Hong Kong, and this presents some challenges in its own right. The current maths curriculum is ‘dense and compact’, with the result that learning and teaching are rushed. While a proliferation of maths in and between disciplines is changing demands on the discipline, maths learning and teaching in Hong Kong is ‘examination oriented’ and the efficacy of students in maths is low.

In contrast to the dense and compact current curriculum, the Education Bureau will develop a senior secondary core maths curriculum that has breadth and depth, caters for individual differences and includes an appropriate balance between content and understanding, and hence thinking and doing. This curriculum will involve both solving lots of problems and ‘problem solving’, and will seek to also develop important attitudes and values such as confidence and perseverance in students in the senior years.

The new subject of liberal studies, Wardlaw explained, is a key initiative aimed at developing students’ critical thinking skills. Liberal studies is designed to ‘ensure that students experience a broad education in their senior secondary years’. It ‘interactively borrows knowledge and perspectives from other subjects to enrich its study’ and issues are chosen to provide students with the opportunity to:

- study present-day events not covered by any single discipline (raising awareness)
- expand perspectives beyond single disciplines (broadening)
- connect knowledge and concepts across different disciplines (connection and critical thinking).

To help achieve all this, it features an enquiry study of 90 hours that connects various parts of their learning. This adds as a valuable finishing touch, which, in some senses, echoes the extended essay and theory of knowledge included in the International Baccalaureate.

Wardlaw then pointed out that Hong Kong does not ‘shy away’ from values, but talks of universal values it seeks to promote. The values the Hong Kong curriculum is designed to engender in young people are:

- ‘a deep understanding of what it means to be a Hong Konger and a citizen of China and of the world’
- ‘a sense of responsibility for all in our society, regardless of their background, gender, race, social or geographical group’
‘perseverance and be risk taking (never accepting defeat, yet being prepared to fail)
• ’an acceptance that the answers they are seeking may not be totally clear at first, but to build their understanding
• ’a willingness to collaborate and share, to listen to others’ points of view and to communicate their own viewpoint’.

A comprehensive reform process

Drawing his presentation to a close, Wardlaw outlined the key features of the ongoing successful reform program in Hong Kong from which other countries can learn.

The first is that the whole program of reform is based on ‘big ideas’ which are well-grounded and widely shared. Hong Kong has produced a series of ‘headland’ documents, including documents directed at different stakeholders and different aspects of the reform. These encompass Learning for Life, Learning through Life, issued in 2000 to kick off the process and outline the reform proposals for education in Hong Kong, details of the reform proposals for basic education and the new academic structure in the senior secondary years, and detailed guidelines for curricula, applied learning and more.

The reform program has a 12-year timeframe, in part because ‘time in China is longer’, an idea summed up by a legendary exchange in which Henry Kissinger is reported to have asked Zhou En Lai his view of the impact of the French Revolution on world history, only to be told, ‘it is too early to tell’. Having started the process in 2000, the first graduates will not emerge until 2016 and, importantly, resources to support the reforms have already been allocated till that time.

Beyond this, Wardlaw explained, the reforms align curriculum, pedagogy and assessment in ways that ensure both ‘vertical and horizontal coherence’ so they are seen as a consistent whole. They involve multi-stage, multi-stakeholder consultation at all stages on the way. It has been a ‘very sophisticated process’ similar to what the Board has proposed. In this context he highlighted that, during the consultation periods, every piece of feedback was recognised through the consultation website. More specifically, the site indicated ideas which were supported and, if they were not supported, the reasons why not. This proved very important in carrying people with the reforms.

The whole program is, as he had noted throughout, ‘well-resourced for both baseline and targeted improvements’ and has detailed supporting strategies which are ‘demanded’ by the history and context of Hong Kong. This includes multiple approaches to building professional capacity and teachers have been very responsive because they genuinely support the direction of change. The national curriculum may have great intentions, Wardlaw observed, but implementation is always another matter and the profession, broadly defined, ‘is the nub of making it happen’.

Finally, the reforms in Hong Kong tackle the ‘interfaces’ - pre-primary, basic education, senior secondary and university - so it effectively spans from K through to 16 and includes ‘rigorous and comprehensive benchmarking’.

