



National Quality Framework Approved Learning Frameworks Update Literature Review

COMMISSIONED BY THE AUSTRALIAN CHILDREN'S EDUCATION
AND CARE QUALITY AUTHORITY (ACECQA)

SEPTEMBER 2021

Prepared by

Associate Professor LENNIE BARBLETT, Edith Cowan University

Associate Professor JENNIFER CARTMEL, Griffith University

Associate Professor FAY HADLEY, Macquarie University

Professor LINDA J. HARRISON, Macquarie University

Professor SUSAN IRVINE, Queensland University of Technology

Dr FRANCIS BOBONGIE-HARRIS, Queensland University of Technology

Dr LEANNE LAVINA, Edith Cowan University

To cite: Barblett, L., Cartmel, J., Hadley, F., Harrison, L.J., Irvine, S., Bobongie- Harris & Lavina, L. (2021). *National Quality Framework Approved Learning Frameworks Update: Literature Review*. Australian Children’s Educations and Care Quality Authority

Authors contact details

Associate Professor LENNIE BARBLETT, Edith Cowan University l.barblett@ecu.edu.au

Associate Professor JENNIFER CARTMEL, Griffith University j.cartmel@griffith.edu.au

Associate Professor FAY HADLEY, Macquarie University fay.hadley@mq.edu.au

Professor LINDA J. HARRISON, Macquarie University linda.j.harrison@mq.edu.au

Professor SUSAN IRVINE, Queensland University of Technology s.irvine@qut.edu.au

Dr FRANCIS BOBONGIE-HARRIS, Queensland University of Technology

francis.bobongie@qut.edu.au

Dr LEANNE LAVINA, Edith Cowan University l.lavina@ecu.edu.au

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Methodology	4
2.1 Methodological approach.....	4
Phase 1. Processes of inclusion	4
Phase 2: Cluster group input	5
Phase 3: Quality audit	6
Phase 4: Constructing the review.....	6
3. The 12 focus areas	6
3.1. Planning, documentation, and assessment.....	6
3.2. The role of play-based learning, intentional teaching and intentionality.....	10
3.3. Connecting to content/discipline knowledge	12
3.4. Digital technologies	14
3.5. Embedding Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives	16
3.6. Cultural responsiveness and providing culturally safe spaces	17
3.7. Civics and citizenship.....	19
3.8. Inclusion of children and young people with additional requirements	20
3.9. Relational pedagogy	22
3.10. Mental, physical health and social competence	24
3.11. Sustainability and environmental education	26
3.12. Transitions and continuity.....	28
Appendix 1: Mapping similar frameworks to the EYLF.....	31
Appendix 2: Mapping similar frameworks to the MTOP	48
Appendix 3: Frameworks	51
References	54

1. Introduction

The purpose of this Literature Review is to undertake a concise review of contemporary literature and other Frameworks to identify areas of strength and potential areas for updating the national Approved Learning Frameworks (ALFs). *Becoming Being and Belonging: Early Years Learning Framework* (EYLF) published in 2009 sets out the principles, practices, and learning outcomes to be used in the early childhood education and care (ECEC) of children from birth to age 5 years. *My Time, Our Place: Framework for School Age Care in Australia* (MTOP) using a similar structure was subsequently developed and published in 2011 to be used in outside school hours care (OSHC) settings with children and young people. Providers of ECEC and OSHC services are required to use the ALFs to guide: the development of programs that promote children’s learning and development; the pedagogical practices of educators including early childhood teachers; and a considered and reflective approach to planning and assessment for each child.

The overarching question that underpinned the review was:

1. What aspects of the EYLF/MTOP are affirmed and what requires consideration for alteration based on evidence from the last 12 years?’

A scoping methodology was employed to investigate this question and the literature review conducted over four phases is described next.

2. Methodology

2.1 Methodological approach

Phase 1. Processes of inclusion

The writers searched international publications from the following databases - Educational Database, EDResearch online, EBSCO Education Source, Proquest and Google Scholar. Searches for literature pertaining to the EYLF included ‘*Early Years Learning Framework*’; ‘*early years*’ AND ‘*Framework*’; ‘*early learning*’ AND ‘*EYLF*’. MTOP included initial literature searches with the terms ‘*after school hours*’ AND ‘*care*’; ‘*extended school hours*’ AND ‘*care*’.

Publications were limited from 2010, peer-reviewed, and included those written in English. Following initial independent searches, the writers then reassembled to review relevant publications and identify additional sources of interest stemming from publication references or other identified sources. As part of the qualifying process for inclusion, full text articles were reviewed to determine relevance. Consistent with a scoping review, writers adopted a reflexive approach to ensure literature was comprehensively covered (Arksey & O’Malley, 2005). Articles were then placed in Microsoft Teams, with a literature library created in Zotero®. Across database sources a total of 156 records for the EYLF and MTOP searches (including related literature) were found in the initial search.

In Phase 1, 21 ECEC and OSHC curriculum/learning/guiding frameworks and information from Australia and selected countries were reviewed as detailed in Table 1. Some frameworks fall just out of the 2010 and later parameter but were recommended by Consortia members. There was considerably less information in the form of OSHC frameworks and guidelines. Two frameworks for OSHC were reviewed and one was a draft framework, and the information from New Zealand was gleaned from an OSHC practice handbook because of the limited frameworks available.

Table 1. Early learning /curriculum frameworks reviewed

Origin of Framework	Name
International	
Belgium	MeMoQ (Measuring and Monitoring Quality in Childcare for Babies and Toddlers) <i>A pedagogical framework for childcare for babies and toddlers.</i>
Canada	Alberta Kindergarten Curriculum
England	Early Years Foundation Stage
Europe	ISSA Quality Framework 0-3
Finland	Finnish Curriculum for ECEC
Ireland	Aistearsiolta
Jamaica	The Jamaica Early Childhood Curriculum Guide
New Zealand	Te Whariki
Scotland	Curriculum for Excellence (ages 3 to 18) Be You (birth to early years of school)
Singapore	Nurturing early learners. A framework for a Kindergarten Curriculum for Singapore
United States of America	Massachusetts Guidelines for Preschool Learning Experiences Minnesota Early Childhood Washington State Early Learning and Development Guidelines Headstart and Beautiful Beginnings California Preschool Guidelines
Australian	
Northern Territory	Preschool Curriculum
South Australia	Reflect, Respect, Relate
Queensland	Queensland Kindergarten Learning Guideline
Victoria	Victorian Early Years Learning and Development Framework
Western Australia	Kindergarten Curriculum Guidelines

Table 2. Outside school hours frameworks/information reviewed

Origin of Framework	Name
Scotland	Out of School Care in Scotland
Sweden	School-age Educare Curriculum Framework
New Zealand	Out of School Care Network

Phase 2: Cluster group input

After the first examination of available literature, ALFs Update Consortia members were asked to contribute three pieces of literature addressing the area of their expertise to guide the revision of the ALFs. All the literature was placed in a Zotero library for further analysis. Each member belonged to one of five cluster groups:

1. Cluster 1- Learning, Development and Wellbeing
2. Cluster 2- Pedagogy, Practice and Praxis
3. Cluster 3- Relationships and Partnerships
4. Cluster 4- Connections and Pathways
5. Cluster 5- Diverse Perspectives

At the end of phase two, the literature examined rose to 475 with the addition of three frameworks (added to Table 1). Adopting a “charting” approach using clusters supported in-depth analysis and examination of sub-area relationships (Arksey & O’Malley, 2005, p. 22). The intention being to draw

“conclusions from existing literature” in addition to identifying “gaps in the evidence base” for further investigation (Arksey & O’Malley, 2005, p. 21).

Phase 3: Quality audit

Peer-reviewed journal articles, books and reports “published by reputable publishers” were seen to represent quality research (Xiao & Watson, 2019, p. 94) with full text articles of initial search results used to deepen understandings. Using initial findings as a springboard, cluster searches involved making decisions about key concepts and related terms, with space left to refine (Arksey & O’Malley, 2005, p. 24). The quality of literature was then evaluated based on the rigour of methods used, data analysis, and generalisability of findings (Fink, 2005) with annotations across ‘core’ and ‘cluster’ groups created to describe publication positioning and to categorise “effectiveness”; a recognised approach to assessing quality (Arksey & O’Malley, 2005, p. 28). Adopting consistent approaches to “reporting...findings” also supported identification of research gaps, whilst opening consideration of new approaches to contemporary curriculum (Arksey & O’Malley, 2005, p. 28).

Phase 4: Constructing the review

Returning to the overall review question, ‘What aspects of the EYLF/MTOP are affirmed and what requires consideration for revision based on evidence from the last 12 years?’ The 24 frameworks/information were mapped on a framework to distill core ideas, show areas of the ALFs they supported and areas that could be strengthened. This mapping document can be found in Appendix 1. Once the areas to be supported and areas that could be strengthened were identified, an in-depth review of the final 475 publications involved the writers developing a scoping framework with key findings described as focus areas and information collated and summarised under these headings.

3. The 12 focus areas

The scoping framework developed in Phase 4 from the literature review and frameworks/information identified 12 focus areas to be examined to enhance the revision of the ALFS and are described below.

3.1. Planning, documentation, and assessment

Planning and critical reflection

The EYLF and MTOP strengths-based model positions children/young people as the central focus for planning. The way in which the ALFs view children/young people as competent and capable learners and value children’s life-long learning and real-world experiences for learning has been heralded (Grieshaber, 2010). The strengths-based model supports Goal 2 of the Alice Springs (Mparntwe) Education Declaration that states: “All young Australians become confident and creative individuals, successful lifelong learners, active and informed members of the community” (Education Council, 2019, p.1).

Planning includes the continuous cycle of observation/assessment, planning, teaching and reflecting. The planning process can include a focus on one child/young person, a small group of children/young people or the whole group/class. However, in terms of the EYLF the critiques include the difficulty experienced by educators enacting the planning cycle due to the limited “learning trajectories” provided in the learning outcomes (Cohrssen, 2021). White and Flear (2019) found that educators implementing the EYLF struggle with the planning and assessment aspects and would like more examples in the Framework. Unfortunately, the Australian literature in regard

to OSHC planning approaches is an under researched space (Cartmel & Brannelly, 2016; Hurst, 2020).

Effective teaching and learning are dependent upon educators' capacity for critical reflection (Marbina et al., 2015). While the EYLF and MTOP promote the importance of critical reflection, Brownlee Lunn et al., (2021) argue there is a need for more explicit advice to guide educators in relation to critical reflection. Acknowledging the complexity of educators' daily work with children and families, they argue for more distinction between reflection and critical reflection and to review outcome examples to better illustrate critical reflection in practice. This is supported by Harrison et al. (2020) who noted in their study of quality improvement in long day care centres that educators talked about critical reflection but "with limited consideration of theory, research, multiple perspectives on practice and/or issues of power, social justice and equity" (p. 26). Cooper et al. (2014) argue that critical reflection requires critical reflective dialogue amongst educators, as well as families, to unpack teaching and learning.

Documentation

Observing and documenting children's and young people's engagement in learning is a longstanding professional practice and a key component of the planning and assessment cycle. It is described in the National Quality Standard in Quality Area 1. Yet it is an area in which educators are seeking more information and support, in particular, what and how to document learning in ways that are empowering, meaningful to others and not so time consuming (Harrison et al, 2019). Alvernik (2018, p.80) contends that the concept of pedagogical documentation remains problematised because on the one hand educators are bound by everyday requirements related to the "systematic quality of work", while on the other there is the need to experience "pedagogical documentation qualitatively" as a process and representation of "meaning-making" with children. The literature highlights the need for educators to critically reflect on the purpose of pedagogical documentation, asking questions such as who needs to be involved and how educators are enabled to undertake this professional work. Drawing on the work of Dahlberg et al. (2006), Basford and Bath (2014) maintain that quality pedagogical documentation is jointly constructed with educators, parents, and children to create a democratic space for reflecting on learning. To enable this professional work, Alnervik (2018) advocates ways of working with pedagogical documentation that are both "systematic and dynamic", integrating visual, collaborative, and reflective ways of working that supports and captures both children's and adults' learning (Alnervik, 2018, p. 81).

Recognising the contribution of pedagogical documentation to learning and teaching, there is growing focus on the documentation and assessment of children/young people's learning, development and wellbeing. Examining the English ECEC context, Basford and Bath (2014) raised concern about documentation being seen as a form of external accountability, and the seemingly negative impact of the regulatory gaze on educator confidence, knowledge and understanding of effective pedagogy. They contend that emphasis placed on outcomes along with increased standardisation has resulted in educators' performance of "technical duties to satisfy the gatekeepers of regulation" whilst trying to balance participative approaches with children and families. Australian research also describes a subtle shift away from pedagogical documentation to inform practice, to documentation to provide evidence of quality practice. Grant et al. (2018) considered the implications of Australia's National Quality Framework, in particular, the Assessment and Rating process, on early childhood teachers' pedagogical documentation. The authors suggest the demand for evidence of quality engenders teacher performativity, risking a shift away from quality pedagogical documentation to inform learning and teaching to an unhelpful emphasis on the quantity of documentary evidence.

Digital documentation

Digital documentation has changed the work of educators, with digital platforms shifting what is shared about children/young people’s learning and how it is shared with stakeholders. What has emerged is the recognition that these grounds are not a “neutral teaching space” with communication reshaped in ways that present a particular image of a child’s learning; inequities existing in relation to access, power, authority, and privileging of voices (White et al., 2021, p. 16). As digital documentation is also seen to align with “multiple external accountabilities, organisational systems and lived experiences with learners” questions also arise as to audience moderation (White et al., 2021, p. 16). For instance, whilst software tagging supports teacher reflection on children’s progress, allowing for ‘tracking’ of learning entry types across curriculum areas, evidence suggests digital documentation is primarily used to communicate with parents “rather than also as tools for genuine collaboration with children” (White et al., 2021, p. 15). In this sense, emphasis is placed on complete narrative accounts, an approach also supported by “software architecture” (p. 14), with tensions arising when documenting the incompleteness of spontaneous “mini observations” (White et al., 2021, p. 13). Teacher expertise in using digital technologies was also identified as a barrier to fully capturing children’s learning, with concerns also raised about workload and duplication of documentation (White et al., 2021). These findings are consistent with Stratigos and Fenech’s (2021, p. 29) questions around the use of apps with “content, workload burden, ethics, access and equity” all identified as requiring examination given the prevalence of an increasingly market-driven ‘technicist’ context.

Assessment and Evaluation

Assessment and evaluation *for* children’s learning and wellbeing is described in the EYLF and MTOP and aligns with an accepted, broad definition of formative assessment as a “process that educators employ to collect and use assessment information to tailor instruction to the individual needs of children” (Riley-Ayers, 2014, p. 4). However, more modern definitions of assessment describe assessment “for learning, as learning and of learning” broadening the definition (McLachlan, 2017, npg). Assessment ‘for learning’ is when educators draw inferences about children/young people’s progress to inform their planning; assessment ‘as learning’ occurs when children/young people are involved in their own assessment and assessment ‘of learning’ assists educators to gauge attainment of the outcomes. Assessing children/young people’s progress according to the five learning outcomes and approaching planning for them with “outcomes in mind” requires educators to make decisions about learning progress and development against observable characteristics to ensure achievement of outcomes (Grieshaber, 2018, pp. 1221-2). Documenting and assessing children/young people’s learning and wellbeing requires skill and knowledge of appropriate tools. Wood (2014) notes that educators require particular skills to observe and attend to children’s meanings and patterns of play, and then effectively integrate their educative purposes with children’s purposes. Furthermore, the assessment of young children’s social and emotional wellbeing is highly complex (Barblett & Maloney, 2010), making it important to take a holistic approach to assessing wellbeing (Marbina et al., 2015).

Evaluation assists educators to assess if they are reaching their goals for children/young people’s learning. Therefore, assessment and evaluation extend beyond assessment of children’s learning as educators critically reflect upon all areas of their curriculum and pedagogy. The curriculum as described in the EYLF (DEEWR, 2009, p. 9) is “all the interactions, experiences, activities, routines and events, planned and unplanned, that occur in an environment designed to foster children’s learning and development”. Educators can use a number of tools (such as areas of the NQS) to evaluate their effectiveness of aspects of the curriculum and the pedagogy used to improve their practice.

Assessment Tools

In order to support educators to monitor children’s progress, some State governments have commissioned a series of reviews of assessment tools suitable for use, or currently used by,

teachers and educators. These reviews/reports focus on each of the Learning and Development Outcomes in the Victorian Early Years Learning and Development Framework (Cloney et al., 2019; Jackson et al. 2020; Marbina et al., 2015; Noble et al., 2020; Verdon et al., 2018) and on formative assessment practices in the year before school (CESE, 2020; Harrison et al., 2019). Such reviews were conducted amidst concerns regarding the ‘push down’ of school-based teaching and assessment methods compromising the prioritisation of the play-based and holistic learning intentions of early childhood (Cloney et al., 2019; Noble et al., 2020). While highlighting the importance of rigorous assessment *for, as and of* learning, the authors of these reviews emphasise the need for developing assessment approaches that align with early childhood pedagogy and philosophy. The purpose of assessment in early childhood is to enable educators to support children’s development in evidence-based ways, without which it might be a challenge for educators to know whether their pedagogy is having an impact, and to observe children’s development more deeply and purposefully (Cloney et al., 2019; Harrison et al., 2019). The reviews/reports also note that assessment may be even more critical to identify and support learners with additional needs (CESE, 2020) and include examples of developmental screening tools that can be or are being used in ECEC services, including tools validated for use with Australian populations, for example, the Australian adaptation for Aboriginal children of the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (D’Aprano et al., 2016).

Reviews (eg. Cloney et al., 2019; Jackson et al. 2020; Marbina et al., 2015; Noble et al., 2020; Verdon et al., 2018) identify a number of limitations to existing assessment tools. Many are developmental screeners designed to inform clinical assessment and include checklist-style measures, which may be useful for educators on occasion but do not capture a progression of learning appropriate for recording growth in children’s learning (Cloney et al., 2019). Few tools have been validated with culturally diverse populations (Jackson et al., 2020; Noble et al., 2020) or are seen as useful for children who speak a language other than English (Harrison et al., 2019). All of these reviews recommend the development or adaptation and validation of new tools and approaches that are fit for purpose and can be used by early childhood educators, necessitating further collaboration between early childhood professionals, researchers and government.

