

- globally, we need to resolve a looming Sustainability crisis presented by phenomena such as global warming.

The construction of the priorities as (optional) solutions to problems, rather than intrinsically worthwhile phenomena, exposes them to distinct vulnerabilities. Their presence in curriculum suggests that significant phenomena are being addressed, and more significantly resolved, via curriculum content. Yet despite overwhelming resonance in teacher responses that these phenomena are important, research indicates variable implementation of the CCPs as distinct curriculum elaborations in everyday teaching practice. For example, Sustainability is cited as 'neither a priority nor cross-curricular' (Barnes et al., 2017) and some teachers were 'unaware of its existence' (Nicholls & Thorne, 2017). Elsewhere, the transformative potential of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and cultures, and Asia and Australia's engagement with Asia, is identified, however teachers are not confident in their attempts to realise them (Salter & Maxwell, 2015). By contrast, there are also instances where the rich potential of a CCP is recognised (see Heaton, 2019).

How 'relevance' is perceived more widely also contributes to vulnerability. The Federal Government's 2014 review of the Australian Curriculum framed the CCPs as requiring review, given concerns they were politically motivated inclusions, rather than pedagogically justified initiatives (Maude, 2014). Ultimately, this led to reduction of their documentation in learning area elaborations. The Mparntwe Declaration (COAGEC, 2019) may also signal further revision if, like its predecessor, it guides ACARA's decisions. Of particular note is a shift in Goal 2. While the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and cultures and Sustainability CCPs are still foregrounded, Asia and Australia's engagement with Asia is not. In fact, there is no mention of Asia at all in the entire declaration. There is, however, a call for students to 'engage in the global community, particularly with our neighbours in the Indo-Pacific regions' (p. 8). Perhaps 'Asia' is now irrelevant to Australia's preferred future? To what extent this may be a statement of geography, or a geopolitical statement, may emerge more clearly in the next version of the curriculum.

Geography

Geography teachers are uniquely positioned to address the CCPs through the subject's disciplinary focus on interrelationships between physical features of the earth with individual, social and political relationships. Unlike Science and Mathematics curricula, the Geography

Curriculum is considered a 'natural' place for all three CCPs to be embedded, by academics as well as industry (AGTA, 2014; Australian Government, 2014; Casinader, 2016). Research suggests that teachers also view Geography as a discipline within which the topics related to the CCPs can be logically addressed (e.g. da Silva-Branco, 2019).

However, for some the challenge to the stability of Geography as a distinct discipline is the greater priority. For example, as Australian governments increasingly focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) in schools and industry, practitioners are contemplating benefits for the discipline and broader society of positioning Geography within STEM (Caldis & Kleeman, 2019). Given the potential for marginalisation of the subject in a context that suggests the humanities and social sciences are less lucrative than STEM subjects, it is germane to seriously consider Geography's disciplinary strengths and position (Dolan, 2019). However, it is important to do so cognisant of the ways in which such debates, which potentially pit 'hard' and 'soft' sciences against one another and the subjective and regional against the purportedly unbiased and universal, may leave content such as CCPs vulnerable to exclusion (Barnes et al., 2017; Lambert, 2013; Moreton-Robinson, 2006).

The manner in which the CCPs have been conceptualised and constructed and the current context in which curriculum decisions are made mean that we need to reflect on our practice and ask to what degree are the CCPs vulnerable – in my classroom, in my school, in my profession – and what does this mean for our students?

References

- Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2018). *Cross-curriculum perspectives*. <https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/f-10-curriculum/cross-curriculum-priorities/>
- Australian Geography Teachers Association. (2014). *Submission to the review of the Australian Curriculum*. <https://www.agta.asn.au/files/Geographical%20Education/2014/Geographical%20Education%20Vol%2027,%202014%20-%20Review%20of%20the%20Australian%20Curriculum%20-%20Kleeman.pdf>
- Australian Government Department of Education. (2014). *Review of the Australian Curriculum: Supplementary material*. https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/review_of_the_national_curriculum_supplementary_material_0.pdf

- Bacchi, C. (1999). *Women, policy and politics: The construction of policy problems*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Barnes, M., Moore, D., Almeida, S. (2017). Sustainability in Australian schools: A cross-curriculum priority? *Prospects*, 47, 377–392. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-018-9437-x>
- Caldis, S., & Kleeman, G. (2019). Geography and STEM. *Geographical Education*, 32, 5–10.
- Casinader, N. (2016). A lost conduit for intercultural education: school geography and the potential for transformation in the Australian Curriculum. *Intercultural Education*, 27, 257–273.
- Council of Australian Governments Education Council. (2019). *Alice Springs (Mparntwe) education declaration*. https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/final_-_alice_springs_declaration_-_17_february_2020_security_removed.pdf
- da Silva-Branco, K. (2019). *Through the lens of teachers: Understanding the implementation of sustainability as a cross-curriculum priority in Western Australian schools* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Murdoch University.
- Dolan, L. (2019). The humanities and social sciences in Australian schooling: An overview – Where HASS thou gone? *Professional Education*, 1(20), 8–11.
- Heaton, A. (2019). Combatting racism to create a better Australia: the potential of the national cross-curriculum priority of teaching Aboriginal histories and cultures. *Australian Aboriginal Studies*, 1, 41–50.
- Lambert, D. (2013). Who hung the humanities? *Geographical Education*, 26, 25–28.
- Lingard, B. (2018). The Australian curriculum: A critical interrogation of why, what and where to? *Curriculum Perspectives*, 38, 55–65. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41297-017-0033-7>
- Maude, A. (2014). Comments on the recommendations relating to Geography in the review of the Australian Curriculum. *Geographical Education*, 27, 13–18.
- Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA). (2008). *Melbourne declaration of educational goals for young Australians*. http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/National_Declaration_on_the_Educational_Goals_for_Young_Australians.pdf
- Moreton-Robinson, A. (2006). Towards a new research agenda? Foucault, whiteness and Indigenous sovereignty. *Journal of Sociology*, 42, 383–395.
- Nicholls, J., & Thorne, M. (2017). Queensland teacher's relationship with the sustainability cross-curriculum priority. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 33, 189–200. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ae.2018.1>
- Roth, M., & McGaw, B. (2010). *Dr. Martina Roth interviews Barry McGaw at LATWF 2010*. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZOCNe-uxQxQ>
- Salter, P., & Maxwell, J. (2015). The inherent vulnerability of the Australian curriculum's cross-curriculum priorities. *Critical Studies in Education*, 57, 296–312.