Taking these lessons into account, the success of any reform will, in Wardlaw’s view, ultimately depend on the strength of the ideas, ‘which have to be good’; the organisational and infrastructure arrangements: resources and building professional capacity (a difficult job not only for the Board but for all the stakeholders involved in the forum); and the information (communication, consultation, evidence and feedback) along the way, since a lack of them will undermine the reform.

‘One needs to have a breathing space while hanging himself’ is an old Chinese saying he quoted to emphasise the importance of stopping, reflecting and thinking often as the journey of developing a national curriculum unfolds. But also remember, he concluded with another Chinese saying, ‘to walk 1000 miles you have to take the first step’.
Questions from participants

Participants asked a series of questions to Chris Wardlaw:

• How has Hong Kong handled the challenge of developing a curriculum that meets the diversity and equity questions we all face?

• What planning was done for this far-reaching 2000–2016 program of reform?

• How many teachers needed to be reached through the consultation process?

• Could more be said about ‘tackling the interfaces’?

• Were there particular stages of implementation of the reforms?

• How is creativity embedded in the system to ensure it is taken seriously?

Providing a consolidated answer to these questions Wardlaw began by explaining there are about 50 000 teachers in Hong Kong plus 15 000 kindergarten teachers, and thousands of academics who also needed to be involved. This constitutes a ‘big system’ which is admittedly smaller than Australia’s but bigger than any one state’s.

In terms of implementation it is interesting to note that the series of ‘headland’ documents he described in his address started in 2000, but extend to 2012 because they all have been planned. The first document was about system issues to ‘generate excitement’ and tackle the systemic streaming of which he spoke. The first curriculum document (Learning to Learn) in 2001 set the framework for basic education because that was the stage of schooling where more comfort and agreement existed at the time. Only later, when the basic education reform was under way was senior secondary education introduced as the next stage of reform. Hong Kong, he observed in this context, has been ‘very deliberate’ about improving the interface with pre-primary because ‘we know its importance from research’.

In terms of implementation, the Education Bureau has always sought to work with practising teachers and they are involved in all discussions and committees to ensure ‘our work is grounded’ as it proceeds. School planning documents have been developed for principals who have been trained through workshops which reflect an iterative and ongoing process of engagement in the reforms.

It should be noted, he explained, that the ‘headland documents drive everything’ and creativity is embedded in all of these. The documents are supplemented by targeted professional development, which helps embed creativity in specific domains because domain expertise is very powerful and important in Hong Kong.

Although the Hong Kong timeframe is much longer than that envisaged for Australia it needs to be understood, Wardlaw argued, that the structural complexity was greater in Hong Kong in 2000 than it is in Australia in 2008. If Australia is looking at curriculum from K–12 by 2011 that, in his view, is ‘perfectly do-able’. However, he sees the senior end as ‘much trickier’ and perhaps requiring more time, but that remains to be seen. Terminology emerges as an issue through the forum development paper, and Wardlaw said that Hong Kong took a ‘very pragmatic’ approach to terminology. It had a core group which met regularly and pragmatically decided to adopt certain words which were amplified in brackets so that everyone would see their own preferred term. Then over time, the words in brackets simply disappeared.

Australia, Wardlaw concluded, is ‘miles ahead of Hong Kong’ in its understanding of, and teachers’ capacity to work in, diverse classrooms. ‘We have tried to be modest about the diversity issue, but we are explicit about building it in and supported it with targeted PD’. But, he conceded, ‘it’s not an area where Australia has much to learn from Hong Kong’.
Groups of up to 25 participants considered approaches to developing national curriculum and national curriculum content before sharing their deliberations in a plenary session moderated by Tony Mackay. The following questions, contained in the development paper provided as pre-reading to forum participants, were provided to guide discussion in the workshop groups.

### Approaches to developing national curriculum

What would it mean for curriculum to be ‘futures-oriented’ and how could that best be balanced against the need for it also to provide students with an understanding of the past that has shaped their society and culture?

How could curriculum take account of the great variation in rates of students’ development and still be useful to teachers who work with students grouped in classes by age?

How could national curriculum at primary level best be linked with the various system curricula for other subject areas to help primary teachers work in an integrated way across subjects if they wish?

What would be an appropriate length and degree of specification for a curriculum document to be useful for teachers? Would such a document also be of use to parents and others wanting to know what schools are doing and what is being expected of students?
In what way might content most usefully be described in curriculum documents?