Assessment tools that enable educators to evaluate the learning environment and learning experiences provided for children/young people in their education and care services are also relevant. Research with OSHC services (Cartmel, 2019; QCAN, 2020) note the use by educators of the School Age Care Environmental Rating Scale (Harms et al., 2016/1996) and the Leuven Scale (Laevers, 2005) to examine school age services. Tribolet (2020) reviews and applies affordance theory protocols (Kytta, 2002) to assess outdoor play provisions for preschool physical activity. Although designed for use by educators to observe and evaluate their own settings, for the most part criteria from environmental rating scales tools have become incorporated into external assessment and quality ratings (La Paro et al., 2012).

Gaps and silences

The reviews mentioned in the previous section provide recommendations regarding effective assessment, including the importance of multidisciplinary collaboration and multiple sources of information (Cloney et al., 2019; Marbina et al., 2015; Verdon, 2018). Further considerations in the selection of assessment tools requires recognition of the multiple languages and communication systems that a child may use (Verdon, 2018), capturing the progression of learning (Cloney et al., 2019), and the need to clarify the purposes of assessment (Harrison et al., 2019). The authors recommend the development or adaptation and validation of new tools and approaches that are fit for purpose and that can be used by early childhood educators, necessitating further collaboration between early childhood professionals, researchers and government.

Researchers, such as Davis et al. (2015) argue the invisibility of infants and toddlers in the EYLF restricts educator’s ability to plan quality programs for this age group. Harrison and colleagues’ (2020) study found that high-quality programs in long day care centres in Australia demonstrated a strategic and reflective approach. Another gap in the literature was identified in Cooper et al.’s (2014, p. 733) study of family involvement in infants’ and toddlers’ assessment of “dispositional learning”. The researchers found it a necessity to involve families in the assessment of infants and toddlers as they gave valued insights into their child’s learning. Cooper et al. further suggest that educator notions of assessment require reframing so that it is seen as a “distributed process” that recognises the role of the family “as the first and main cultivators of their children’s learning dispositions” (p. 745). Educators are also encouraged to consider sociocultural principles in ways that communicate value for family partnerships, at the same time, critically evaluating the differing views about learning, teaching and assessment that may be held by different stakeholders and may limit the involvement of others in children’s assessment.

Main points	Areas supported in the ALFs	Areas to strengthen in the ALFs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning, assessing and critically reflecting is a continuous cycle • assessment as, for and of learning, development and wellbeing • critical reflection is integral to the planning cycle • documentation and assessment involves children, young people and families and should support quality planning • digital documentation requires examination • in-house and externally sourced assessment tools require critique to ensure effectiveness • assessment tools are reflective of the diversity of children/young people • educators require tools to evaluate aspects of their curriculum and its effectiveness for children/young people’s learning, development and wellbeing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ongoing learning and reflective practice; • partnerships • planning and implementing play-based learning, • intentionality (MTOPI); intentional teaching (EYLF); • collaboration with children (MTOPI); assessment for learning (EYLF); • evaluation for wellbeing and learning (MTOPI). • some examples in outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • describe plan/do/review cycle in preamble; • ongoing learning and reflective practice; • partnerships • planning and implementing play-based learning, intentionality (MTOPI) and intentional teaching (EYLF); • collaboration with children (MTOPI); • assessment for learning (EYLF) and evaluation for wellbeing and learning (MTOPI); • examples in outcomes.

3.2. The role of play-based learning, intentional teaching and intentionality

Strong evidence supports the values and benefits of using play-based pedagogies to support children and young people’s learning and development (BERA, 2017; Zosh et al 2017). This is reinforced by the Alice Springs (Mparntwe) Education Declaration that early childhood education should be strengthened by providing “guidance to the early childhood education workforce to enable it to support young children to learn and develop through play-based learning” (Education Council, 2019, p.12). For the middle years, the Declaration promotes being “responsive to students’ developmental and learning needs in ways which are challenging, engaging and rewarding” (Education Council, 2019, p.13). Learning through play and intentionality (MTOPI) or intentional teaching (EYLF) are promoted as evidence-based pedagogical practices in both Frameworks. However, there is a complex relationship between play, learning, pedagogy, curriculum and outcomes (Brooker et al., 2014).

While learning through play is described in both ALFs as a practice, it is also a pedagogical approach and Fleer et al. (2013, p. 7) found definitions of play varied amongst educators with “no consensus across the data set reached.” Additionally, educators interpreted their role in play differently (Taylor & Boyer, 2020), or have been described as “missing in action” (Edwards, 2017, p.4) or restricted to asking questions (Devi & Fleer, 2018). It is important that educators take varied roles at different times in children/young people’s play to promote learning (Kennedy & Barblett, 2016) including higher order thinking, connecting to content knowledge and building dispositions for learning and being social (Pascal et al., 2019). According to Kilderry et al. (2017) and Leggett and Ford (2013), the practices of learning through play and intentional teaching practices remain blurred and problematic. A key problem is that many educators are unable to articulate their role in play-based learning with discussion of ‘intentional teaching’ focusing on group work and children’s acquisition of knowledge (Leggett & Ford, 2013). However, it is important to remember that intentionality is not the sole domain of the educator and consideration should be given to the intentionality of children in their learning and play. Hedges and Cooper (2018, p. 379) suggest that children are intentional in their learning and together with educators have “intentional and proactive engagements”. Given intentional teaching is a means of articulating “teacher-child relationships and interactions...central to quality in early childhood education”, enhancing educator understanding and use of this construct should be prioritised to support “teaching and learning in ECE in order to achieve equity” and support positive child outcomes (McLaughlin et al., 2016, p. 191).

Learning and teaching strategies

The E4Kids study suggested there was a need for improving the quality of adult/children interactions chiefly for instructional support to assist children with the development of thinking and concept development (Tayler, et al., 2013). More discussion is required of play-based learning, intentionality and the nature and role of instructive learning strategies, recognising that effective educators use a repertoire of learning and teaching strategies to enhance children and young people’s learning and development. Both ALFs describe this repertoire to include for example: active listening, modeling, demonstrating, questioning, speculating, explaining and problem solving (DEEWR, 2009). Pascal et al., (2019) suggest that a balance of ‘adult framed’ activities with play-based, relational approaches effectively supports children’s learning, development and wellbeing. In the English Effective Preschool, Primary and Secondary Education study (Taggart et al., 2015) outcomes were improved for children where educators used play environments that provided the basis for instructive learning and made the most of shared sustained thinking. Responding to contemporary understandings of the interrelationship between play-based learning and intentional teaching, McLaughlin et al. (2016) advocate support for educator intentionality and professional decision-making to enable quality educational programs and practices.

OSHC, play and leisure

In the out of school hours care literature, notions of play as leisure are also explored. Palsdottir and Kristjansdottir (2017) note that the concept of leisure has the potential to underpin OSHC programs of creativity, fun, holistic learning and social awareness and sense of community. Gorrie and Udah (2020) report on the value of playwork practice to Australian OSHC educators. Projects such as Playworks in the United Kingdom, position full-time coaches in socially disadvantaged primary schools who organise play opportunities at recess and lunch times while fostering social cooperation (Bleeker et al., 2015; Johnston & Cullen, 2020). Hurst (2015, 2019) consults older children to critique play as leisure in OSHC services, suggesting that programming options do not offer experiences with adequate challenge and engagement for their age group.

Main points	Areas supported in the ALFs	Areas to strengthen in the ALFs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clear description of play-based learning as a pedagogical approach and practice in ways that creates a shared understanding • intentionality is for both adult, child and young person and does not rest solely with the educator • the intentional role of the educator in play-based pedagogies is described • investigation of play as leisure, playwork practice and programs such as Playworks • a repertoire of learning and teaching strategies enhances children and young people’s learning and supports program quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning and implementing play-based learning; • collaboration with children (MTOPI); • supports overall ideas of intentionality (MTOPI). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preamble to describe play-based pedagogies • planning and implementing play-based learning • intentionality (MTOPI) and intentional teaching (EYLF) combined with play-based learning.

3.3. Connecting to content/discipline knowledge

It remains contentious to what extent young children can and should engage with subject matter, concepts (big ideas children learn) and skills in early childhood. Wood and Hedges (2016) suggest learning processes are viewed as more important than content or outcomes. At the same time, there is concern in some countries that policy direction is narrowing the curriculum to focus on school preparation (for e.g., Gunnarsdottir, 2014) and pushing out child-centered pedagogies to achieve academic goals (Barblett et al., 2016). However, Te Whariki and the Finnish curriculum reinforce the principles and practices of the ALFs, that “early childhood curriculum empowers the child to learn and grow” (Te Whariki, 2017, npg). In empowering environments, agency is shared, and educators facilitate children/young people’s learning and engagement in a wide range of enriching experiences. Educators collaborate with children/young people to co-construct and extend learning, connecting to discipline knowledge to thoughtfully build upon children/young people’s real-world understandings. Furthermore, working in this way exposes children to “processes and words” that not only expand their thinking, but also provide them with the ‘tools’ to “describe more accurately the processes he or she has used” (Krieg, 2011, p. 52). Studies in Australia and New Zealand have revealed a lack of educator confidence in their content knowledge. Pedagogical support is needed to guide educators’ active positioning, including how a concept should be taught when promoting children’s new concept development in ECEC settings (Hedges in Lewis et al., 2019; McLaughlin et al., 2016).

Often educators view content knowledge with suspicion and at odds with their child-centered philosophies (Hedges in Booker et al., 2014). Hedges describes how educators cannot be experts in all areas but those who have foundational knowledge are more likely to maximise potential learning. She suggests that educators use children’s funds of knowledge (Esteban-Guitart & Moll, 2014) that is represented in their play and provides a foundation for extension into content without pretension. Funds of knowledge is a term that includes children/young people’s knowledge, skills and experiences gained at home and in the community. Educators actively contribute to children/young people successfully attaining knowledge, skills, attitudes and dispositions foundational for future learning. Children/young people’s knowledge is constructed by the integration of knowledge, skills and concepts from a variety of sources such as content knowledge pertaining to personal, discipline area or cultural knowledge bases. Children moving to school are assisted in their transition when educators are aware of how the outcomes of the ALFs connects to the Australian Curriculum. Further, attitudes and dispositions to learning are developed through educators’ thoughtful and responsive curriculum where children and young people are encouraged to discuss ideas and reflect on experiences and situations (SCSA, 2016).

Discussion of content

There is much discussion about what content should be included in learning frameworks used with children and young people. However, there are some areas that have stood out in the scoping of this review and warrant attention. These are in no particular order:

- *Brain development and metacognitive strategies:* Contemporary literature underscores the value of teaching children and young people about how their brains work and what is required for healthy brain development. Childhood is a foundational time where children’s knowledge base and their capacities for metacognition and self-regulation develops significantly (Rosanbalm & Murray, 2017).
- *Oral language and communication:* The importance of a solid foundation in oral language supports the case that the development of basic phonology, syntax, and vocabulary as a fundamental basis in the process of becoming literate (Pascal et al., 2017). Oral language is the backbone of later literacy development and promoting higher order literacy skills before a secure foundation of oral language develops may be detrimental (Pascal et al, 2019).
- *Protective behaviours:* In educating children and young people about self-protective behaviours, educators require curriculum content and teaching strategies that are developmentally appropriate, integrate observable behavioural skills, are inclusive of disabilities and cultural diversity, and involve processes of evaluation (Trew et al., 2021)[this is further addressed in 3.10].
- *Social and Emotional Learning (SEL):* The intentional teaching of Social and Emotional Learning for children of all ages is highlighted by decades of research from the Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL) that demonstrates intentionally teaching Social Emotional Learning (SEL) contributes to long terms success (CASEL, 2021). Hurd & Deutsch (2017) highlight the value of SEL for OSHC curricula.
- *Mathematical and scientific thinking:* Thinking and learning in the areas of mathematics and science begins in infancy and educators assist children to learn about their world with the everyday application of mathematics and science. Using tools of reasoning, doing and problem-solving with rules, numbers and symbols in learning is often linked to explorations and games in ECEC and OSHC settings.
- *STEM:* There has been increasing interest in integrating STEM experiences in early childhood settings, with learning gains in children’s development of “cognitive, affective, and psychomotor skills” (Yildirim, 2021, p. 160).
- *Visual and Creative Arts:* There is significant evidence that children and young people's engagement and knowledge of content, processes, skills and attitudes in the visual and creative arts enhances creativity, self-regulation, communication, belonging and identity (Pascal et al., 2019). Nutbrown (2013) suggests that educators require assistance with a clearer conceptualisation of arts-based learning.
- *Spirituality:* Supporting children’s connectedness with the natural world requires teachers “to promote children’s relationality with nature as a component of their spirituality” (Robinson, 2019, p. 348). Goodcliff (2013) suggests that spirituality assists children and young people in identity formation, expression of their thinking and meaning making.
- *Gender identity:* Promoting gender equality and diversity involves creating opportunities for children and young people to construct understandings in ways that consider “broader contextual dimensions of gender imbalances and inequalities” (Chapman, 2021, p. 13), with space also provided for individuals to “develop their gender identities” (Solomon, 2016, p. 71).
- *Physical Activity and Health:* Incorporating opportunities for children to be physically active, develop health-related fitness, strength, and flexibility, and to practise Fundamental Motor Skills for specialised skill development, increases children’s physical literacy. This, in turn, increases their motivation and confidence to enjoy an active lifestyle with benefits into primary school and adolescence (Figuroa & An, 2017; Lubans et al., 2010). Similarly, building children and young people’s knowledge of nutrition and healthy lifestyle choices

requires educators to maintain currency with health and nutrition guidelines, including infant and young children feeding guidelines.

Main points	Areas supported in the ALFs	Areas to strengthen in the ALFs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • age-appropriate content/discipline knowledge builds children/ young people’s real-world understandings • content/discipline knowledge supports the co-construction of knowledge, higher-level thinking, problem solving and communication with children/young people • children/young people’s funds of knowledge are a practical starting base for connection to expand content/discipline knowledge • knowledge of brain development, metacognition and social emotional learning influences educator’s pedagogy and practices with children/young people • current health, nutrition knowledge and physical activities guidelines assists educators to promote healthy lifestyle choices with children/young people, families and communities • content/discipline knowledge in the EYLF and MTOP relating to the Australian Curriculum made visible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning and implementing play-based learning; • collaboration with children (MTOP); • supports overall ideas of intentionality (MTOP) and intentional teaching (EYLF); • some outcome examples. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning and implementing play-based learning; • leadership • citizenship • collaboration with children (MTOP); • intentionality (MTOP) and intentional teaching; • outcome descriptions and examples • map EYLF and MTOP to Australian Curriculum

3.4. Digital technologies

From a young age, most children are accessing a range of digital technologies in their homes, early childhood and out of school hours settings and communities. However, it is important to recognise and address issues of access and equity for some children, evidenced during school closures and the shift to online teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. Supporting children/young people’s ‘digital citizenship’ requires embedding digital technologies in the EYLF and MTOP, to prioritise “digital play” (Fox & Diezmann, 2017, p. 160). This is highlighted by Goal 3 of the Alice Springs (Mparntwe) Education Declaration (Education Council, 2020, p.7) that describes successful lifelong learners as those who are “productive and informed users of technology as a vehicle for information gathering and sharing and are able to adapt to emerging technologies into the future.” However, the word digital appears only twice in MTOP in the practice of environments and the definition of technology. In the EYLF it is mentioned three times, similar to the two mentions in MTOP but it also appears in Outcome 5. Further complicating the inclusion of digital technologies in the ALFs is a limited research base that has hindered “professional practice and community knowledge” on appropriate ways of supporting children’s engagement (Fox & Diezmann, 2017, p. 160; Straker et al., 2018). Therefore, critical reflection is needed on what is being accessed to support knowledge of learning benefits, along with consideration of safe practices associated with digital technology use. Educators in children/young people’s lives are pivotal to establishing age-appropriate guidelines and expectations (Segal-Drori & Ben Shabat, 2021; Straker et al., 2018; The LEGO Foundation, 2020) and should be aware of the digital divide, as some families do not have the resources or skills to access or use digital technologies and media. The divide shows differences in digital usage according to income, low levels of education, geographic location, age (e.g., are over 65), gender or are unemployed (Lan Fang et al., 2019). Therefore children/young people and their families will have different experiences with digital technologies. This is similar to teachers and educators, as Blackwell et al. (2014 cited in Stamoupolos & Barblett, 2018) found that teachers’ attitudes, confidence and support in using technology were the strongest determinants of technology use with children and young people.

Since 2009, there have been three significant projects focussed on digital technologies. These include Early Childhood Australia’s Statement on Young Children and Digital Technologies (ECA, 2018), Growing up digital (Gonski Institute, 2021) and the newly established Australian Research Council Centre for Excellence for the Digital Child (QUT, 2021). Drawing on the two completed projects, and other relevant literature, ideas to be explored within the curriculum focus on the critical use of digital tools and information, child digital safety, digital use on health and wellbeing (Hilkemeijer, 2020) and the notion of digital citizenship (Zabatiero et al, 2018). Educator views not only mediate the use of digital technologies in the setting, but also influence children’s perceptions of technology appropriateness in preschool contexts (Segal-Drori & Ben Shabat, 2021). Clear learning and teaching goals that recognise the “pedagogical potential” of digital technologies across curriculum areas (Magen-Nagar & Firstater, 2017, as cited in Segal-Drori & Ben Shabat, 2021, p. 37) is required to support their relevance and use with children and young people. This includes building understanding of the difference between active and passive use of technology, and integration of technology in socially and culturally appropriate ways to support children and young people’s exploration and investigation and development of digital citizenship (Johnston et al., 2018). Children/young people’s safety in digital environments and safe use of digital devices is of increasing concern (Straker et al. 2018) and requires consideration by educators. Furthermore, Segal-Drori and Ben Shabat (2021) recommend teachers share meaningful conversations with children about the relevance and use of digital technologies to build a ‘safe use’ environment, with children’s increased “understanding and learning from these technologies” (Segal-Drori & Ben Shabat, 2021, p. 38). An Australian study showed that educators wanted more advice on how digital technologies, augmented devices and apps are being used to build more inclusive programs for all children/young people (Dwyer et al, 2019).

Digital technology and OSHC

There is minimal literature relating to digital technologies in OSHC. Klerfelt (2012) describes educational and developmental benefits connected to a child’s use of digital technologies in a Swedish school age care setting. Klerfelt describes how through the use of technologies children are able to construct their identities as individuals and members of communities, communicate views about matters important to them, and also learn to take the position of others whose experiences might differ from theirs. Mavoa et al. (2020) found similarly that children’s engagement with Minecraft, a popular game in many OSHC settings is characterised by many accepted forms of play. Vigara et al. (2021) are developing Australian guidelines for physical activity and screen time in OSHC.

Main points	Areas supported in the ALFs	Areas to strengthen in the ALFs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> children/young people’s ‘digital citizenship’ is enhanced by embedding digital technologies in curriculum educator’s knowledge, confidence, attitudes and engagement are central in mediating children/young people’s perceptions, critical and safe use of digital technologies digital technologies can enrich learning opportunities for children/young people when appropriately provisioned children/young people (of all capabilities) should be provided ongoing opportunities to use digital technologies, to support learning, leisure, play and creative expression digital use, including documentation brings with it issues of equity, access, audience, and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> learning environments (EYLF) and environments (MTOPI); outcome 5 (EYLF). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> preamble as children/young people are digital citizens; partnerships; ongoing learning and reflective practice; collaboration with children (MTOPI) and responsiveness to children (EYLF) learning environments (EYLF) and environments (MTOPI) cultural competence outcome descriptions and examples in and beyond outcome 5.

'moderated' representations of children's and young peoples' learning		
---	--	--

3.5. Embedding Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives

The Alice Springs Agreement (Mparntwe) Education Declaration (Education Council, 2019, p.5) describes the importance of learning that builds “on and includes local, regional and national cultural knowledge and experience of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and work in partnership with local communities”. Furthermore, children and young people become active and informed members of the community who “come to understand, acknowledge and celebrate the diversity and richness of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and cultures” (Education Council, 2019, p.8). This understanding is supported by a guiding principle of the NQF which is “Australia’s Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures are valued” (ACECQA, 2019, p.10).

Invisibility of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander references in the ALFs

While the words Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander are discussed in the ALFs in the preamble and some outcomes, the terms are not threaded through the documents. Mulhearn (2016, cited in Sumsion et al., 2018, p. 342) suggests that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures, ways of knowing and being are silenced in the EYLF with general statements about diversity, so that “respect for Indigenous knowledges had been rendered close to invisible”. The same argument could be made for MTOP as the words appear seven times in the preamble, principles and one practice but are absent in the outcomes. To meaningfully embed Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives in education and care settings, a holistic approach must be adopted that recognises Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples’ connectedness to people, place and spiritual and cultural histories in ways that move beyond tokenism (Collins & Keenan, 2011; Harrison et al., 2017).

There are concerns educators may lack the experience, knowledge, and the motivation to engage in the learning and understanding of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledges (Lampert et al., 2014). Acknowledging Indigenous knowledges as valuable resources in early childhood education is a crucial first step in mediating the history of educational and social disadvantage experienced across generations (Colquhoun & Dockery, 2012). As a shared community approach (Commissioner for Children and Young People, 2015; Maher & Buxton, 2015), relationships are emphasised, where “Aboriginal ways of knowing, being and doing” inform approaches to pedagogy and practice with children that support “awareness of their social and cultural heritage” (Maher & Buxton, 2015, p. 1). It is essential for educators to take the time to engage with communities and to build strong relationships through professional development and dialogue (Lampert et al 2014). Holzinger and Biddle (2017) suggest positive ways forward involve weaving Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives across teaching practices and programs.

Connecting with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives

To embed Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives, educators should understand that kin relationships and a deep sense of belonging are at the heart of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander culture (Bobongie, 2017). The responsibility for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children is seen as the responsibility of the broader community (Armstrong et al., 2012). Families and kinship systems are complex in their makeup so that everyone has a different cultural obligation and responsibility when it comes to the care of children/young people (Bobongie, 2017). The kinship system provides a support network that link extended family through duty of care. Through kinship, positive effects for children include the retention of cultural knowledge and overall health and wellbeing (Salmon et al., 2019). Understanding these broader family and community connections is important for educators, as family, community and cultural connections affect the well-being of children and young people (Matthews & Burton, 2013).

Demonstrating valuing and respect for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures in settings involves adopting integrated approaches centered on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander ownership of knowledges, community involvement, and culturally sensitive practices (Sydenham, 2019). Holzinger and Biddle (2015), and Miller (2011 cited in Stamopoulos and Barblett, 2018) describe ways in which embedding Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives assist in Reconciliation. They are: practical, where the environment shows that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives are a key part of the everyday curriculum; symbolic, where educators recognise Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as self-determining and rethink what they know about the past and present circumstances of both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Australia; and substantive, where space is made for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people for self-representation and self-determination. Forming respectful reciprocal relationships builds foundations of mutuality that recognise the strength and influence of families in children’s lives, supporting wellbeing, reinforcing identity, and affirming cultural capital (Mason-White, 2012; National Indigenous Australians Agency, 2021).

Main points	Areas supported in the ALFs	Areas to strengthen in the ALFs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander past, present and contributions into the future are acknowledged and valued • Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are the owners and custodians of all their cultural tools (for example knowledges, histories, stories, languages, art, and artifacts) • Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures, ways of knowing and being are currently silenced in the EYLF and MTOP • embedding Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives in ways to assist in Reconciliation • relationships and an understanding of connected kinship systems for cultural connections are key to embedding Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preamble; respect for diversity; • ongoing learning and reflective practice; • holistic approaches; • collaboration with children (MTOP); • responsiveness to children (EYLF). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preamble and vision; • include as a new principle; • respect for diversity; • cultural competence; • ongoing learning and reflective practice; • holistic approaches; • collaboration with children (MTOP) and responsiveness to children (EYLF); • examples in outcomes.

3.6. Cultural responsiveness and providing culturally safe spaces

Educators are required to work effectively with children, young people, and their families from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds (Keengwe, 2010). Developing cultural competency is crucial to “appropriately applying culturally sensitive pedagogy” in educators’ work with children, families, and communities (p. 560). However, educators’ understandings of diversity need to move beyond “visual differences and language background” to meaningfully discuss a range of representations that reflect on silences outside personal experience (Adam et al., 2019, p. 561). The WA Education Department (2015, p.3) asks educators to move beyond competence to “take culturally responsive actions”. Such actions are typified as a respect for culture, self-reflection, learning and a commitment to improvement of practices and relationships. Furthermore, educators respond to diverse knowledge pools that children and young people bring and use these as a foundation for developing learning opportunities (WA Education Department, 2015).

Implementing a culturally responsive approach that embraces spaces of inclusion and belonging, involves moving beyond understandings of cultural competence to critically reflect on the “people, activities, materiality, and institutional and cultural practices” shaping settings (Kyrönlampi et al., 2021, p. 65). For educators this means more deeply interrogating “social, cultural and linguistic diversity” to enact “more inclusive pedagogies” (Miller & Petriwskyj, 2013, p. 251). Aligning with

the UNESCO (2006) principles guiding intercultural education, approaches with children, families and communities need to respect cultural identities. This is done by providing culturally responsive learning experiences that build inclusive attitudes towards diverse groups, enabling children to contribute to respectful practices. Cultural safety extends to all family groups in contemporary society. Educators should be skilled to recognise the diverse makeup of families and how to engage responsively, without bias. Families in ECEC and OSHC services may include single parents, blended families, families experiencing complexity including poverty, drug and alcohol dependencies, children in foster or kinship care and LGBTQI+ families. Research by Cloughessy, et al. (2019) found it was critical for early childhood educators to be skilled in providing a welcoming environment for same-sex families and their children to gain social support and a sense of belonging.

Cultural safety

Cultural safety has been identified as a critical aspect of effective early childhood programs, even more so for those who work with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children/young people and families (Fox et al., 2015). The Alice Springs (Mparntwe) Agreement (Education Council, 2019, p. 16) describe the Australian education system embracing “Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander identities and provide safe learning environments” to support Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander learners to reach their potential. In culturally safe spaces, educators’ address: issues of power, actively counteract issues of racism or discrimination, adapt programs to be responsive to families’ priorities and lived realities, integrate Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives into program design and delivery, and privilege the views of families in determining if a service is culturally safe (Gerlach et al., 2017). Creating culturally safe spaces has been shown to increase attendance of Aboriginal children and participation of families in services (Lee Hammond & Thompson cited in Barblett et al., 2019). Educators all learn from and about their students’ culture, language, and learning styles to make instruction more meaningful and relevant to their students’ lives (Perso & Hayward, 2015). A child or young person from a culturally diverse background will have a more positive transition into a setting, where the educators know the cultural context of the person, and shows respect for other cultures (Keengwe, 2010). Furthermore, children/young people construct place-belonging which is important in building belonging and grows as they navigate the social, material, and institutional dimensions of settings. Understanding children/young people’s perspectives on what makes a place meaningful provides educators with additional insights into “places and events of significance to children” as they navigate their daily lives in institutional spaces (Kyrönlampi et al., 2021, p. 80).

Multi-cultural education

A strong multicultural education program creates culturally safe spaces and builds cultural responsiveness. Adopting a social justice perspective, the Finnish education system has reconceptualised multicultural education, with integration of “multicultural perspectives...throughout the curriculum” which is seen to benefit all students, not just those outside the dominant culture (Zilliacus, 2017, p. 244). The Finnish system uses a pluralistic perspective that focusses on human rights and democracy that informs the curriculum (Zilliacus, 2017). The EYLF is heralded as promoting the delivery of a curriculum that celebrates the diversity between children, families and communities yet some educators using the EYLF required assistance with culturally responsive pedagogy (Adam et al., 2019).

Main points	Areas supported in the ALFs	Areas to strengthen in the ALFs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • culturally responsive learning experiences build inclusive attitudes towards diverse groups • building inclusive attitudes and awareness of diversity involves interrogating representations outside personal experience • educators play a crucial role in questioning and deconstructing narrow cultural representations • educators build culturally safe spaces where all children, young people and their families feel safe and accepted • educators, children/young people need to move beyond cultural competence to cultural responsiveness • children/young people build a sense of belonging and place attachment through their experiences • creating culturally safe spaces increases attendance and family participation in learning • educators and families work together to support wellbeing, reinforce identity, and affirm cultural capital of children and young people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preamble; • cultural competence; • respect for diversity; • ongoing learning and reflective practice • collaboration with children (MTOPI); • assessment for learning (EYLF) and evaluation for wellbeing and learning (MTOPI); • outcome 1, 2 and 5 (EYLF) outcomes 1,2,3 and 5 (MTOPI). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preamble; • secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships; • partnerships; • cultural competence to move to cultural responsiveness; • respect for diversity; • ongoing learning and reflective practice • learning environments (EYLF) and environments (MTOPI); • assessment for learning (EYLF) and evaluation for wellbeing and learning (MTOPI); • descriptions and examples in outcomes.

3.7. Civics and citizenship

Goal 2 of the Alice Springs (Mparntwe) Agreement (Education Council, 2019, p.6) advocates all young Australians “become active and informed members of the community”. Considering children/young people as citizens now rather than citizens in waiting is part of an emerging international discourse to strengthen democracy, human rights, and sustainable futures (Xu, 2019). Opening a “civic space” for children/young people to adopt an active stance in decisions that affect their daily lives is central to their learning and membership in local and global communities of experience (Millei & Sumsion, 2011, p. 79). Aligning the concept of community as a collective approach not only affirms children/young people’s citizenry, but also offers possibilities of building a more socially just society (Millei & Sumsion, 2011). The educator’s role in this process involves modelling principles of democracy, with notions of fairness, empathy and compassion assuming central importance in a participatory framework with children/young people.

Enacting a “pedagogy for social justice” engages the educator alongside children in becoming “more culturally sustaining” and empathetic to the experiences of others (Newcomer & Cowin, 2021, p6 & 16)). In the Finnish curriculum (Finnish National Agency for Education, 2018) ideas of citizenship emerge when children are assisted to take different viewpoints, participate in civic activities of their communities and be actively involved in decision-making. In sharing stories, all stakeholders are encouraged to “think, feel, and reflect upon a lived experience” with shared readings leading to renewed understandings of self and others (Newcomer & Cowin, 2021, p. 17). Within this context, children and young people are provided with appropriate experiences to challenge marginalised representations to better understand their social worlds in ways that embrace democratic approaches and empower diverse voices and perspectives in the classroom (Silva & Langhout, 2011). In an arts-based program in the United States, young people developed a “critical consciousness” shifting thinking from an individual to a ‘collectivistic’ view of their environment where real-life connections were made to community, with actions focused on

improving the “lives and experiences” of those living on “the margins” (Silva & Langhout, 2011, p. 86).

OSHC promoting active citizenship

Seeing children as citizens with a right to active participation in OSHC settings is central to the play-based curriculum approaches practiced in OSHC. How adults conceptualise children’s rights to democratic participation influences the play choices made available to children in their services (Elvstrand & Närvänen, 2016; Bell & Cartmel, 2014). Adults working in Swedish Leisure Time Centres, which philosophically align closely with Australian OSHC, have diverse interpretations of children’s participation rights (Elvstrand & Närvänen, 2016). Educators’ aversion to risk can limit the range of play choices available to children (Bell & Cartmel, 2014, van Rooijen & Newstead, 2016). Having high expectations for children and young people and viewing them as capable rather than vulnerable can therefore contribute to ways of working that support active participation and citizenship.

Main points	Areas supported in the ALFs	Areas to strengthen in the ALFs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • children/young people are active citizens now • children/young people’s understanding of citizenship involve educators modeling principles of democracy, notions of fairness, empathy, and compassion for all • real-life connections to, and activities within, local communities positively influence children’s sense of active citizenship • incorporating a critical approach to multi-cultural education builds children/young people’s cultural responsiveness • children/young people require appropriate experiences to challenge marginalised representations to understand their worlds and make a positive difference • children/young people are actively involved in decision making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preamble; • partnerships (MTOPI); • intentionality (MTOPI); • outcome 4 (MTOPI). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preamble; • high expectations and equity; • partnerships; • collaboration with children (MTOPI) and responsiveness to children (EYLF) • learning environments (EYLF) and environments (MTOPI); • learning through play and intentional teaching/intentionality; • outcomes 1, 2 and 4.

3.8. Inclusion of children and young people with additional requirements

In 2020, the Department of Education, Skills and Employment (DESE) conducted a review of the Disability Standards for Education (Commonwealth of Australia, 2005) and gave four reform directions. They are: to empower and support students with disabilities and their families, strengthen the knowledge and capabilities of educators and providers, embed accountability for the Standards throughout the education system, and build awareness and capability in the ECEC sector (DESE, 2021, p.1). Building awareness and capability in the ECEC sector entails the Australian Government working with all states and territories to develop products to understand the Disability Discrimination Act of 1992.

Reconceptualising inclusion

Erwin and colleagues (2021) advocate the need to reconceptualise inclusion, which requires educators to dismantle labels that are limiting and to appreciate disability as one of the many identities adopted. This requires educators to see beyond an individual’s disability to see the person (NAEYC, 2017). Disability is an umbrella term that incorporates three components: impairments, activity limitations and participation restrictions (World Health Organisation, 2001). Children, young people, and their families can be excluded by others for various reasons, and often unknowingly. Therefore, educators work to identify barriers for children’s ‘doing and being’

in settings so they are included (McKenzie et al., 2016, p.10). Cologon (2013) argues that all children in Australia have the right to an inclusive education, but many experience barriers. These include a lack of understanding of inclusive education, negative and discriminatory attitudes and practices, lack of support from management to support inclusion, and inadequate training of educators and other professionals. Cologon argues key to addressing these barriers is recognising and disestablishing ableism which is discrimination against people who are not able-bodied. The Alice Springs (Mparntwe) Education Agreement (Education Council, 2019, p.5) Goal 1 describes all Australians as having “access to high-quality education that is inclusive and free from any form of discrimination.”

To recognise and disestablish ableism, educators should be aware of how difference is represented in the curriculum. This representation communicates what is considered a natural aspect of who people are as unique individuals and often disabilities are largely omitted or problematised (Erwin et al., 2021). Both the EYLF and MTOP highlight the developmental benefits of inclusion for all children including those with additional needs. However, in OSHC settings these benefits are not widely recognised by the community and government who see OSHC primarily as a site of custodial care (Cartmel & Hurst, 2021). Creating greater awareness of the benefits that OSHC brings children with additional needs might increase their participation in OSHC (Cartmel & Hurst, 2021). Educators are often uncertain how to include children with diverse abilities (Cologon, 2013). Blackmore et al. (2016) identify several elements that support successful inclusion of children/young people with additional needs such as: staff ratios, qualified staff, and commitment to inclusive practice. In addition, educators offering emotional support, providing specific home-school strategies and scaffolding, along with a structured choice-based routine was seen by parents to support their child’s learning alongside typically developing peers, with significant gains reported in communication and behaviour regulation (Blackmore et al., 2016).

Gifted and talented children/young people

Identifying gifted and talented children/young people and responding to their strengths, interests and needs is also another area where educators are under prepared. Identifying children/young people with different capabilities such as gifted and talented children involve a number of related strategies, with professional support required after parent and educator information gathering and observations. Walsh et al. (2010) describe several challenges in supporting young, gifted children in ECEC services and these include: educator uncertainty about adopting more formal school-based activities within an emergent curriculum and extended “one-on-one time” needed to effectively support young, gifted children.

Professional advice and family centred practice

Families who have received a health or developmental diagnosis for their child often find themselves in a system of professionals and services that can be overwhelming. Family-centred practice is a model of engaging the family where a team is built of professionals including the family, where the family are acknowledged as experts who know what is best for their child within their family context (Rouse, 2020). Educators recognise their role as a broker (Mitchell et al, 2017), linking families with other professionals, assisting in accessing resources available in the community to mediate educational and social issues associated with disadvantage. Newman et al. (2020) highlight the importance of ‘wrap-around’ health and educational support services that benefit children and families experiencing social disadvantage. Educators contribute to family-centred practice by learning more about each case, acting on professional advice, assisting families with social support, and acting within the parameters of their expertise (Murray & Harrison, 2017; Barblett et al, 2018). In this way they use all the available information to create inclusive curricula that empowers and supports students with disabilities and their families, a recommendation of the DESE 2020 report (DESE, 2021).