How might core curriculum be specified, in what way should it be referenced to stages of schooling, and in what way and to what extent should provision be made for regional and local variation?

In thinking about what terminology you prefer, can you identify nomenclature that you would want to see avoided in national curriculum documents? Can you identify the terminology that you would want to see in national curriculum to describe content?

Forum facilitator Tony Mackay then managed a plenary discussion aimed at identifying the key responses from the workshop groups. This, it should be noted, was supplemented by notes taken by scribes in each of the workshops which board facilitators in each of the sessions will analyse and process into separate reports for consideration by the Board.

Three key concerns emerged as common across the workshop groups.

**Concern 1: The story line**

One category of commentary Mackay observed as common across a number of workshops he visited related to the need for ‘futures-orientation, story line and rationale to be clear before the Board can proceed’. This was eloquently expressed by the spokesperson for one group who indicated that ‘we need a compelling narrative about why we are doing it, which draws in all of the stakeholders and which is about excellence, increasing equity and taking the country forward’. It needs, according to this group, to be a promising story and not one that seeks to blame states or territories for perceived shortcomings.

Change is so rapid, another group added, ‘that we have to have a clear vision for the future’; though it also acknowledged that the development of new national goals elsewhere, to which McGaw had pointed, will frame continuing work in that regard.

Part of the importance of having a compelling rationale, another participant noted, is so we can avoid simply having ‘four subjects done now, then another four in three years which only continues with the result we have a large number of subjects driven by interest groups’. The point of developing the story for this respondent is that it enables us to step back in the way that Hong Kong did and decide what the curriculum should comprise, so we can work from there. Endorsing this view, another contributor noted that this would help to ensure that personal and social learning, as well as an interdisciplinary focus, are clearly articulated and not lost.

**Concern 2: The primary–secondary divide**

‘Can we be clear’, Mackay asked, ‘that we’re talking about something different in primary compared to secondary, or is that not the case?’

A prior decision is required in the mind of the reporter from one group, about when children start school and the names that are associated with where they start. ‘We can’t have a national curriculum without that’.

Part of the importance of having a compelling rationale, another participant noted, is so we can avoid simply having ‘four subjects done now, then another four in three years which only continues with the result we have a large number of subjects driven by interest groups’. The point of developing the story for this respondent is that it enables us to step back in the way that Hong Kong did and decide what the curriculum should comprise, so we can work from there. Endorsing this view, another contributor noted that this would help to ensure that personal and social learning, as well as an interdisciplinary focus, are clearly articulated and not lost.
We know more now about learners and how the brain grows than we did in the past, so for one group the construct should not so much be primary or secondary, but rather what we know in this regard and the implications it has for the phases along the way.

The word ‘framework’ emerged for a number of groups in this context as nomenclature they were seeking to pursue as a means, according to one, ‘of getting the big picture sorted out first and then filling in the details’. Adoption of ‘frameworks’, another suggested, has the added advantage that it encourages interdisciplinary work as well.

Concern 3: Content

The question that arises for Mackay in this context is what framework would be useable in a school context in flexible ways? One group felt it might best be addressed through Wardlaw’s construct of core, elective and other learning experiences. This group, which favoured talking in terms of ‘a curriculum for Australia’s children and young people’ suggested that the real issue for schools is whether they have a multiplicity of documents telling them what to do, or rather a ‘framework’ like Hong Kong’s, that is supplemented by more detailed curriculum content documentation on which they can draw for advice.

For another respondent who acknowledged that she may not have been speaking on behalf of her group, it’s a question of having a framework that tackles what it means to focus on big ideas and conceptual understanding through stages of learning, rather than content per se. ‘Yes, content of course, but focus more on the growing conceptual understanding which allows for flexibility at the local level’.

Content within domains at different stages, for one group’s commentator, should give a clue as to what the stage itself is about. This would then be supplemented by ‘cross-disciplinary things, but recognise that parents may want to see topics as content at the end of the day’.

Another participant who indicated that she may have been speaking more personally than on behalf of a group, noted that she was keen for each curriculum field to ensure ‘it attends to epistemology, which usually gets the most attention, but also ontology and ethics as well’. Content in her view should reflect all three orientations, and they should be embedded in each of the four discipline areas to be pursued. The other question for this respondent is ‘how each field understands its way of connecting with other discipline areas within the curriculum’.