Main points	Areas supported in the ALFs	Areas to strengthen in the ALFs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recast notions of inclusion by dismantling deficit labels and seeing beyond the disability • disability can be seen as one of many identities • multiple discourses of inclusion provide opportunities for children and young people to learn about disability • interrogate deficit discourses to prevent perpetuating discriminatory behaviours • children and young people with a disability and their families are empowered and supported through inclusive curriculum • barriers are removed to create inclusive curriculum • professional diagnosis and ongoing support to develop inclusive curricula may be required • partnerships with other professionals are formed to support and empower children and young people with a disability and their families 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high expectations and equity; • partnerships; • responsiveness to children (EYLF) and collaboration with children (MTOPI); • assessment for learning (EYLF) and evaluation for wellbeing and learning (MTOPI); • learning through play; • outcomes 1, 2 (MTOPI) and 4 (EYLF & MTOPI). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preamble; • partnerships; • high expectations and equity; • respect for diversity; • responsiveness (EYLF) and collaboration with children (MTOPI); • cultural competence; • continuity and transitions; • assessment for learning (EYLF) and evaluation for wellbeing (MTOPI); • outcome descriptions and examples.

3.9. Relational pedagogy

Educators require specific skills in understanding and attuning to children and young people and their social, emotional, and learning behaviours. The EYLF and MTOPI emphasise the centrality of secure, respectful relationships in the attainment of children/young people’s learning outcomes. Recent critiques, however, have highlighted the need to move beyond the idea of relationships as ‘emotionally supportive’ (Cheeseman, 2017), to think about “new possibilities for understanding and enacting relational pedagogies” (Degotardi et al., 2017, p. 358) that promote learning and wellbeing. The Te Whāriki curriculum is an example of a holistic and relational curriculum where the notions of being, belonging and becoming are interconnected to build connections to culture and identity (MoE, 2017). When educator’s tune into children/young people’s funds of knowledge they affirm and strengthen their cultural, linguistic, and social identities.

Moyles and Papatheodorou (2009, cited in Hedges & Cooper, 2018, p.372) articulate relational pedagogy as the interconnections between “attitudes, interpretations and practices”. In ECEC and OSHC services encounters and connections between teachers, educators, children, young people, and their families impact directly on the engagement and learning that happens and informs the daily interactions and practices (Taggart, 2016). Relational pedagogy emphasises connections between adults and children result in teaching, learning and play being blended (Hedges and Cooper, 2018). Such an approach ensures the focus is on quality interactions between children, young people, and their educators, to foster and support academic, social, and emotional growth. Page (2018) argues this requires educators and teachers to move away from self to consider others, emotionally investing in building trusting relationships. Enacting relational pedagogy ensures the focus is on creating safe, trusting spaces for children and their families.

Infants and toddlers

Relational pedagogy for infants and toddlers is often seen through the lens of attachment theory (Bowlby, 1997) and there are complexities of supporting attachment relationships in an ECEC setting (Albin-Clark et al., 2018). Educators’ development of attachment relationships with very

young children is different to that of child and parent and is a complex and responsive process that requires a different set of skills that “adds practical but also emotive and challenging dimensions’ to educator’s work” (Albin-Clark et al., 2018, p.90). Degotardi (2014) contends that protected spaces and enough time needs to be structurally in place for relationships between educators and children to flourish. Relationships are built when educators are attuned to children and young people’s emotional states which brings the action of what Nodding’s (2012) describes as the ethical act of caring. Cooper and Quiñones (2020) caution that infants and toddlers lack visibility in the EYLF so it is important to recognise the youngest children as capable of enacting and expressing an ethic of care alongside responsive educators as co-creators in play (Cooper & Quiñones, 2020).

Engaging families in trusting relationships ensures children/young people’s attitudes, interests, curiosities and knowledge are recognised by educators and guides learning and teaching experiences. Partnerships with families involves developing responsive relationships that fit the individual child/young person and their family. Understanding the context of the child/young person, their family and the community in which they live are all key considerations required of educators to support building relationships (Almendingen et al., 2021; Hadley & Rouse, 2018; Harrison et al., 2017; Rouse 2012). This includes finding ways to communicate that build trust, demonstrate respect for diverse parenting approaches, and developing routines that respond to children’s cues (Cooper & Quiñones, 2020, p. 14).

Relationships between OSHC and schools

In OSHC, triadic relationships between home, OSHC and school are vital in providing high quality care, play and educational environments for children/young people (Cartmel & Hurst, 2021; Cartmel and Hayes, 2016). Kane (2013) argues the values and goals of the school or agency that host the OSHC program should influence the pedagogical practices of educators. Educators and teachers who enact a relational pedagogy work in culturally responsive ways to build trusting partnerships with families, and schools (as host sites for OSHC) to establish routines and expectations that honour the child/young person and their context (Banerjee & Luckner, 2014; Beneke & Cheatham 2016; Cartmel & Grieshaber, 2014).

Main points	Areas supported in the ALFs	Areas to strengthen in the ALFs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relational pedagogies promote children/young people’s learning, development, and wellbeing • educators require knowledge and skills to create safe spaces and to understand and respond to children/young people's behaviours. • relational approaches include tuning into children/young people’s emotional states, intentions and funds of knowledge • partnerships with families involves developing trusting and responsive relationships, with shared exchange of information to build empowerment • relational pedagogies are not just about relationships between educators and children/young people, but all the relationships nested in their professional work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preamble; • secure respectful relationships; • holistic approaches; • responsiveness to children (EYLF) and collaboration with children (MTOPI); • learning through play; • learning environments (EYLF)environments (MTOPI); • continuity and transitions (MTOPI); • outcomes 1, 2, 3, 4 (EYLF) and 5. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • describe relational pedagogy in preamble; • thread through principles, practices, outcome descriptions and examples.

3.10. Mental, physical health and social competence

Much attention has been drawn to the promotion and development of children and young people’s physical, emotional, and mental health. The Alice Springs (Mparntwe) Education Agreement (Education Council, 2019, p.6) in Goal 2 describe confident and creative individuals who “have a sense of self-worth, self-awareness and personal identity that enables them to manage their emotional, mental, cultural, spiritual and physical wellbeing.” Strong identities, a sense of positive self-worth and connections to others assists in positive mental health. The Queensland Health Department (2018) reports that teaching children and young people about mental health, and strategies to maintain it, are as important as learning about physical health. The Department asserts that teaching and talking “about mental health from a young age can help them (individuals) understand their emotions, become more resilient, reduce stigma about mental illness, and teach them how to look after themselves mentally as well as physically” (Queensland Health Department, 2018, p.1). Durlak and colleague’s (2010) OSHC research found four key practices were associated with effective programs teaching personal and social skills. These included: sequenced, active, focused, and explicit program outcomes. Milton et al. (2021) have codesigned a health and wellbeing program for use in an Australian OSHC settings and the model is under evaluation. The nature of the pandemic, Australian bushfires and other events in recent times means that educators can materially assist children and young people with dealing with loss, dislocation, transitions (moving from home back to educational settings) and build resilience (e.g., Krakouer et al., 2017).

Trauma informed practice

Trauma can occur when adverse events (single or multiple) threaten a person’s ability to cope (Kezleman, 2014). Loomis (2018) and Bartlett and Smith (2019) highlight the importance for those impacted by trauma by implementing positive emotional support structures within the learning environment, including predictable routines, safety and belonging that build on educator-child/young people’s relationships. Building quality relationships or relational safety is fundamental to providing positive experiences of connection which forms the basis for children/young people affected by trauma, to learn to do a variety of tasks including how to feel safe exploring new situations and how to initiate and maintain relationships (Ayre & Krishnamoorthy, 2020).

Healthy lifestyles and teaching protective behaviours

To support children’s physical, emotional and mental wellbeing, educators require knowledge of healthy lifestyles, including adequate forms of nutrition, sleep and the physical benefits of movement. Malek-Lasater et al.’s (2021) study found that whilst educators showed strengths in creating responsive mealtime contexts, much more could be done to combat child obesity and the role of ECEC settings is central in advocating healthy lifestyle practices. Furthermore, benefits in creating “consistency and congruence” between ECEC services and health professionals is identified as a means of supporting “optimal outcomes” for children’s development (Malek-Lasater et al., 2021, p. 11).

The Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse (2017) recommendation 6.2 calls for a national strategy to prevent child sexual abuse with mandatory teaching of preventative education in preschools and schools. Children/young people are exposed to many personal safety issues such as “physical and emotional trauma of bullying, cyberbullying, exclusions, sexual abuse, physical abuse, emotional abuse and living with domestic violence” (WA Department of Education, 2016, p.13). Any information provided about child/young people’s safety must be respectful of children/young people’s cultural backgrounds and accessible for all children/young people including children from linguistically diverse backgrounds, and those with disabilities. Teachers and educators in early childhood settings are uniquely positioned to “observe children’s behaviour and development and identify any issues of concern” (McInnes & Ey, 2020, p. 1).

Physical movement

Globally, children/young people are becoming less active with a rise in sedentary behaviours and a decrease in physical activity (Bundy et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2019). The EYLF and MTOP describe holistic learning and development across five outcomes including health and wellbeing yet international evidence suggests that “significant numbers of pre-schoolers fail to meet physical activity recommendations while attending day care” (Maitland et al., 2016, npg). Research shows the benefits of physical movement on children and young people’s cognitive and social emotional development (Engelen et al., 2013), positive wellbeing, school functioning and achievement (Gasser et al., 2018). However, recent reviews have highlighted vast variations in ECEC services’ provisions for and encouragement of physical activity (O’Brien et al., 2018; Saunders et al., 2019).

Within this context, there is a particular need to consider younger children. The physical potentials of infants and toddlers appear to be largely ignored when considering outdoor environments, with protection and natural hazard reduction emphasised (Kemp & Josephidou, 2021; Kernan & Devine, 2010; Morrissey et al., 2015; Rouse, 2015). So too, recent research into toddlers’ risk-taking and risky play experiences emphasises the opportunities provided by well-planned and exciting outdoor environments (Little & Stapleton, 2021). Dismantling limiting narratives involves aligning pedagogy with the EYLF Learning Outcomes highlighting children’s agency and capabilities (see DEEWR, 2009). This involves reconceptualising teacher-held narratives of exclusion associated with young children’s safety to embrace value for the outdoors as important spaces of “holistic learning and development” (Kemp & Josephidou, 2021, p. 12). Diminished stress, enjoyment and opportunities for “physical activity and fitness” also make nature a unique “resource for learning” (Kuo et al., 2019, p. 1). This is true for all ages. Scottish OSHC services found the use of outdoor spaces made it easier to respond to COVID 19 safe protocols. Beginning with recognition that multidisciplinary learning occurs in living spaces (see Constable, 2012; Sedgwick, 2012), there needs to be greater continuity across indoor and outdoor contexts (Schenetti & Guerra, 2018) to promote children’s learning (Kemp & Josephidou, 2021).

Executive function and positive behaviours

Nested within health and wellbeing is a growing discourse on the role of executive function and self-regulation that requires skills of working memory, behavioural inhibition and mental flexibility, necessary for positive behaviour and the selection of sound choices (Harvard University, 2021). Furthermore, teaching children and young people strategies about developing a growth mindset assists with overall wellbeing and positive sense of self as a learner (Boylan, 2021). The recent review of the United Kingdom’s Early Years Foundation stage (EYFS) recommended a strengthened focus on the “enhancement of mental health and wellbeing through teaching Expressive Arts and Design” (Pascal et al., 2019). Equally, Cartmel, et al. (2019) note this emphasis for children aged 9-12 years.

Professional support to inform practice

Responding to children displaying problematic sexual behaviours (PSB), preschool and primary teachers involved in McInnes and Ey’s (2020, p.12) study overwhelmingly called for an “interdisciplinary and whole community approach” to best support all stakeholders. At the same time, access to onsite professional support in the form of child therapists was also deemed useful for supporting “affected children and families”, whilst also “providing guidance” for teachers in “managing future PSB incidents” (McInnes & Ey, 2020, p. 12). Multiple challenges were identified in responding to PSB, with access and communication between educators and child support services seen as problematic, teachers also requiring additional professional support and training to effectively respond to families (McInnes & Ey, 2020). In relation to OSHC there is scant literature on child protection matters. Hadley and colleagues’ (2021) research noted there was often a gap between schools and the OSHC service, especially when dealing with child protection matters. Their

research noted that educators had gaps in knowledge in how to support children and young people who are subjects of allegations, as well as understanding what ‘normal’ sexualized behaviours look like in OSHC.

Main points	Areas supported in the ALFs	Areas to strengthen in the ALFs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • educators actively promote children/young people’s positive mental and emotional health and physical activity • educators support children/young people’s understandings of the positive connection between physical activity, mental health and healthy lifestyles • children/young people learn about executive function and strategies for a positive growth mindset • children/young people’s experiences in nature and outdoor play environments increases their learning capacities, as well as physical and emotional wellbeing • outdoor environments support all areas of infants’ and toddlers’ learning, development and wellbeing • educator concerns about safety and risk limit young children’s play potential • children/young people learn about healthy lifestyles, including adequate forms of nutrition and healthy eating habits, sleep and the physical benefits of movement • an interdisciplinary approach supports educators’ understanding and appropriate responses to children and young people’s sexual behaviours • educators require professional development to teach protective behaviours and increase knowledge of child protection • trauma informed practices adopt positive emotional supports that build on educator-child/young people relationships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preamble; • holistic approaches; • environments (MTO) and learning environments (EYLF); • evaluation for wellbeing and learning (MTO) and assessment for learning (EYLF); • outcomes 1, 2, 3 and 4. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preamble; • secure respectful, reciprocal relationships; • partnerships; • respect for diversity; • responsiveness to children (EYLF) and collaboration with children (MTO); • learning through play • intentional teaching (EYLF), intentionality (MTO); • learning environments; • cultural competence • outcome descriptions and examples (especially outcome 3)

3.11. Sustainability and environmental education

The benefits of children/young people playing outdoors and engaging with their natural environment is an historical and enduring principle in education and care. A review of contemporary literature in this context reveals two themes: environmental education and sustainability. While overlapping and interconnected, Davis and Elliot (2014) argue the need for education and care to adopt a broader definition of sustainability, pointing to global initiatives (e.g., the Brundtland Report, 1987) that extend beyond a focus on the natural environment to include social and economic sustainability. This definition promotes three dimensions of sustainability; environmental, social and economic sustainability which are seen to be intertwined, not separate. The Brundtland Report describes sustainable development as that which “meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, p. 8). Davis (2015) strongly advocates the need to adopt a broader view in early childhood education for sustainability and the interest and ability of children, even very young children, to engage with these concepts of sustainability. In support of children’s ability to engage with the big questions of global sustainability, she highlights that ‘enough for all forever’ was a description used by a young person at an international conference in Australia to define sustainability.

The natural world

Engagement with nature not only contributes to our emotional and physical wellbeing, but also supports our learning of the natural world, building a sense of stewardship and conservation (Dennis et al., 2014) and is vital for our present and future sustainability (Common Worlds Research Collective, 2020). Early childhood education has an important role in redefining our relationship with place by instilling the concept of interdependence, whereby we come to understand our place *within* the world rather than existing apart from it (Common Worlds Research Collective, 2020). There are numerous benefits associated with natural spaces including “positive learning outcomes”, teacher co-construction of learning, reduced behavioural issues, and increased levels of wellbeing (Dennis et al., 2014, p. 48). Heightened levels of engagement along with supportive learning dynamics are also a result of children’s immersion in “nature classrooms” (Dennis et al., 2014, p. 48). Furthermore, there is increasing recognition of the equal value of “environmental stewardship” alongside “academic content knowledge” (Kuo et al., 2019, p. 6), with education and living viewed as a seamless encounter of connectedness; planet protection seen as integral to lived experience (Quay & Jensen, 2018). However, aspects of unpredictability and possibilities and educator fears and concerns can sometimes limit the affordances of outdoor spaces for building children’s relationship with the natural world (Schenetti & Guerra, 2018).

Agency and sustainability

Contemporary global policy and research promotes a view of sustainability that includes but extends beyond sustainability of the natural environment. While the EYLF and MTOP advocate for children and educators to play active roles in sustainability, Elliott and Young (2015) suggest that a historical focus on children playing and engaging with their natural environment has led educators to “nature by default practices”, rather than ethically informed worldviews about sustainability. Advocating the need to embrace a systems theory approach, and broader definition of sustainability, beyond nature play, Ärlemalm-Hagsér and Davis (2014, p. 240) argue that children’s agency and their active role in global change needs “stronger articulation” in the EYLF. The Finnish National Core Curriculum for Pre-primary (Finnish National Board for Education, 2014, p. 80) describes part of their environmental education that “creates a foundation for a sustainable way of living by familiarising children with nature preservation. Children are guided to take care of their environment.”

OSHC, global citizenship and sustainability

Internationally, there is growing interest in the contribution of ECEC and OSHC to promoting global citizenship and addressing issues of fairness, social justice, and equity, which correspond with the broader definition of sustainability. Reflecting on this, several other early years curricula (e.g., Norway, Sweden, Japan, and Korea) include an underpinning principle of sustainability, positioning children and young people as competent problem-solvers, able to engage with complex problems and to enact positive change (Elliott, et al., 2020).

Main points	Areas supported in the ALFs	Areas to strengthen in the ALFs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> contemporary perspectives of sustainability include environmental education alongside social and economic aspects of sustainability sustained engagement in nature builds emotional and physical wellbeing and environmental awareness and positive attitudes to learning outdoors cultivating a sense of interdependence with nature is vital for present and future sustainability children and young people are interested in broader issues of sustainability, including fairness, social justice and equity children and young people exercise agency to further sustainability and take positive actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> environments (MTOF) and learning environments (EYLF); outcome 2. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> preamble, include a principle of sustainability; partnerships; responsiveness to children (EYLF) and collaboration with children (MTOF); learning through play; intentionality (MTOF) and intentional teaching (EYLF); learning environment (EYLF) and environments (MTOF); outcome descriptions and examples (particularly outcomes 2 and 4)

3.12. Transitions and continuity

Children/young people make multiple transitions everyday such as moving from home to an ECEC setting (horizontal) and within their ECEC settings (Harrison, 2016), likewise in OSHC, and larger vertical transitions such as starting school or high school. Transitions are times of change in which children/young people, families and educators adjust to new roles, identities, expectations, interactions and relationships (DETVIC, 2017). The key to successful transitions is collaborative partnerships, with consistent exchange of information across care, educational and home contexts affirming children and young people’s identities and wellbeing (Babić, 2017; Dockett & Perry, 2013; Peters, 2010). Successful transition experiences influence children’s potential in that setting, and their ability to cope with all future transitions (OECD, 2017, p.13).