‘Do we’, another contributor asked rhetorically, ‘actually have a shared expectation in the room of what the national curriculum should provide?’ He asked this question because he doubted that it did exist. For him, the key question is to know ‘where kids are and that the national curriculum is accessible to all’; though he and others did concede that this comes back to the first issue of a compelling rationale.

The ultimate purpose for the final contributor to the plenary session is that ‘it helps teachers and kids’. We know what we want students to learn in the early years, he observed in this context, and hence that should be the starting point. ‘Perhaps we then need to go back to the evidence about what children need to know and learn; start with ‘teachable points’ and our knowledge of what works’. The test would then be, ‘will it guide and help change teaching tomorrow so it is more effective?’ If we know the answer to that, he concluded, ‘that’s what should be in the document’.
The groups then turned their attention to the national curriculum achievement standards and the way in which cross-curriculum areas might be addressed. In this case, they were asked to use the following questions, posed in the development paper, to guide their deliberations and to then share their thoughts in a further plenary session moderated by Tony Mackay.

**National curriculum and cross-curriculum learnings**

What cross-curriculum competencies and perspectives should be addressed in national curriculum in English, mathematics, the sciences and history?

How might they be addressed to minimise the risk of their falling through the cracks as attention is focused on subject-specific knowledge, understanding and skills?

Prior to the plenary session for these workshops, Rose Naughton from the Office of the National Curriculum Board briefed participants on the new Board website at [www.ncb.org.au](http://www.ncb.org.au) which will play a key role in the development and consultation process for the national curriculum over coming years.

The website, she explained, will be the ‘key source of communication to stakeholders throughout Australia’ and will include ‘think pieces’ to stimulate professional engagement and debate, and ensure a ‘robust conversation’ throughout the nation about the national curriculum.

The main email address for participants and others wishing to communicate with the Board is info@ncb.org.au

Forum facilitator Tony Mackay then managed a second reporting-back session to consolidate discussion in the groups. The results of this session will be provided to the Board in the form of notes from each of the workshop scribes.

According to Mackay when he initiated the feedback, there is in 2008 ‘a very positive mood and spirit to do national curriculum work’. It will, he acknowledged, be complex work, and there is a need to avoid getting ‘sidetracked through multiple agendas and ensure we learn from earlier efforts so we can do it in a smarter way’. With this in mind, and as a context for the workshop reports that followed, he invited Bruce Wilson (former CEO of Curriculum Corporation) to comment on the traps to avoid.

Wilson observed that the first criterion for the work is that ‘whatever we do should reflect the daily, routine work of teachers’. It then needs to be ‘clear, simple, explicit, and brief so an ordinary layperson is able to understand it’. A Year 3 teacher, he noted by way of example, ‘should not have to read 40 pages by eight domains and construct a curriculum based on it. Otherwise it will fail’.

The real task, Wilson argued, is to produce a formulation around the disciplines that reflect the pedagogical principles in which we believe. It will be discipline-based - ‘that’s the real politics so let’s make it the
best discipline framework we can’. This, he concluded, is a task that intersects with pedagogy, assessment and reporting, and more. But the Board is not doing that. It is constructing a national curriculum. That is not, in his view, a difficult task. ‘What’s hard is reaching agreement on it?; so let’s not make it more difficult than it has to be’.

**Achievement standards**

‘Unless we nail content, Mackay observed before inviting contributions from the workshop groups, ‘some think it’s hard to get into achievement and/or performance standards’. Put simply, there is a constituency for wanting to see first what it will look like, while others disagree and want a fruitful debate about achievement standards. The question is, where participants stand on this and what they feel the Board should focus on.

There is, one group suggested in response to this input, a need to be clear about what, in fact, the nature of the task is. Whether the emphasis is on ‘learning or content’ shapes the whole argument about what we are doing. ‘It’s possible to develop a national curriculum that brings together curriculum, assessment and pedagogy and which isn’t just limited to curriculum’.

One participant speaking as an individual rather than group reporter in this context suggested there is a ‘key conceptual issue about achievement standards to address’. They are, according to this contributor, ‘developed and described differently for different purposes’. One relates to standards-referencing for reporting. The other is a form of benchmarking. And in some states, there’s a move towards blending the two. ‘We need to tease out the purpose and audience for achievement standards first’.

In talking of literacy and numeracy in particular, another participant argued, ‘we need to consider the evolving nature of those terms’. In particular, he cautioned, when looking at key base skills, there is a need to take account of new media and their impact, because they transform our understanding of literacy in particular.

A representative of one working group suggested that standards should be ‘aspirational and inspirational, should guide curriculum and pedagogy, drive improvement and be anchors of achievement. Good standards, have these four characteristics described, help teachers to be better teachers.’

There are principles of equity to be followed, another group representative added, but equity is helped by having ‘well-defined, measurable, nationally comparable standards’. It is hard to determine assessment without content and standards should be specified in that context which, according to this respondent, ‘is not beyond us to do’. And overseas systems that are seen as high performing can guide us in the task.

The Board’s remit, yet another contributor observed, talks of achievement standards for each year of schooling. That, she suggested, is ‘an impossible task since you can’t get the degree of differentiation that is required’. A better way to go is to follow Hong Kong and look at doing it every three years.
Cross-curriculum learnings

Turning to cross-curriculum learnings as the development paper lays it out, and taking account of ‘refreshed national goals’, what, Mackay asked, are we talking about here? Is it, for instance, the same as Hong Kong where they are embedded in all areas of learning and help frame the content?

Should knowledge, understanding and skills related to the Asian region, one participant noted by way of example in response, be a cross-curriculum perspective or not? Achieving ‘Asia literacy’ cannot, in her view, be left to just a cross-curriculum perspective such as intercultural awareness. It requires ‘reframing the content to which students are exposed within the disciplines such as English and history’. And when we talk about competencies, capabilities and skills, she cautioned, ‘we must make sure not to forget knowledge’.

This for Mackay raised a question about whether the language of cross-curriculum may be wrong and could lead to ‘superficial treatment’ that is not sufficiently scoped or sequenced. At the very least, he suggested, that may be something on which the Board will need to reflect.

Regardless of what they are called, however, there is a need to ensure, as one participant commented in the final contribution for the session, ‘that we reflect the diverse needs of our learners, especially when the participants at this forum are largely of a certain age and ethnic mix.’

Forums participants: Simone White (Australian Teacher Education Association), Bill Louden (National Curriculum Board), Barbara Comber (University of South Australia) and Jan Turbil (Australian Literacy Educators’ Association)
Forum facilitator Tony Mackay then moderated a panel discussion comprising Chris Wardlaw, Debbie Efthymiades (Teaching, Learning & Standards, Department of Employment, Education and Training, Northern Territory) and Allan Luke (Research Professor, Faculty of Education, Queensland University of Technology) which focused on the development, consultation and engagement processes needed for the national curriculum.

This, together with contributions from the floor, effectively provided an entrée to addressing the following two questions related to these issues that the forum development paper advanced.

**National curriculum development and consultation**

What strengths and weaknesses are evident in the Board’s initial thinking on its curriculum development processes?

What communication and engagement strategies work well in establishing productive connections with a wide range of audiences?

**A map, not a GPS**

An important question for Luke is whether this is ‘just a political stunt or mandate in search of a reason for being’. There are, he responded, real educational reasons for doing it, including that:

- the data shows the equity gap is growing
- intellectual depth and demand is a problem in many classrooms
- retention rates are declining
- variation between schools is getting greater
- the profession needs renewal
- teacher education is weak.

Put simply, according to Luke, ‘we are not doing as well as we should, and we haven’t had the conversation because, over ten years at least, we have been split’. The national curriculum and work of the Board provides, in his view, an opportunity to come together and look at it now.

‘Will the national curriculum solve these things?’ he asked.

The answer is ‘no’. In part this reflects the fact it is not a national curriculum board, in his view, ‘but rather a national syllabus body because it doesn’t get into the classroom’. Nonetheless, the development paper and discussion around it can facilitate resolution.

There is, he argued, a need to see three different ‘settlements’ on the table which are not necessarily in order and may not ultimately be quite the settlements we may want:

- national curriculum - written
- national assessment and accountability and what unfolds
- professionalism and teacher capacity - what we will do about it.

Curriculum in this context may be ‘the easiest of the three tasks’. More importantly still, if they are ‘misaligned’ nothing will happen.