Changes to children and young people’s identity is appropriately supported when educators adopt a strengths-based approach that recognises children/young people’s funds of knowledge (Dockett & Perry, 2013; Peters, 2010). The more similarity that children experience between settings and the less discontinuity around learning, teaching and relationships, the more likely it is that children/young people will move confidently from one setting to another (Dockett & Perry, 2014). A child’s individual personal characteristics, their family background and experiences will have an influence on how well they adjust to the challenges of a new situation (Harrison, 2016). Educators play a key role in creating continuity, where a deeper understanding of strategies for enhancing transitions can materially assist children in their movements across settings (Barblett et al., 2011). Educators make connections to children/young people’s families and other transition settings such as school or high school. Hansford (2019) however suggests that educators have limited awareness of curriculum alignment between ECEC settings and schools which is necessary to assist continuity in learning. To preserve learning pathways, recognising children’s learning trajectories is essential to ensure learning links are not lost (Hansford, 2019).

Debates on school readiness

There is evidence in Australia and around the world that there is an inappropriate focus on each child’s readiness for school with perceived pressure to push more academic school-like curriculum in prior to school settings (Dockett & Perry, 2015). There are many constructions as to what constitutes readiness but Christenson et al (2020, npg) show that school readiness constructs should “shift from a focus on child capacities to one that includes factors “outside” the child, such as parent, school and community elements of school readiness.” Furthermore, issues around tools

used to assess children’s ‘readiness’ are often conceptualised in developmental terms, thereby marginalising particular groups, resulting in deficit ‘unready’ labelling (Dockett & Perry, 2013). For Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children the concept of school readiness is drawn from western conceptions of readiness and often does not allow for other ways of knowing, being or doing (Lee-Hammond & Hesterman, 2019). In reviewing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children’s school engagement programs, Higgins and Morely (2014) found effective transition programs included schools that supported and empowered parents to assist their child’s learning; created a place where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander culture is respected; and linked parents to other parents and other community resources. However, Moyle (2019) reports that often Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander values and ways of knowing are overlooked and schools look to children and young people to do the adapting. Schools, ECEC and OSHC settings are required to create culturally safe spaces because as Taylor (2011, p. 150) points out, “anxiety in early schooling transition is likely to impact significantly on children’s well-being and/or comfort and subsequently their willingness to attend”.

Transitions for children with diverse backgrounds and additional needs

Transitions can be particularly challenging for children who are considered “outside the mainstream” which requires careful planning and collaborative efforts to support effective transitions (Warren & Harden-Thew, 2019, p. 63). It is critical that educators recognise the strengths and capabilities of children/young people and families to support children and families from diverse backgrounds during these transitions. Warren and Harden-Thew (2019) note this requires educator training regarding attitudes and practices to ensure responsive relationships are enacted. Interestingly, families with English as an additional language do not appear to be as involved in ECEC/ OSHC settings and schools, with educators using “fewer strategies to involve these families compared to families who spoke English as their main language” (Murray et al., 2015, p. 1049). This research would suggest that educators may require support to improve their range of strategies to communicate with families with English as an additional language.

Everyday transitions within settings

As a significant (and often overlooked) experience in the lives of children and families, transitions *within* contexts also require involvement from all stakeholders to develop responsive strategies that support children’s positive transition (O’Farrelly & Hennessy, 2014). In relation to OSHC these transition points extend to linking OSHC educators and school management, as Principals’ attitudes play a key role in how transitions occur. Supporting transitions from home to school for all children, regardless of their age, is critical for establishing positive experiences. In adjusting to new learning and social dynamics, children and young people’s friendships are recognised as pivotal in easing this transition and supporting wellbeing (Danby et al., 2012).

Main points	Areas supported in the ALFs	Areas to strengthen in the ALFs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> children/young people make multiple transitions daily as well as at key transition points (vertically and horizontally) educators have a major role in assisting children/young people with effective transitions and continuity of experience (e.g., continuity of curriculum and pedagogy as children move from preschool to school) consistent exchanges of information support transitions to and from home/settings and school concepts of ‘readiness’ and its assessment require broader considerations with appropriate tools to support diverse learners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> vision for learning (EYLF); partnerships; continuity and transitions; outcome 1 and 3 (MTOF) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> preamble; partnerships; high expectations and equity; responsiveness to children (EYLF) collaboration with children (MTOF); environments (MTOF) and

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • children/young people’s changing identities are affirmed when a strengths-based approach recognising and using their funds of knowledge is adopted • educators assist children/young people’s transitions when connections are made between transitional settings • children/young people’s learning trajectories between settings are recognised so essential learning links are not lost • connections between the ALFs and Australian Curriculum should be made clearer to teachers and educators in both settings • effective transitions for children/young people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds involves adopting a strengths-based approach • supporting Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children/young people’s transitions involves valuing other ways of knowing, being and doing 		<p>learning environments (EYLF);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cultural competence; • continuity and transitions, • outcome descriptions and examples
---	--	---

Appendix 1: Mapping similar frameworks to the EYLF

Learning Outcomes KEY

✓ = supported

✓ = somewhat supported

The frameworks are nominally mapped to the EYLF in this table. Not all connections have been made but it is a demonstration of areas that support and require strengthening. Most frameworks support all the principles and practices of the EYLF, however the degree of support has not been mapped, as some areas for strengthening have been described.

Country and name of Framework	Main ideas of the Frameworks		EYLF areas supported					EYLFs areas to be strengthened		
	Principles or underlying ideas	Areas for teaching and learning/outcomes/goals	Principles	Practices	L O 1	L O 2	L O 3	L O 4	L O 5	Principles/Practices/ Outcomes
Belgium MeMoQ (Measuring and Monitoring Quality in Childcare for Babies and Toddlers) <i>A pedagogical framework for childcare for babies and toddlers</i>	Every child is unique. Holistic approach. Family and community influence. Children’s agency. Respect, inclusion and democracy. Sustainability.	Me and the Other Body and Movement Communication and Expression Exploration of the World Specific teaching approaches: Holistic approach. Emotional safety. Stimulating role models. Opportunities for autonomy. Individualised approach. Living harmoniously Integrated experiences.	- Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity - Ongoing learning and reflective practice	- Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play - Intentional teaching - Learning environments - Cultural competence - Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes (i) Infants and toddlers recognized throughout (ii) Civics and citizenship (iii) The principle of partnerships to include working with diverse families, creating culturally safe spaces and strengthening connections with child and family and other professionals (iv) Add principle of sustainability with wider definition LO2- Concepts of sustainability LO3- Extend understanding and practice of wellbeing by integrating physical movement skills, social and emotional competence and self-regulation LOs - Examples for infants and toddlers
Canada Alberta Kindergarten	Knowledge of child development is key. Development is influenced not determined	Personal and social responsibility Citizenship and identity Early Literacy	- Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships	- Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes (i) Planning for learning and cycles of decision-making informing curriculum in preamble (ii) Connect content and discipline knowledge

Curriculum 2011	<p>by early experiences. Children learn and interact in a variety of experiences. Co-constructors of knowledge. Children are citizens and active participants in school and society. Children are active collaborators in and users of assessment. Children may require specialised programs and supports to develop knowledge, skills and attitudes to prepare them for later learning. Children and families may need coordinated community services.</p>	<p>Physical skills and wellbeing Creative and cultural expression. Environment and community awareness. Mathematics. Infusion of ICT across areas of instruction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity - Ongoing learning and reflective practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Learning through play - Learning environments - Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning 						<p>(iii) Add principle of sustainability with wider definition (iv) Digital technologies throughout LO1 - Identity as a citizen LO2- Concepts of sustainability: children’s active citizenry with connection to community LO3- Extend understanding and practice of wellbeing by integrating fundamental movement skills, including mental health promotion, and resilience LO4- Children and young people’s thinking; deliberative inquiry; concepts of mathematical and scientific thinking and learning LO4 & LO5- Use of digital technologies to support children’s thinking, learning, inquiry and communication</p>
<p>England Early Years Foundation Stage</p>	<p>Children are unique. Positive relationships. Enabling environments. Teaching and support from adults. Children learn and develop at different rates. Three characteristics of effective teaching: - Playing and exploring - Active learning - Creative and critical thinking</p>	<p>Seven areas of learning and development. Three prime areas: - Communication and language - Physical development - Personal, social and emotional development Four specific areas: - Literacy - Mathematics - Understanding the world</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity - Ongoing learning and reflective practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play - Intentional teaching - Learning environments - Cultural competence 	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes (i) Include description of planning and assessment cycle (ii) Connect learning through play and intentional teaching (iii) Describe assessment with more clarity LOs- Connect content and discipline knowledge; include more examples of expressive arts; describe effective learning examples for particular age groups; digital learning LO2- Children’s active citizenry LO4- Children and young people’s thinking and the language of learning; concepts of</p>

		- Expressive arts and design		- Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning						mathematical and scientific thinking and learning; executive function LO5- Oral language foundations; language and literacy
Europe ISSA Quality Framework 0-3	Centrality of relationships. Child as an active participant. Holistic development. Healthy and safe environments enhance development and learning. Family as primary source of influence and responsibility. Integrated and intersecting approach to EC services and child development policies.	Relationships Family and Community Inclusion, diversity and values of democracy. Health, well-being and nutrition. Development and learning. Observation, documentation, reflection and planning. Enabling environments Professional development. Intersectoral cooperation.	- Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity - Ongoing learning and reflective practice	- Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play - Intentional teaching - Learning environments - Cultural competence - Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes (i) Clarify the meaning of holistic approaches including the connection between the vision, principles, practices and learning outcomes: relational pedagogy (ii) Expanding the principle of ongoing learning and reflective practice to further strengthen critical reflection as guiding professional practice (iii) Civics and citizenship (iv) Environments, inclusion and agency (v) Planning for learning, assessment and cycles of decision-making informing curriculum LO1- Identity as a citizen LO2- Children’s active citizenry LO3- Extend understanding and practice of wellbeing by integrating physical movement skills, social and emotional competence and self-regulation LOs- Examples of working with other professionals to support children’s learning; examples for infants and toddlers
Finland Finnish Curriculum for ECEC	Intrinsic value of childhood. Growth as a human being. Rights of the child. Equity, equality and diversity. Diversity of families.	Transversal competencies: - Thinking and learning - Cultural competence - Interaction and self-expression	- Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships	- Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Principles/Practices- (i) Relational pedagogy (ii) The principle of partnerships to include working with diverse families, creating culturally safe spaces and strengthening connections with child and family and other professionals

	<p>Healthy and sustainable ways of living. Play and exploration. Adult guidance. Relationships. Children as active agents and participants in community activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Learning to take care of oneself - Multi-literacy and ICT competence - Participation and involvement skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity - Ongoing learning and reflective practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intentional teaching - Learning environments - Cultural competence - Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning 						<p>(iii) Cultural responsiveness and providing culturally safe spaces (iii) Civics and citizenship LO1- Identity formation and diversity; LO2- Concepts of sustainability; exploring diversity and discrimination; notions of fair and unfair; cultural and linguistic diversity LO3- Extend understanding and practice of wellbeing by integrating fundamental movement skills, including mental health promotion, protective behaviours, and resilience LO4- Children and young people’s thinking and the language of learning; creative arts LO4&LO5- Educators’ understanding and use of digital technologies to support children’s thinking and learning; children who speak another language</p>
<p>Ireland Aistear Siolta</p>	<p>Children and their lives in early childhood: -Children are unique -Equality and diversity -Children as citizens Children’s connections with others: - Relationships - Parents, family and community The adult’s role How children learn and develop: - Holistic learning and development - Active learning</p>	<p>Themes: Wellbeing Identity and belonging Communicating Exploring and thinking Six interconnected curriculum pillars: - Building partnerships with parents - Creating and using the learning environment - Learning through play - Nurturing and extending interactions - Planning and assessing using <i>Aistear’s</i> themes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity - Ongoing learning and reflective practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play - Intentional teaching - Learning environments - Cultural competence - Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning 	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes (i) Relational pedagogy (ii) Clarify the meaning of holistic approaches to learning and teaching, including the connection between the vision, principles, practices and learning outcomes (iii) The principle of partnerships to include working with diverse families, creating culturally safe spaces and strengthening connections with child and family professionals and school communities (iv) Planning for learning and cycles of decision-making informing curriculum; assessment expanded (v) Civics and citizenship (vi) Learning environments – inclusive, empowering, planned for learning</p>

	-Plan and hands-on experiences -Communication and language - The learning environment									(vii) Intentionality in play-based learning LO2- Children’s active citizenry; connections to community LO4- More than thinking (learning and/or exploring, reasoning); LO4- Children and young people’s thinking and the language of learning
Jamaica The Jamaica Early Childhood Curriculum Guide	Wellness. Communication. Valuing culture. Intellectual empowerment Respect for self, others and the environment. Resilience	Thematic Integrated Curriculum: - Concepts and content - Suggested learning activities - Vocabulary - Sight words - Preparing for learning (Practitioner strategies) - Supporting children - Look, listen, note - Involving parents	- Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity - Ongoing learning and reflective practice	- Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play - Intentional teaching - Learning environments - Cultural competence - Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes (i) Embedding cultural perspectives i.e. identity, social and cultural heritage (ii) Cultural responsiveness and providing culturally safe spaces (iii) Civics and citizenship (iv) The principle of partnerships to include working with diverse families, creating culturally safe spaces and strengthening connections with child and family professionals and school communities LOs- Examples connect content and discipline knowledge LO1- Cultural identity LO2- Concepts of sustainability; children’s active citizenry LO3- Resilience and persistence LO4- multimodal learning; intellectual empowerment
New Zealand Te Whariki	Bicultural foundation and multicultural immersion. Empowerment. Holistic development. Family and community. Relationships. Children’s rights. Learning dispositions and children’s working theories.	Wellbeing Belonging Contribution Communication Exploration	- Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - High expectations and equity	- Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play - Intentional teaching	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes (i) Embedding First Nations perspectives i.e. identity, social and cultural heritage and (ii) Relational pedagogy (iii) Leadership (iv) Cultural responsiveness and providing culturally safe spaces

	<p>Other ideas included: Pathways to school; underpinning theories and approaches; considerations for leadership, organisation and practice; questions for reflection.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respect for diversity - Ongoing learning and reflective practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Learning environments - Cultural competence - Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning 						<p>(v) Clarify the meaning of holistic approaches to learning and teaching, including the connection between the vision, principles, practices and learning outcomes in both frameworks</p> <p>(vi) The principle of partnerships to include working with diverse families, creating culturally safe spaces and strengthening connections with child and family professionals and school communities</p> <p>(vii) Planning for learning and cycles of decision-making informing curriculum; critical reflection; assessment</p> <p>(viii) Continuity and transition</p> <p>LOs- Examples for different age groups</p> <p>LO1- Multiple and changing identities; cultural and linguistic identities are recognised and affirmed; family and kinship systems important to identity; funds of knowledge are used; agency and participation; dispositions</p> <p>LO2- Children’s active citizenry; community participation; sustainability of social, cultural, physical and economic environments.</p> <p>LO3- Protective behaviours; diversity; physical activity; persistence and resiliency; social skills</p> <p>LO4- Working theories; exploration; children’s thinking and the language of learning; metacognition and other cognitive strategies for thinking and reasoning</p>
<p>Scotland Curriculum for Excellence (ages 3 to 18)</p>	<p>Four fundamental capacities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Successful learners - Confident Individuals - Effective Contributors - Responsible Citizens. 	<p>Learning across four contexts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opportunities for personal achievement - Interdisciplinary learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play 	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes</p> <p>(i) Embedding multi-cultural perspectives i.e. identity, social and cultural heritage</p> <p>(ii) Cultural responsiveness and providing culturally safe spaces with child and family professionals and school communities</p>

<p>And</p> <p>Be You (birth to early years of school) 2020</p>	<p>Recognition that education and learning is lifelong. Children to develop understanding of self as an individual and with others in families and communities. Children need opportunities to develop knowledge, skills and attributes to thrive in an interconnected world. Children as democratic citizens and active shapers of that world.</p> <p>Being me: baby; toddler; a young child. Attachment. Relationships. Schemas. Trauma informed practice. Equity. Importance of play and child centred pedagogy. Early childhood curriculum and leadership. Leading learning with families. Pedagogical practice.</p>	<p>- Curriculum areas and subjects - Ethos and life of the school as a community Eight curriculum areas: - Expressive arts - Health and wellbeing - Languages (including English, Gàidhlig, Gaelic learners, modern languages and classical languages) - Mathematics - Religious and moral education</p> <p>What I need to grow and develop: executive function and self-regulation, communication and language, confidence, creativity and curiosity, movement and coordination, and self and social development.</p>	<p>- High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity Ongoing learning and reflective practice</p>	<p>- Intentional teaching - Learning environments - Cultural competence - Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning</p>		<p>(iii) Clarify the meaning of holistic approaches to learning and teaching, including the connection between the vision, principles, practices and learning outcomes (iv) The principle of partnerships to include working with diverse families, creating culturally safe spaces and strengthening connections with child and family professionals and school communities (v) Learning through play and the role of the intentional adult; schemas in play and thinking (vi) Planning for learning and cycles of decision-making informing curriculum (vii) Executive function (viii) Trauma informed practice LOs - in examples connect content and discipline knowledge; babies and toddlers highlighted; examples across age groups LO1- cultural and linguistic identity; LO2- Children’s active citizenry and participation; cultural and linguistic diversity; LO3- Extend understanding and practice of wellbeing by integrating fundamental movement skills, including mental health promotion, and resilience; self-regulation; social skills LO4- Children and young people’s thinking and the language of learning; ethics; concepts of mathematical and scientific thinking and learning LO5- Multi-modal language and literacy; LO4&LO5- Educators’ understanding and use of digital technologies to support children’s thinking and learning</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

<p>Singapore Nurturing early learners. A framework for a Kindergarten Curriculum for Singapore</p>	<p>Holistic development and learning. Integrated learning Active learning. Supporting learning. Learning through interactions. Learning through play.</p>	<p>Aesthetics and creative expression. Environmental awareness. Language and literacy Motor skills development Numeracy Self and social awareness</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity Ongoing learning and reflective practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play - Intentional teaching - Learning environments - Cultural competence - Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning 	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>Principles/practices- (i) Embedding culturally diverse perspectives i.e. identity, social and cultural heritage (ii) Cultural responsiveness and providing culturally safe spaces with child and family professionals and school communities (iii) Clarify the meaning of holistic approaches to learning and teaching, including the connection between the vision, principles, practices and learning outcomes (iv) Planning for learning and cycles of decision-making informing curriculum (v) Continuity and transition LOs- In examples connect content and discipline knowledge; include more examples of expressive arts LO1- Identity LO3- Extend understanding and practice of wellbeing by integrating fundamental movement skills, including mental health promotion, and resilience; self-regulation; social skills LO4- Concepts of mathematical and scientific thinking and learning; reasoning, problems solving; dispositions for learning LO4&LO5- Educators’ understanding and use of digital technologies to support children’s thinking and learning; language and literacy</p>
<p>United States of America California Preschool Guidelines</p>	<p>Children are personally and socially competent. Children are effective learners. Children show physical and motor competence.</p>	<p>Five Essential Domains: - Social and Emotional Development - Language and Literacy Development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play 	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes (i) Embedding diverse cultural perspectives i.e. identity, social and cultural heritage</p>

	<p>Children are safe and healthy. Families support their child’s learning and development. Families achieve their goals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cognition and General Knowledge -Physical Wellbeing and Motor Development - Approaches Toward Learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity Ongoing learning and reflective practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intentional teaching - Learning environments - Cultural competence - Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (ii) Cultural responsiveness and providing culturally safe spaces with child and family professionals and school communities (iii) Clarify the meaning of holistic approaches to learning and teaching, including the connection between the vision, principles, practices and learning outcomes (iv) The principle of partnerships to include working with diverse families, creating culturally safe spaces and strengthening connections with child and family professionals and school communities (v) Planning for learning and cycles of decision-making informing curriculum; assessment (vi) Continuity and transition LOs - Examples to connect content and discipline knowledge LO3- Extend understanding and practice of wellbeing by integrating fundamental movement skills, including mental health promotion, protective behaviours, and resilience LO4- Children’s active citizenry LO4- Children and young people’s thinking and the language of learning
<p>Headstart Child Development and Early Learning Framework 3-5 years</p>	<p>Each child is unique and can succeed. Learning occurs within the context of relationships. Families are children’s first and most important caregivers, teachers, and advocates.</p>	<p>Eleven Domains:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Physical Development & Health 2. Social & Emotional Development 3. Approaches to Learning 4. Language Development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play - Intentional teaching - Learning environments 	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Embedding culturally diverse perspectives i.e. identity, social and cultural heritage (ii) Cultural responsiveness and providing culturally safe spaces with child and family professionals and school communities (iii) Clarify the meaning of holistic approaches to learning and teaching, including the

	<p>Children learn best when they are emotionally and physically safe and secure. Areas of development are integrated, and children learn many concepts and skills at the same time. Teaching must be intentional and focused on how children learn and grow. Every child has diverse strengths rooted in their family’s culture, background, language, and beliefs.</p>	<p>5. Literacy Knowledge & Skills 6. Mathematics Knowledge & Skills 7. Science Knowledge & Skills 8. Creative Arts Expression 9. Logic & Reasoning 10. Social Studies Knowledge & Skills 11. English Language Development</p>	<p>Ongoing learning and reflective practice</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cultural competence - Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning 						<p>connection between the vision, principles, practices and learning outcomes (iv) The principle of partnerships to include working with diverse families, creating culturally safe spaces and strengthening connections with child and family professionals and school communities (v) Clarify practices specific to learning through play and intentional teaching (vi) Connect content and discipline knowledge (vii) Planning for learning and cycles of decision-making informing curriculum LO3- Extend understanding and practice of wellbeing by integrating fundamental movement skills, including mental health promotion, protective behaviours, and resilience LO4- Children’s active citizenry LO4- Children and young people’s thinking and the language of learning LO4- Concepts of mathematical and scientific thinking and learning LO4&LO5- Educators’ understanding and use of digital technologies to support children’s thinking and learning</p>
<p>Massachusetts Guidelines for Preschool Learning Experiences</p>	<p>All young children are capable of learning. Children show individual differences in development. Knowledge of child growth and development is essential for program development and implementation</p>	<p>Social and Emotional Development and Approaches to Play and Learning English Language Arts Mathematics Science and Technology/Engineering</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play - Intentional teaching - Learning environments 	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes (i) Clarify the meaning of holistic approaches to learning and teaching, including the connection between the vision, principles, practices and learning outcomes (ii) Civics and citizenship (iii) The principle of partnerships to include working with diverse families, creating culturally safe spaces and strengthening</p>

	<p>Children’s language skills are the best predictors of academic success. Developmental domains are highly interrelated Young children learn by doing Families are the primary caregivers and educators of their young children</p>	<p>History and Social Science Comprehensive Health The Arts</p>	<p>Ongoing learning and reflective practice</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cultural competence - Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning 						<p>connections with child and family professionals and school communities (iv) Connect content and discipline knowledge (v) Planning for learning and cycles of decision-making informing curriculum LO4- Children’s active citizenry LO4- Children and young people’s thinking and the language of learning; concepts of mathematical and scientific thinking and learning; include more examples of expressive arts LO4&LO5- Educators’ understanding and use of digital technologies to support children’s thinking and learning</p>
<p>Minnesota Early Childhood-Knowledge and Competency Framework</p>	<p>Competencies arranged in broad content areas: - Child development and learning - Developmentally appropriate learning experiences - Assessment, evaluation and individualisation * Versions are available for those working with infants and toddlers, family child care providers, and preschool-age children in centre and school programs</p>	<p>Three levels of competency, with each level building on the previous one: 1. Explores 2. Implements 3. Designs and Lead 4. Cultural responsibilities 5. Trauma informed care 6. Support for multilingual learners</p> <p>Note: The newly updated version of the Knowledge and Competency Framework for Educators includes additions 4-6.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity Ongoing learning and reflective practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play - Intentional teaching - Learning environments - Cultural competence - Continuity of learning and transitions Assessment for learning 	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes (i) Embedding Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives i.e. identity, social and cultural heritage (ii) Cultural responsiveness and providing culturally safe spaces with child and family professionals and school communities (iii) Clarify the meaning of holistic approaches to learning and teaching, including the connection between the vision, principles, practices and learning outcomes (iv) The principle of partnerships to include working with diverse families, creating culturally safe spaces and strengthening connections with child and family professionals and school communities (v) Planning for learning and cycles of decision-making informing curriculum LO1- Identity; LO2- Children’s active citizenry</p>

										LO3- Extend understanding and practice of wellbeing by integrating fundamental movement skills, including mental health promotion, protective behaviours, and resilience LO4- Children and young people’s thinking and the language of learning
Washington State Early Learning and Development Guidelines	<p>Learning starts with families and communities.</p> <p>Every child and family has unique gifts and abilities. Children learn through relationships, play and active exploration. Children learn best when they are healthy, safe and free of hunger. Learning and development build on prior learning and development. Learning is interrelated. Young children can learn more than one language. Building ‘executive function’ is crucial for learning and development. Children learn in and through their environment.</p>	<p>Guidelines are broken up into age groups using six areas of development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. About me and my family and culture 2. Building relationships 3. Touching, seeing, hearing and moving around 4. Growing up healthy 5. Communicating 6. Learning about my world <p>* includes a final section: Differences in Development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity <p>Ongoing learning and reflective practice</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play - Intentional teaching - Learning environments - Cultural competence - Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning 	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Embedding diverse cultural perspectives i.e. identity, social and cultural heritage (ii) Cultural responsiveness and providing culturally safe spaces with child and family professionals and school communities (iii) Clarify the meaning of holistic approaches to learning and teaching, including the connection between the vision, principles, practices and learning outcomes (iv) The principle of partnerships to include working with diverse families, creating culturally safe spaces and strengthening connections with child and family professionals and school communities (v) Clarify practices specific to learning through play and intentional teaching (vi) Connect content and discipline knowledge (vii) Planning for learning and cycles of decision-making informing curriculum <p>LO1 - Identity LO2 – Community participation; cultural diversity LO3- Extend understanding and practice of wellbeing by integrating fundamental movement skills, including mental health</p>

										linguistic identities affirmed by educators; identity and kinship; LO2- Children’s active citizenry LO3- Extend understanding and practice of wellbeing by integrating fundamental movement skills, including mental health promotion, protective behaviours, and resilience; social skills LO4- Learning AND thinking (not only learning); children’s thinking and the language of learning LO5- Language and literacy;
Queensland Queensland Kindergarten Learning Guideline	Principles: High expectations, equity and respect for diversity. Respectful relationships. Collaborative partnerships. Effective pedagogies. Reflective practice and professional decision-making Practices: Decision making Intentional teaching practices. Assessment	Learning and development areas: Identity Connectedness Wellbeing Active learning Communicating Supporting children’s transition to school	- Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity - Ongoing learning and reflective practice	- Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play - Intentional teaching - Learning environments - Cultural competence - Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes (i) Embedding Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives i.e. identity, social and cultural heritage (ii) Cultural responsiveness and providing culturally safe spaces with child and family professionals and school communities (iii) Clarify the meaning of holistic approaches to learning and teaching, including the connection between the vision, principles, practices and learning outcomes (iv) The principle of partnerships to include working with diverse families, creating culturally safe spaces and strengthening connections with child and family professionals and school communities (v) Clarify practices specific to learning through play and intentional teaching (vi) Planning for learning and cycles of decision-making informing curriculum (vii) Assessment LO1- Identity LO2- Children’s active citizenry

										LO4 - Children's thinking and the language of learning
South Australia Reflect, Respect, Relate	Four key integrated premises: - Relationships - Active learning environment - Wellbeing - Involvement	Educators' involvement with children is emotional and intellectual: - wellbeing is essential for involvement - involvement is essential for deep level learning - wellbeing comes from relationships - involvement is increased through an active learning environment - an active learning environment strengthens relationships	- Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity Ongoing learning and reflective practice		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes (i) Embedding culturally diverse perspectives i.e. identity, social and cultural heritage (ii) Cultural responsiveness and providing culturally safe spaces with child and family professionals and school communities (iii) Clarify the meaning of holistic approaches to learning and teaching, including the connection between the vision, principles, practices and learning outcomes LO1 - Identity LO2 - Children's active citizenry and connections LO3- Extend understanding and practice of wellbeing by integrating fundamental movement skills, including mental health promotion, protective behaviours, and resilience LO4- Children and young people's thinking and the language of learning
Victoria Victorian Early Years Learning and Development Framework	Eight interrelated Practice Principles: - Reflective Practice - Partnerships with families - High expectations for every child - Respectful relationships and responsive engagement - Equity and diversity	Three integrated elements: 1. Practice Principles 2. Outcomes 3. Transition and continuity of Learning Outcome 1: Children have a strong sense of identity	- Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity	- Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play - Intentional teaching - Learning environments	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes (i) Embedding Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives i.e. identity, social and cultural heritage (ii) Cultural responsiveness and providing culturally safe spaces with child and family professionals and school communities (iii) The principle of partnerships to include working with diverse families, creating culturally safe spaces and strengthening

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment for learning and development - Integrated teaching and learning approaches - Partnerships with professionals 	<p>Outcome 2: Children are connected with and contribute to their world</p> <p>Outcome 3: Children have a strong sense of wellbeing</p> <p>Outcome 4: Children are confident and involved learners</p> <p>Outcome 5: children are effective communicators</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Supporting children’s transitions</p>	Ongoing learning and reflective practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cultural competence - Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning 					<p>connections with child and family professionals and school communities</p> <p>(v) Clarify practices specific to learning through play and intentional teaching</p> <p>(vi) Planning for learning and cycles of decision-making informing curriculum</p> <p>(vii) Assessment practices to involve children, young people and families to support quality planning</p> <p>(viii) Assessment practices to ensure assessment tools are reflective of the diversity of children and young people</p> <p>(ix) Continuity and transitions</p> <p>LOs- Connect content and discipline knowledge</p> <p>LO2- Children’s active citizenry</p> <p>LO4- Children and young people’s thinking and the language of learning</p>	
<p>Western Australia</p> <p>Kindergarten Curriculum Guidelines</p>	<p>EYLF: Being becoming and belonging</p> <p>NQF guiding principles</p> <p>Planning and assessment cycle</p> <p>Curriculum decision making involves:</p> <p>Differentiation and inclusion</p> <p>Early learning environments</p> <p>Relationships and partnerships</p> <p>Balanced content</p> <p>Contexts and strategies for learning</p> <p>Child participation</p>	<p>EYLF Principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity <p>Ongoing learning and reflective practice</p> <p>EYLF Practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play - Intentional teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure, respectful and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity - Ongoing learning and reflective practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Holistic approaches - Responsiveness to children - Learning through play - Intentional teaching - Learning environments - Cultural competence - Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning 	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes</p> <p>(i) Embedding Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspectives i.e. identity, social and cultural heritage</p> <p>(ii) Cultural responsiveness and providing culturally safe spaces with child and family professionals and school communities</p> <p>(iii) Clarify the meaning of holistic approaches to learning and teaching, including the connection between the vision, principles, practices and learning outcomes</p> <p>(iv) The principle of partnerships to include working with diverse families, creating culturally safe spaces and strengthening connections with child and family professionals and school communities</p> <p>(v) Learning through play and intentionality</p>

	<p>Extension, engagement and enjoyment in learning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Learning environments - Cultural competence - Continuity of learning and transitions - Assessment for learning <p>EYLF Outcomes Identity Connecting and contributing Wellbeing Learning and thinking Communication</p>								<p>(vi) Planning for learning and cycles of decision-making informing curriculum (vii) Assessment practices to involve children, young people and families to support quality planning; assessment practices to ensure assessment tools are reflective of the diversity of children and young people (viii) Critical reflection LO1- Children have multiple and changing identities; children from culturally diverse backgrounds have their social, cultural and linguistic identities affirmed by educators; identity and kinship; build a positive sense of worth LO2- Children’s active citizenry; sustainability LO3- Extend understanding and practice of wellbeing by integrating fundamental movement skills, including mental health promotion, protective behaviours, and resilience; social skills LO4- Learning AND thinking; strategies for metacognition; executive function; reasoning; mathematical and scientific concepts; expressive arts LO5- Digital literacy; language and literacy;</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

✓ = supported

✓ = somewhat supported

Appendix 2: Mapping similar frameworks to the MTOP

Learning Outcomes KEY

✓ = supported

✓ = somewhat supported

The frameworks are nominally mapped to the MTOP in this table. Not all connections have been made but it is a demonstration of areas that support and require strengthening. Most frameworks support all the principles and practices of the MTOP, however the degree of support has not been mapped, as some areas for strengthening have been described.

Origin of Framework And Name	Main ideas of the Frameworks		MTOP areas supported							MTOP areas to be strengthened
	Principles or underlying ideas	Areas for teaching and learning/outcomes/goals	Principles	Practices	1	2	3	4	5	Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes
Sweden Curriculum for the compulsory school, preschool class and school-age edu-care 2011 (Revised 2018)	Democratic, human rights and social justice foundation. Children as active citizens of community and society. Emphasis on historical, environmental, international and ethical perspectives. Community, solidarity, supporting equal rights. Communication, social and historical awareness, identity, cultural heritage.	Holistic development Language Social learning and engagement Wellbeing Empowerment Communication	- Secure and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - Environments - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity - Ongoing learning and reflective practice	- Holistic approaches - Collaboration with children - Learning through play - Environments - Collaborating with Children - Cultural competence	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes (i) Embedding multi-cultural perspectives (ii) High expectations and equity (iii) Sustainability as a principle (iv) Collaboration with children LO1 Identity; cultural heritage LO2 and LO4 Children as active citizens; human rights; ethical perspectives LO3 Extend understanding and practice of wellbeing by integrating fundamental movement skills, including mental health promotion, and resilience; social skills LO4 Learning and thinking LO5 Communication; digital safety and literacy

<p>Scotland</p> <p>Out of School Care in Scotland (Draft framework)</p> <p>School Age Child Care in Scotland (Progress Report)</p>	<p>Affordable, accessible, and flexible child care. Connection between care and family employment security. Care services are connected to communities. Social support and social justice (focusing on poverty). Contribute to positive physical and mental wellbeing. Advocates for a holistic approach to child care and learning (focus on social, physical, creative and identity).</p>	<p>Holistic development Employment security Social justice, equity and support Community</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - Environments - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity - Ongoing learning and reflective practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Holistic approaches - Collaboration with children - Learning through play - Environments - Collaborating with Children - Cultural competence 	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>Preamble/Principles/Practices/Outcomes</p> <p>(i) Preamble- young people’s connections to families and communities</p> <p>(ii) Clarify the meaning of holistic approaches including the connection between the vision, principles, practices and learning outcomes: relational pedagogy</p> <p>(ii) The principle of partnerships to include working with diverse families, creating culturally safe spaces and strengthening connections with child and family and other professionals</p> <p>(iii) High expectations and equity</p> <p>(iv) Respect for diversity</p> <p>LO2- Children’s active citizenry and action</p> <p>LO3- Extend understanding and practice of wellbeing by integrating physical movement skills, social and emotional competence and self-regulation; mental health promotion; healthy lifestyle choices; protective behaviours</p>
<p>New Zealand</p> <p>Out of School Care Network (various materials available at https://www.govt.nz/education/early-childhood/learning-and-development/learning-and-development-framework/)</p>	<p>Positive child-centered approach to care. Culturally responsive practice. Holistic care and development. Ethic of respect.</p>	<p>Holistic development. Social learning and engagement. Agency and leadership. Empowerment. Communication and decision-making.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure and reciprocal relationships - Partnerships - Environments - High expectations and equity - Respect for diversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Holistic approaches - Collaboration with children - Learning through play - Environments - Collaborating with Children - Cultural competence 	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>(i) Preamble – child centred, relational pedagogy and inclusive participatory approaches</p> <p>(ii) Include principle of leadership at all levels including young people</p> <p>(iii) The principle of partnerships to include working with diverse families, creating culturally safe spaces and strengthening connections with child and family and other professionals</p>

w.oscn.nz/resources.html	Inclusive participatory approaches. Health, wellbeing and self-protection.		- Ongoing learning and reflective practice						(iv) Embedding multi- cultural perspectives (v) High expectations and equity (vi) Environments, inclusion and agency (vii) Collaboration with children (viii) Cultural competence to change to cultural responsiveness LO1 - cultural and linguistic identity LO2 respect for diversity LO3- Extend understanding and practice of wellbeing by integrating physical movement skills, social and emotional competence and self-regulation; mental health promotion; healthy lifestyle choices; protective behaviours LO4- Agency and decision making; thinking and problem solving
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

Appendix 3: Frameworks¹

Alberta, Canada

Government of Alberta, Canada, Alberta Education. (2021). *Kindergarten Curriculum Overview*. <https://education.alberta.ca/media/160232/kindergarten-curriculum-overview.pdf>

Belgium

The Department of Social Work and Social pedagogy of the University of Ghent and the Research Centre for Experiential Education of the University of Leuven (ndg). *A pedagogical framework for childcare for babies and toddlers* <https://www.kindengezin.be/img/pedagogische-raamwerk-engelseversie.pdf>

California

California Department of Education (2008). *California Preschool Learning Foundations (Vol 1)*. <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/re/documents/preschoolif.pdf>

England

Department for Education (2020). *Early Years Foundation Stage*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/early-years-foundation-stage-framework--2>

Europe

Onescu, M., & Tankersley, D. (2016). *Quality Framework for Early Childhood Practice in Services for Children under Three Years of Age* International Step by Step Association (ISSA). https://www.issa.nl/quality_framework_birth_to_three

Finland

Finnish National Agency for Education. (2018). *National core curriculum for early childhood education and care 2018* (D. Oy & P. Oy, Trans.). Author.