High quality/high equity systems, he observed in this context, ‘have a set of parsimonious policies that give teachers pedagogical freedom, but set standards and content, and then really focus on professional capacity that enables teachers to translate it into class programs’. And they also have ‘a very strong low-stakes diagnostic testing capacity as opposed to high-stakes regimes that reduce equity and lead to teachers teaching to the test’.
In this way, Luke argued for a ‘relatively economical curriculum that’s not overloaded, that gives people professional capacity to modulate the pedagogy to get there in different ways, and that raises the assessment capacity of teachers at the local level’ in ways that negate the high-stakes threat to which he had referred. John Dewey, he noted in conclusion, said that curriculum is a map of the territory to be covered, not the journey. ‘We need to provide that sort of map rather than a GPS system that monitors and corrects us all the time and deskills teachers as a result’.

Implementation and development in concert

Since she cares about the product, Efthymiades was equally concerned to plan for implementation as well as development, with a particular focus on teacher engagement and professional learning. It is important to recognise in this context, she argued with reference to some experience in the Northern Territory, that ‘you can’t get a critical groundswell towards implementation through the development process itself’.

The Northern Territory, she explained, initially used a ‘concerns-based adoption model’ that dates back to the 1970s to achieve this end. The model essentially charts people’s progress through various ‘stages of concern’ spanning ‘awareness, informational, personal, management, consequence, collaboration and refocusing’, as a way of monitoring where innovations are at and examining the impact the system is having on teacher practice and engagement.

More recently the development process has focused on ‘dissemination’, broadly defined as engaging people in meaningful ways, and made up of:

- spread - e.g. media releases
- exchange - e.g. interactive websites
- choice - e.g. trialling
- implementation.

Adoption of this sort of model, according to Efthymiades, could give people the chance to actually ‘use the national curriculum as part of the process of development and implementation’. It is a ‘critical way of engaging teachers and gaining their buy-in’. It also enables the Board to address the stages of concern she outlined, through a process of dissemination which ‘really comes into play when people have a go and move into the stage of choice’.

It is a process, she concluded, that ‘helps us acknowledge and exploit the strengths the states and territories already have in relation to their curriculum development processes’. We will get ‘a better framework and refined product as a result, while getting genuine teacher involvement that moves us more readily through the stages of concern’ and therefore has a greater impact.

It may not get us to the end of the road, Mackay noted in response, but it is ‘an invitational process that helps build the critical mass’ which, as Efthymiades added, ‘could move us towards the tipping point’.

Responding to the opportunity offered by Mackay for participants to comment on the process, a practising teacher ‘who will deliver the national curriculum’ made the point that she has ‘faith in the research and knowledge behind it’, but also wants the invitation to be part of it ‘to ensure I can own it and deliver it in ways that engage students’.

Endorsing the approach of pursuing development and implementation in an ‘entwined’ way, another participant cautioned about the need to ‘find ways of addressing assessment and reporting’, or else the collaborative spirit could be lost if agreement is not reached on Luke’s three settlements. And it is important in this context, yet another added,
to ensure that parents also are involved or else it will fail.

There is, for one contributor at least, a ‘prior question’ that has to be asked about the process Efthymiades proposed - ‘dissemination of what, and to whom? Is it a framework, a syllabus document or what?’

For yet another, it is a question of engaging teachers in all phases of the process, rather than just giving them a product at the end of the day. It is, a Board member added, ‘up to each system to bring their teachers into the process’. It can’t just be passed on to the Board; which Efthymiades endorsed, noting that teachers need to be feeding back all along the way to documents they actually get the chance to use.

It is important, Luke added, not to neglect that the messages from the forum itself are part of the dissemination and development process though, a participant from the floor warned, we need to make sure that when teachers are involved it is not just teachers from the four disciplines in the Board’s remit.

Back to Hong Kong and an elder statesman’s words

The culture in Hong Kong is very different, Wardlaw noted in light of the preceding discussion, ‘and we would just give people in the room “the line” for them to take outside’. In thinking about the issues under consideration, he indicated he would endorse Bruce Wilson’s view that ‘simplicity’ is key and that the Board has a specific and simple task. If it is not undertaken iteratively with teachers, however, it is ‘bound to fail’. But, he argued, you can do it in parallel.