Ireland

National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA). (2009). *Aistear: The Early childhood Curriculum Framework*. https://ncca.ie/media/4151/aistear_theearlychildhoodcurriculumframework.pdf

Jamaica

Dudley Grant Memorial Trust with the Ministry of Education (2008). *The Jamaica Early Childhood Curriculum for Children Birth to Five. A Conceptual Framework*. The D Dudley Grant Memorial Trust <https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/read/25868267/the-jamaica-early-childhood-curriculum-for-children-birth-to-five>

New Zealand

Ministry of Education, New Zealand. (2017). *Te Whāriki: Early childhood curriculum*. <https://www.education.govt.nz/early-childhood/teaching-and-learning/te-whariki/>

Out of School Network <https://www.oscn.nz/resources.html>

¹ These are listed alphabetically

Northern Territory

Northern Territory Government (2018). Northern Territory Preschool Curriculum. https://education.nt.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0012/359778/preschool-curriculum-revised-2018-version.pdf

Queensland

Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority, Queensland Government. (2018). *Queensland Kindergarten Learning Guideline*. https://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/downloads/p_10/qklg_2019.pdf

South Australia

Department of Education and Child Development (2015). *Reflect, Respect, Relate*. <https://www.education.sa.gov.au/schools-and-educators/curriculum-and-teaching/assessment/reflect-respect-relate-resource-assessing-learning-and-development-early-years>

Scotland

Education Scotland. *Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) (2021)*. <https://education.gov.scot/education-scotland/scottish-education-system/policy-for-scottish-education/policy-drivers/cfe-building-from-the-statement-appendix-incl-btc1-5/what-is-curriculum-for-excellence>

Education Scotland. (2020). *Realising the ambition: Being Me*. <https://education.gov.scot/media/3bjpr3wa/realisingtheambition.pdf>

Scottish Government (2019). *DRAFT Framework*

<https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/consultation-paper/2019/08/out-school-care-scotland-draft-framework-2019/documents/out-school-care-scotland-draft-framework-2019/out-school-care-scotland-draft-framework-2019/govscot%3Adocument/out-school-care-scotland-draft-framework-2019.pdf>

Scottish Government (2021). *Progress Report*

<https://www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/progress-report/2021/03/school-age-childcare-progress-report/documents/school-age-childcare-scotland-progress-report-2021/school-age-childcare-scotland-progress-report-2021/govscot%3Adocument/school-age-childcare-scotland-progress-report-2021.pdf>

Singapore

Ministry of Education (2021). *Nurturing Early Learners (NEL) Framework: A curriculum Framework for Kindergartens in Singapore*. Singapore. <https://www.nel.moe.edu.sg/gql/slot/u143/Resources/Downloadable/pdf/kindergarten-curriculum-framework.pdf>

Sweden

Skolverket (Revised 2018). *Curriculum for the compulsory school, preschool class and school-age edu-care 2011* <https://www.skolverket.se/getFile?file=3984>

United States of America

Headstart (2010). *Child Development and Early Learning Framework 3-5 years*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED547179.pdf>

Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (2021). *Guidelines for Preschool Learning Experiences* <https://www.mass.gov/service-details/guidelines-for-preschool-learning-experiences>

Minnesota Department of Education. (2017). *Early Childhood Indicators of Progress: Minnesota's Early Learning Standards for Birth to Kindergarten*.

<https://education.mn.gov/MDE/dse/early/highqualel/ind/>

Washington State Department of Early Learning (2021). *Early Learning and Development Guidelines* <https://www.k12.wa.us/student-success/support-programs/early-learning-washington-state/early-learning-and-development-guidelines>

Victoria (Australia)

Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority, Department of Education and Training. (2018). *Victorian Early Years Learning and Development Framework*.

<https://www.education.vic.gov.au/Documents/childhood/providers/edcare/veyldframework.pdf>

Western Australia

School Curriculum and Standards Authority (SCSA). *Kindergarten Curriculum Guidelines* (2014).

https://k10outline.scsa.wa.edu.au/media/documents/outline_downloads/Western-Australian-Kindergarten-Curriculum-Guidelines-pdf.pdf

References

- Adam, H., Barratt-Pugh, C., & Haig, Y. (2019). 'Portray cultures other than ours': How children's literature is being used to support the diversity goals of the Australian Early Years Learning Framework. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 46, 549-563.
- Albin-Clark, J., Shirley, I., & Woolhouse, C. (2018). Relationships in early childhood education-beyond the professional into the personal within the teacher-child dyad: relationships 'that ripple in the pond'. *Early Childhood Development and Care*, 188(2), 88-101. DOI: [10.1080/03004430.2016.1220374](https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2016.1220374)
- Almendingen, A., Clayton, O., & Matthews, J. (2021). Partnering with parents in early childhood services: Raising and responding to concerns. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, Online First, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-021-01173-6>
- Alnervik, K. (2018). Systematic documentation: Structures and tools in a practice of communicative documentation. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 19(1), 72-84.
- Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1), 19-31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616>
- Ärlemalm-Hagsér, E. & Davis, J. (2014). Examining the rhetoric: A comparison of how sustainability and young children's participation and agency are framed in Australian and Swedish early childhood education curricula. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 15(3), 231-244.
- Armstrong, S., Buckley, S., Lonsdale, M., Milgate, G., Kneebone, L. B., Cook, L., & Skelton, F. (2012). *Starting school: a strengths-based approach towards Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children*. Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER). https://research.acer.edu.au/indigenous_education/27
- Australian Children's Education & Care Quality Authority (ACECQA). (2019). What is the NQF? Retrieved from <https://www.acecqa.gov.au/nqf/about>
- Australian Government Department of Education Employment and Workplace Relations [DEEWR]. (2009). *Belonging, being and becoming: The early years learning framework for Australia*. Author.
- Ayre, K. & Krishnamoorthy, G. (2020). *Trauma informed behaviour support: A practical guide to developing resilient learners*. University of Southern Queensland. <https://usq.pressbooks.pub/traumainformedpractice/>
- Babić, N. (2017), Continuity and discontinuity in education: example of transition from preschool to school. *Early Child Development and Care*, 187(10), 1596-1609. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2017.1301935>
- Banerjee, R., & Luckner, J. (2014). Training needs of early childhood professionals who work with children and families who are culturally and linguistically diverse. *Infants and Young Children*, 27(1), 43-59. DOI: [10.1097/IYC.0000000000000000](https://doi.org/10.1097/IYC.0000000000000000)
- Barblett, L. Barratt-Pugh, C., Kilgallon, P., & Maloney, C. (2011). Transition from long day care to kindergarten: Continuity or not? *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 36(92), 42-50.
- Barblett, L., Hydon, C., and Kennedy, A. (2018) *Ethics in Action: A practical guide to implementing the ECA Code of Ethics*. Early Childhood Australia.
- Barblett, L., Knaus, M., Barratt-Pugh, C. (2016). The pushes and pulls of pedagogy in the early years: Competing knowledges and the erosion of play-based learning. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 41(4), 36-43.
- Barblett, L & Maloney, C. (2010). Complexities of assessing social and emotional competence and wellbeing in young children. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 35(2), 13-18.
- Bartlett, J. D., & Smith, S. (2019). The role of early care and education in addressing early childhood trauma. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 64(3-4), 359-372.
- Basford, J., & Bath, C. (2014). Playing the assessment game: an English early childhood education perspective. *Early Years*, 34(2), 119-132. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2014.903386>

- Bell, K., & Cartmel, J. (2014). Stepping back in school age care. *Journal of Playwork Practice*, 1(2), 157-171. <https://doi.org/10.1332/205316214X14111157717370>
- Beneke, M. R., & Cheatham, G. A. (2016). Inclusive, democratic family-professional partnerships: (Re)conceptualizing culture and language in teacher preparation. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 35(4), 234–244. DOI: [10.1177/0271121415581611](https://doi.org/10.1177/0271121415581611)
- Blackmore, R., Aylward, E., & Grace, R. (2016). ‘One of the kids’: Parent perceptions of the developmental advantages arising from inclusion in mainstream early childhood education. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 41(2), 13-17.
- Bleeker, M., Beyler, N., James-Burdumy, S., & Fortson, J. (2015). The impact of playworks on boys’ and girls’ physical activity during recess. *Journal of School Health*, 85(3), 171-178.
- Bobongie, F. (2017). Family+Stories=Research. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 17(4), 345-355. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-11-2016-0069>
- Boylan, F. (2021). Mindsets Matter: Early childhood teacher perceptions of mindset. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Edith Cowan University.
- Brillante, P. (2017). *Essentials: Supporting young children with disabilities in the classroom*. National Association for the Education of Young Children [NAEYC].
- British Educational Research Association (BERA) (2017) *BERA-TACTYC Early childhood education and care review 2003-2017*. <https://www.bera.ac.uk/project/bera-tactyc-early-childhood-research-review-2003-2017>
- Brooker, L., Blaise, M., & Edwards, S. (Eds.). (2014). *Handbook of play and learning in early childhood*. SAGE.
- Brownlee Lunn, J. L., Irvine, S., Sullivan, V., & Thorpe, K. (2020). Educators reflecting on sleep and rest time dilemmas in ECEC: where is the “critical” in reflective practices? *Australian Educational Researcher*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-020-00414-8>
- Bundy, A., Engelen, L., Naughton, G., & Wyver, S. (2018). Low levels of after school-hours social interaction and physical activity of 5-7 year olds. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Research in Early Childhood Education*, 12(2), 79-92. DOI: [10.17206/apjrece.2018.12.2.79](https://doi.org/10.17206/apjrece.2018.12.2.79)
- Cartmel, J. (2019). *OSHC and Space*. Griffith University.
- Cartmel, J. & Brannelly, K. (2016). A framework for developing the knowledge and competencies of the Outside School Hours Services workforce. *International Journal for Research on Extended Education (IJREE)*, 4(2), 17–33.
- Cartmel, J., & Grieshaber, S. (2014). Communicating for quality in school age care services. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 39(3), 23-28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/183693911403900304>
- Cartmel, J., & Hayes, A. (2016). Before and after school: Literature review about Australian school age child care. *Children Australia*, 41(3), 201-207. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cha.2016.17>
- Cartmel, J., & Hurst, B. (2021). *More than ‘just convenient care’: What the research tells us about equitable access to Outside School Hours Care*. New South Wales Department of Education.
- Cartmel, J., Udah, H., San Gil, O., & Prause, A. (2019). Self-regulation, behaviours and learning among children: An evaluation of the Journey to the Island of Calm programme in Australia. *Children Australia*, 44(3), 126-135. doi:10.1017/cha.2019.9
- Centre for Education Statistics and Evaluation (CESE). (2020). *Formative assessment practices in early childhood settings: evidence and implementation in NSW*. NSW Department of Education. <https://www.cese.nsw.gov.au/publications-filter/formative-assessment-practices-in-early-childhood-settings-evidence-and-implementation>
- Chapman, R. (2021). Moving beyond ‘gender-neutral’: creating gender expansive environments in early childhood education. *Gender and Education*. Online First, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2021.1902485>
- Cheeseman, S. (2017). Narratives of infants’ encounters with curriculum: Beyond the curriculum of care. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 18(1), 55-66. doi:[10.1177/1463949117692243](https://doi.org/10.1177/1463949117692243)

- Chen, B., Waters, C. N., Compier, T., Uijtdewilligen, L., Petrunoff, N. A., Lim, Y. W., van Dam, R., & Müller-Riemenschneider, F. (2020). Understanding physical activity and sedentary behavior among preschool-aged children in Singapore: a mixed-methods approach. *BMJ Open Access*.
<https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/10/4/e030606>
- Christensen, D., Taylor, C. L., Hancock, K. J., & Zubrick, S. R. (2020). School readiness is more than the child: a latent class analysis of child, family, school and community aspects of school readiness. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, Online First.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ajs4.138>
- Christian, H., Maitland, C., Enkel, S., Trapp, G., Trost, S. G., Schipperijn, J., Boruff, B., Lester, L., Rosenberg, M., & Zubrick, S. R. (2016). Influence of the day care, home and neighbourhood environment on young children's physical activity and health: protocol for the PLAYCE observational study. *BMJ Open*, 6. DOI: [10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014058](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014058)
- Cloney, D., Jackson, J., & Mitchell, P. (2019). *Assessment of children as confident and involved learners in early childhood education and care: Literature review*. Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority.
- Cloughessy, K., Waniganayake, M., & Blatterer, H. (2019). The good and the bad: Lesbian parents' experiences of Australian early childhood settings and their suggestions for working effectively with families. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 33(3), 446-458.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02568543.2019.1607786>
- Cohrsen, C. (2021). Considering form and function: A commentary on the review of the Early Years Learning Framework. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 0(0), 1-8. Online First.
<https://doi-org.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/10.1177/18369391211018518>
- Collins, M., & Keenan, A. (2011). *How do we genuinely embed Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island perspectives in our centre?* Australian Association for Environmental Education.
<http://aaewa.org.au/docs/Aboriginal&TorresStraitIsPerspectives.pdf>
- Cologon, K. (2012). Confidence in their own ability: postgraduate early childhood students examining their attitudes towards inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 16 (11), 1155-1173.
- Cologon, K. (2013) *Inclusion in education: Towards equality for students with disability*. Children with Disability Australia.
- Colquhoun, S., & Dockery, A. M. (2012). *The link between Indigenous culture and wellbeing: Qualitative evidence for Australian Aboriginal Peoples*. CLMR Discussion Paper Series 2012/1. Perth. Centre for Labour Market Research. Curtin Business School.
- Commissioner for Children and Young People WA. (2015). *Using the wellbeing monitoring framework to strengthen children's and young people's wellbeing. Aboriginal and young people's wellbeing. Policy brief*. Government of Western Australia.
- Commonwealth of Australia. (2006). *Disability standards for education 2005*. Australian Government Publishing Service.
http://www.deewr.gov.au/Schooling/Programs/Documents/Disability_Standards_for_Education_2005.pdf
- Common Worlds Research Collective. (2020). *Learning to become with the world: Education for future survival. Education Research and Foresight Working Paper 28*. Paris, UNESCO.
- Constable, K. (2012). *The outdoor classroom ages 3-7: Using ideas from forest school to enrich learning*. Routledge.
- Cooper, M., Hedges, H., & Dixon, H. (2014). Weaving RIE with *Te Whāriki*: re-thinking family involvement in assessment of learning dispositions. *Early Childhood Development and Care*, 184(5), 733-748. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2013.818987>
- Cooper, M., & Quiñones, G. (2020). Toddlers as *the one-caring*: co-authoring play narratives and identities of care. *Early Child Development and Care*, Online First, 1-16.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2020.1826465>
- Dahlberg, G., Moss, P. & Pence, A. (2006). *Beyond quality in early childhood education and care: Postmodern perspectives*. Routledge.

- Danby, S., Thompson, C., Theobald, M., & Thorpe, K. (2012). Children's strategies for making friends when starting school. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 37(2), 63-71.
- D'Aprano, A., Silburn, S., Johnston, V., Robinson, G., Oberklaid, F., & Squires, J. (2016). Adaptation of the ages and stages questionnaire for remote Aboriginal Australia. *Qualitative Health Research*, 26(5), 613–625, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732314562891>.
- Davis, J. (2015). What is early childhood education for sustainability and why does it matter? In J. Davis (Ed.), *Young children and the environment early education for sustainability* (2nd ed.) (pp. 7-27). Cambridge University Press.
- Davis, J. & Elliot, S. (2014). *Research in early childhood education for sustainability: International perspectives and provocations*, Routledge.
- Davis, B., Torr, J., & Degotardi, S. (2015). Infants and toddlers: How visible are they in the Early Years Learning Framework? *International Journal of Child Care and Educational Policy*, 9(1), 1-14.
- Degotardi, S. (2014). In Harrison, L. & Sumsion, J. (eds.). *Lived spaces of infant-toddler education and care: exploring diverse perspectives on theory, research and practice* Springer, p. 187-199 13 p. (International perspectives on early childhood education and development; vol. 11).
- Degotardi, S., Page, J. & White, E. J. (2017). (Re)conceptualising relationships in infant-toddler pedagogy. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 18(4), 355-361.
- Dennis, S. F., Wells, A., & Bishop, C. (2014). A post-occupancy study of nature-based outdoor classrooms in early childhood education. *Children, Youth and Environments* 24(2), 35-52. <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublication?journalCode=chilyoutenvi>
- Department of Education WA. (2015). *Aboriginal Cultural Standards Framework*. Western Australian Government. <https://www.education.wa.edu.au/>
- Department of Education, Skills and Employment [DESE]. (2021). *Summary document - 2020 Review of the disability standards for education 2005*. Commonwealth of Australia.
- Department of Education and Training VIC. (2017). *Transition a positive start to school. Resource kit*. Department of Education and Training Melbourne.
- Department of Education and Training VIC. (2021). Early Abilities Based Learning and Education Support (Early ABLES). <https://www.education.vic.gov.au/childhood/professionals/needs/Pages/early-ables.aspx>
- Devi, A., Fler, M., & Li, L. (2018). 'We set up a small world': Preschool teachers' involvement in children's imaginative play. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 26(3), 295–311.
- Dockett, S., & Perry, B. (2013). Trends and tensions: Australian and international research about starting school. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 21(2-3), 163-177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2013.832943>
- Dockett, S. & Perry, B. (2014). *Continuity of Learning: A resource to support effective transition to school and school age care*. Canberra, ACT: Australian Government Department of Education.
- Dockett S., & Perry B. (2015) Transition to School: Times of opportunity, expectation, aspiration, and entitlement. In J. M. Iorio & W. Parnell (Eds.), *Rethinking readiness in early childhood education. Critical Cultural Studies of Childhood*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Durlak, J., Weissberg, R., & Pachan, M. (2010). A meta-analysis of after-school programs that seek to promote personal and social skills in children and adolescents. <http://casel.org/wp-content/uploads/A-meta-analysis-of-after-school-programs-that-seek-to-promote-personal-and-social-skills-in-children-and-adolescents.pdf>
- Dwyer, A., Jones, C., & Rosas, L. (2019). What digital technology do early childhood educators use and what digital resources do they seek? *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*. 44(1), 91-105.
- Early Childhood Australia [ECA]. (2018). *Statement on young children and digital technologies*. ECA. <http://dx.doi.org/10.23965/ECA.001>
- Education Council. (2019). *Alice Springs (Mparntwe) education declaration*. Council of