On the level of specification of documentation, he pointed participants towards the Hong Kong maths curriculum for secondary levels 4 to 6, which applies to every student in those years. ‘It’s neither a framework nor a syllabus and there is quite a bit of content’. As far as standards are concerned, Hong Kong has, in his view, ‘cleverly emphasised quite detailed feedback to schools’. As a result, assessment is not just benchmarking, but feedback to schools and this is something that very good assessment systems can achieve. Thus, Hong Kong teachers get advice on why students have not learned what teachers thought they had and can take this into account in considering the next steps.

A lot of people talk about the future, Wardlaw concluded, but ‘kids are in the here and now’. Rather than simply ‘future proofing’, which can’t really be done, we should aim to develop ‘future capability’.

Asked as ‘a wise elder in the room’ by Mackay to make a final reflection before Barry McGaw brought proceedings to a close, Paul Brock (NSW Department of Education and Training) segued from Luke’s reference to Dewey by pointing out that the very next sentence advised us never to mistake the map for the territory.

Brock indicated that he is one who is ‘confident’ about the Board and its work. In getting to that point, he acknowledged, he did have to overcome some ‘scepticism about the timeline’, especially given the difficulties associated with addressing Years 11 and 12. Australia, he noted in this context, is ‘incredibly diverse in its population’ and certainly more so than either Finland or Hong Kong. Thus, although there is a need to learn from these and other jurisdictions, we also need to keep our own particular context in mind.
As the ‘only remaining member’ of the original curriculum body, CURASS, he told participants how its work essentially stopped because it put so many resources into English, mathematics and science that the other key learning areas got left behind. In addition, it separated statements from profiles so the profiles lost contact with the statements and then it was done in by state politics and electoral change. These, he argued, are all lessons from which we have to learn.

His confidence now, by contrast, comes from the relationship the new National Curriculum Board has to COAG, rather than MCEETYA, since it is that body which really has the responsibility for dollars. Beyond this, the Board is not starting from scratch and it knows this to be the case. He is ‘impressed’ by the honesty and openness of the process and the great deal of associated goodwill. The Board also has ‘excellent leadership and a quality board’ along with strong support within the Minister’s office. He will, he indicated, be even more confident if he sees an ongoing commitment from the Commonwealth and the states and territories to what Ken Boston, who he quoted, called ‘the fragile coalition of cooperation’. In this context he specifically urged the Board to reject ‘ideological polarities’, to seek out and heed more student voices around the country, and to genuinely consult with schools and their communities.

Finally, he commented, he will be ‘really confident’ when the Board shows it is in touch with powerful, evidence-based research and, where necessary, commissions its own research to fill in our knowledge gaps.

Barry McGaw then closed proceedings, acknowledging that a specific effort was made by the Board to ensure that practising teachers formed a critical mass of participation at the forum itself.

Commenting more specifically on some issues that emerged through the day, he noted that purpose and goals must frame what the Board does and about which a consensus in Australia has to be forged. That is something that is beyond the Board itself to achieve and it must ensure it is not, on the one hand, saying it wants to be collaborative yet, on the other, seeking to unilaterally undertake a task that belongs to someone else. It is, he added, a role for others who have ‘invited us in’ and that is something that does not trouble him in the least.

There are, he noted, a range of questions to consider arising from the day. These comprise:

• questions for which we need to craft answers, primarily contained in the development paper prepared for the forum
• questions, some raised in the course of the day, for which answers are still to come.

He then exemplified this last set of questions in this list:

• will it be compulsory? - to which he ventured an answer that referenced the current state and territory approach which doesn’t really force it on all

• will it be a syllabus or a framework? - to which he suggested it depends on how you define the terms

• what language will be used? - a question the Board will need to decide, while recognising that whatever is on the paper is not necessarily what is enacted in the lives of young people in schools

• where will the work of the Board connect with pedagogy? - if, he suggested in response, you talk about what should be taught in schools, and what students learn, you inevitably are talking about pedagogy

• what about assessment? - this is something that needs to be worked through as the writing briefs are prepared

• teacher professional development? - this is not something the Board will do itself, but it does have to ensure that its work facilitates this
the whole issue of dissemination? - the Board has, he explained, talked about piloting, but Debbie Efthymiades’s contribution helps frame it more clearly as the process unfolds.

This forum, McGaw noted in ending the day, is the first consultation to be undertaken by the Board. He then invited participants to continue their dialogue through the newly established website www.ncb.org.au which was introduced earlier in the day, and also by revisiting the vodcast to be placed on the website.
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