- Australian Governments. <http://www.educationcouncil.edu.au/Alic-Springs-Mparntwe-Education-Declaration.aspx>
- Edwards, S. (2017). Play-based learning and intentional teaching: Forever different? *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 42(2), 4-11. <https://doi.org/10.23965/AJEC.42.2.01>
- Elliott, S., Årlemalm-Hagsér, E., Okjong, J., Wang, W., & Mackey, G. (2020). An update on countries previously represented in the first volume (Australia, Japan, South Korea, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom, plus China). In S. Elliott, E. Årlemalm-Hagsér, & J. Davis (Eds.), *Researching early childhood education for sustainability: Challenging assumptions and orthodoxies* (pp. 53 - 68). Routledge.
- Elliott, S. & Young, T. (2015). Nature by default in early childhood education for sustainability. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, 32(1), 57–64.
- Elvstrand, H., & Närvänen, A.-L. (2016). Children's own perspectives on participation in leisure-time centers in Sweden. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 4(6), 496-503. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-4-6-10>
- Engelen, L., Bundy, A.C., Naughton, G, SimpsonJudy, M., Bauman, A., Ragen. J., Baur, L., Wyver, S., Tranter, P., Niehues, A., Schiller. W., Perry, G., Jessup, G., & van der Ploeg, H. P. (2013). Increasing physical activity in young primary school children – it's child's play: A cluster randomized controlled trial. *Preventive Medicine*, 56(5), 319-325. DOI: [10.1016/j.ypmed.2013.02.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2013.02.007)
- Erwin, E. J., Bacon, J. K., & Lalvani, P. (2021). It's about time! Advancing justice through joyful inquiry with young children. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, Online First, 1-12.
- Esteban- Guitart, M., & Moll, L. (2014). Funds of identity: A new concept based on the funds of knowledge approach. *Culture & Psychology*, 20(1) 31–48.
- Figueroa, R., & An, R. (2017). Motor skill competence and physical activity in preschoolers: A review. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 21(1), 136-146.
- Finnish National Agency for Education. (2018). *National core curriculum for early childhood education and care 2018* (D. Oy & P. Oy, Trans.). Author.
- Fink, A. (2005). *Conducting Research Literature Reviews: From the Internet to Paper* (2nd ed.). SAGE.
- Fleer, M., Shah, C., & Peers, C. (2013). *Final report: Baseline evaluation of the Early Years Learning Framework (EYLF)*. Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.
- Fox, J. L., & Diezmann, C. M. (2017). The Australian Early Years Learning Framework and ICT: A part of life or apart from life? In M. Li, J. L. Fox & S. Grieshaber (Eds.), *Contemporary issues and challenge in early childhood education in the Asia-Pacific region* (pp. 143-164). Springer.
- Fox, S., Southwell, A., Stafford, N., Goudhue, R., Jackson, D., & Smith, C. (2015). Better systems, better chances: A review of research and practice for prevention and early intervention. Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth (ARACY). https://www.aracy.org.au/publications-resources/command/download_file/id/274/filename/Better-systems-better-chances.pdf
- Gasser, C., Evans-Whipp, T., & Terhaag, S. (2018). The physical health of Australian children. In G. Daraganova & N. Joss (Eds.), *Growing up in Australia: The longitudinal study of Australian children, annual statistical report*. Australian Institute of Family Studies.
- Gerlach, A., Browne, A.J., & Greenwood, M. (2017). Engaging Indigenous families in a community-based Indigenous program in British Columbia, Canada: A culturally safe perspective. *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 25(6), 1763-1773.
- Gonski Institute for Education. *Growing up digital*. <https://www.gie.unsw.edu.au/GUDAustralia>
- Goodliff, G. (2013). Spirituality expressed in creative learning: young children's imagining play as space for mediating their spirituality. *Early Child Development and Care*, 183(8), 1054-1071.
- Gorrie, A. & Udah, H. (2020). Loose parts in an outside-school-hours care setting. In J. Cartmel & R. Worch (Eds.), *Playwork practice at the margins* (pp. 78-88). Routledge.

- Grant, S., Comber, B., Danby, S., Theobald, M., & Thorpe, K. (2018). The quality agenda: Governance and regulation of preschool teachers' work. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 48(4), 515–532.
- Grieshaber, S. (2018). Developments in curriculum and assessment in the early years in Australia. In M. Fleer (Ed), *International handbook of early childhood education* (pp. 1211-1226). Springer.
- Grieshaber, S. (2010). Departures from tradition: The early years learning framework for Australia. *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy*, 4(2), 33-44.
- Gunnarsdottir, B. (2014). From play to school: Are core values of ECEC in Iceland being undermined by 'schoolification'. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 22(3), 242– 250.
- Hadley, F., & Rous, E. (2018). The family-centre partnership disconnect: Creating reciprocity. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 19(1), 48-62.
- Hadley, F., Waniganayake, M., Mevawalla, A., Jones, C., Blythin, S., & Beauchamp, D. (2021). Keeping children safe in out-of-school-hours care: Perceptions of staff and managers of one provider in Sydney, Australia. *Child Abuse Review*. Advance Online Publication. <https://doi.org/10.1002/car.2683>
- Hansford, M. T. (2019). Continuity of learning in the early years: do we see ourselves as part of a learning continuum? *Educating Young Children – Learning and Teaching in the Early Childhood Years*, 25(3), 40-41.
- Harms, T., Jacobs, E., & White, D. (2016/1996). *School Age Care Environment Rating Scale*. Teachers College.
- Harrison, L. (2016). *Transitions in children's everyday lives*. ECA everyday learning series.
- Harrison, L. J., Bull, R., Wong, S., Elwick, S., & Davis, B. (2019). *NSW preschool assessment study: Review of formative assessment practices in early childhood settings*. NSW Department of Education. <https://www.cese.nsw.gov.au/publications-filter/formative-assessment-practices-in-early-childhood-settings-evidence-and-implementation>
- Harrison, L. J., Hadley, F., Irvine, S., Davis, B., Barblett, L., Hatzigianni, M., Mulhearn, G., Waniganayake, M., Andrews, R., & Li, P. (2020). *Quality improvement research project: Final report*. Australian Children's Education and Care Quality Authority (ACECQA). <https://www.acecqa.gov.au/sites/default/files/2020-05/quality-improvement-research-project-2019.PDF>
- Harrison, L. J., Sumsion, J., Bradley, B., Letsch, K., & Salamon, A. (2017). Flourishing on the margins: a study of babies and belonging in an Australian Aboriginal community childcare centre. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 25(2), 189-205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2017.1288015>
- Harvard University. (2021). *Executive function & self-regulation*. Centre on the Developing Child. <https://developingchild.harvard.edu/science/key-concepts/executive-function/>
- Hedges, H., & Cooper, M. (2018). Relational play-based pedagogy: theorising a core practice in early childhood education. *Teachers and Teaching*, 24(4), 369-383. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2018.1430564>
- Hilkemeijer, M. (2020). (Blog) *How to write the EYLF ICT integrated curriculum*. <https://www.ictesolutions.com.au/blog/how-to-write-the-eylf-ict-integrated-curriculum/>
- Higgins, D., & Morley, S. (2014). *Engaging Indigenous parents in their children's education* (Resource sheet no. 32). Closing the Gap Clearinghouse.
- Holzinger, L. A., & Biddle, N. (2017). *The relationships between early childhood and care (ECEC) and the outcomes of Indigenous children: Evidence from the longitudinal study of Indigenous children (LSIC)*. Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research (CAEPR). <https://caepr.cass.anu.edu.au/research/publications/relationship-between-early-childhood-education-and-care-ecec-and-outcomes>
- Hurd, N., & Deutsch, N. (2017). SEL-Focused After-School Programs. *The Future of Children*, 27(1), 95-115. DOI:[10.1353/foc.2017.0005](https://doi.org/10.1353/foc.2017.0005)

- Hurst, B. (2020). Re-theorising the pre-adolescent child in school age care. *Global Studies of Childhood*, 10(2), 120-130. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2043610619863071>
- Hurst, B. (2019). Play and leisure in Australian School Age Care: Reconceptualizing children's waiting as a site of play and labour. *Childhood*, 26(4), 462-475.
- Hurst, B. (2015). Not always fun: Older children's play worlds in Australian Outside School Hours Care. *Journal of Playwork Practice*, 2(1), 7-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/090756821986531>
- Jackson, J., Noble, K., Anzai, D., Mitchell, P., & Cloney, D. (2020). *Assessment of children as having a strong sense of identity in early childhood education and care: Literature review*. Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (VCAA). https://research.acer.edu.au/early_childhood_misc/26
- Johnston, C., & Cullen, F. (2020). Paradoxes of playwork practice in an English primary school. In J. Cartmel & R. Worch (Eds.), *Playwork practice at the margins* (pp. 57-77). Routledge.
- Johnston, K., Highfield, K., & Hadley, F. (2018). Supporting young children as digital citizens: The importance of shared understandings of technology to support integration in play-based learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 49(5), 896-910. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12664>
- Kane, E., Ljusberg, A. L., & Larsson, H. (2013). Making magic soup—The facilitation of play in school-age childcare. *International Journal of Play*, 2(1), 7-21.
- Keengwe, J. (2010). Fostering cross cultural competence in preservice teachers through multicultural education experiences. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 38, 197–204 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-010-0401-5>
- Kemp, N., & Josephidou, J. (2021). Babies and toddlers outdoors: a narrative review of the literature on provision for under twos in ECEC settings. *Early Years*, Online First, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2021.1915962>
- Kennedy, A., & Barblett, L. (2016). *Play based learning. Research in practice series*. Early Childhood Australia.
- Kernan, M., & Devine, D. (2010). Being confined within? Constructions of the good childhood and outdoor play in early childhood education and care settings in Ireland. *Children & Society*, 24, 371–385.
- Kilderry, A., Nolan, A., & Scott, C. (2017). 'Out of the loop': Early childhood educators gaining confidence with unfamiliar policy discourse. *Early Years*, 37(4), 341–354.
- Klerfelt, A. (2012). Out on the Net: into the Web [Article]. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 44(2), 157-169. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13158-012-0062-1>
- Knaus, M. (2015). 'Time for being': Why the Australian Early Years Learning Framework opens up new possibilities. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 13(3), 221-235.
- Krakouer, J., Mitchell, P., Trevitt, J., & Kochanpoff, A. (2017). *Early years transitions. Supporting children and families at risk of experiencing vulnerability: Rapid literature review*. Department of Education and Training Victoria.
- Krieg, S. (2011). The Australian early years learning framework: Learning what? *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 12(1), 46-55.
- Kuo, M., Barnes, M., & Jordan, C. (2019). Do experiences with nature promote learning? converging evidence of a cause-and-effect relationship. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(305). 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00305>
- Kyrönlampi, T., Uitto, M., & Puroila, A. (2021). Place, peers, and play: Children's belonging in a preprimary school setting. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 53(1), 65-82. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13158-021-00285-9>
- Kyttä, M. (2002). Affordances of children's environments in the context of cities, small towns, suburbs and rural villages in Finland and Belarus. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 22(1–2), 109-123.
- Laevers, F. (2005). *Well-being and involvement in care settings. A process-oriented self-evaluation instrument*. Kind & Gezin and Research Centre for Experiential Education. <https://www.kindengezin.be/img/sics-ziko-manual.pdf>
- Lampert, J., Burnett, B., Martin, R., & McCrea, L. (2014). Lessons from a face-to-face meeting

- on embedding Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander perspective: 'A contract of intimacy'. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 39(1), 82–88.
- Lan Fang, M., Canham, S.L., Battersby, L., Sixsmith, J., Wada, M., Sixsmith, A. (2019). Exploring privilege in the digital divide: Implications for theory, policy, and practice, *The Gerontologist*, 59 (1), 1-15, <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gny037>
- La Paro, K.M., Thomason, A. C., Lower, J. K., Kintner-Duffy, V. L., & Cassidy, D. J. (2012). Examining the definition and measurement of quality in early childhood education: A review of studies using the Ecers-R from 2003 to 2010. *Early Childhood Research & Practice*, 14(1). 1-13.
- Lee Hammond, L., & Hesterman, S. (2019). Indigenous children's linguistic rights in the 21st century: Intentions and tensions in practice. In D. Whitebread, V. Grau, K. Kumpulainen, M. McClelland, N. Perry, & D. Pino-Pasternak (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of developmental psychology and early childhood education* (pp. 435–465). SAGE.
- Leggett, N., & Ford, M. (2013). A fine balance: Understanding the roles educators and children play as intentional teachers and intentional learners within the early years learning framework. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 38(4), 42-50.
- Lewis, R., Fler, M., & Hammer, M. (2019). Intentional teaching: Can early-childhood educators create the conditions for children's conceptual development when following a child-centred programme? *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 44(1), 6-18.
- Little, H., & Stapleton, M. (2021). Exploring toddlers' rituals of 'belonging' through risky play in the outdoor environment. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*. Advance Online Publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1463949120987656>
- Loomis, A. M. (2018). The role of preschool as a point of intervention and prevention for trauma-exposed children: Recommendations for practice, policy and research. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 38(3), 134-145.
- Lubans, D. R., Morgan, P. J., Cliff, D. P., Barnett, L. M., & Okely, A. D. (2010). Fundamental movement skills in children and adolescents: Review of associated health benefits. *Sports Medicine*, 40(12), 1019-1035.
- Maher, M., & Buxton, L. (2015). Early childhood education at the cultural interface. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 44(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jie.2015.5>
- Malek-Lasater, A. D, Kwon, K., Horm, D. M., Sisson, S. B., Dev, D. A., & Castle, S. L. (2021). Supporting children's healthy development during mealtime in early childhood settings. *Early Childhood Education Journal*. Online First. 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-020-01137-2>
- Marbina, L., Mashford-Scott, A., Church, A., & Tayler, C. (2015). *Assessment of wellbeing in early childhood education and care: Literature review*. Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority.
- Mason-White, H. (2012). *Learning from good practice: implementing the early years learning framework for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children*. Secretariat of National Aboriginal and Islander Child Care.
- Matthews, G., & Burton, J. (2013). Promising practice in intensive family support for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families. *Developing Practice: The Child, Youth and Family Work Journal*, 34, 56–66. <https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/ielapa.247727908892645>
- McInnes, E., & Ey, L. (2020). Responding to problematic sexual behaviours of primary school children: supporting care and education staff. *Sex Education*, 20(1), 75-89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2019.1621827>
- Mackenzie M, Cologon K, Fenech M. 'Embracing Everybody': Approaching the Inclusive Early Childhood Education of a Child Labelled with Autism from a Social Relational Understanding of Disability. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*. 2016;41(2):4-12. doi:[10.1177/183693911604100202](https://doi.org/10.1177/183693911604100202)
- McLachlan, C. (2017). *Assessment in early childhood education*. Oxford University Press. DOI:[10.1093/obo/9780199756810-0179](https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199756810-0179)

- McLaughlin, T., Aspden, K., & Snyder, P. (2016). Intentional teaching as a pathway to equity in early childhood education: Participation, quality and equity. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 51(2), 175-195.
- Millei, Z., & Sumsion, J. (2011). The 'work' of community in Belonging, Being and Becoming: The Early Years Learning Framework for Australia. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 12(1), 71-85.
- Miller, M., & Petriwskyj, A. (2013). New directions in intercultural early education in Australia. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 45(2), 251-266.
- Milton, A C., Stewart, E., Ospina-Pinillos, L., Davenport, T., & Hickie, IB. (2021). Participatory design of an activities based collective mentoring program in after-school care settings: Connect, promote, and protect program, *JMIR Pediatrics and Parenting*, 4(2, e22822 doi: 10.2196/22822
- Ministry of Education. (2017). *Te whāriki: He whāriki mātauranga mō ngā mokopuna o Aotearoa early childhood curriculum*. <https://www.education.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Early-Childhood/Te-Whariki-Early-Childhood-Curriculum-ENG-Web.pdf>
- Morrissey, A., Scott, C., & Wishart, L. (2015). Infant and toddler responses to a redesign of their childcare outdoor play space. *Children, Youth and Environments*, 25(1), 29–56.
- Moyle, K. (2019). *Literature Review: Indigenous early childhood education, school readiness and transition programs into primary school*. Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.
- Murray, E., & Harrison, L. (2017). Interconnections between family, childcare and education, In R. Grace, K. Hodge & C. McMahon (Eds.), *Children, families and communities* (pp. 169-194). Oxford Press.
- Murray, E., McFarland-Piazza, L., & Harrison, L. J. (2015). Changing patterns of parent-teacher communication and parent involvement from preschool to school. *Early Child Development and Care*, 185(7), 1031-1052.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2014.975223>
- National Indigenous Australians Agency. (2021). *Framework to inform the development of a national Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander early childhood strategy*. Australian Government.
- Newcomer, S. N., & Cowin, K. M. (2021). The power and possibility of stories: Learning to become culturally sustaining and socially just educators. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*. Online First, 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2020.1860407>
- Noble, K., Jackson, J., & Mitchell, P. (2020). *Assessment of children as connected with and contributing to their world in Early Childhood Education and Care: Literature review*. Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority.
https://research.acer.edu.au/early_childhood_misc/28
- Noddings, N. (2012). The caring relation in teaching. *Oxford Review of Education*, 38(6), 771-781. DOI: [10.1080/03054985.2021.745047](https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2021.745047)
- Nutbrown, C. (2013). Conceptualising arts-based learning in the early years. *Research Papers in Education*, 28(2), 239-263.
- O'Brien, K. T., Vanderloo, L. M., Bruijns, B. A., Truelove, S., & Tucker, P. (2018). Physical activity and sedentary time among preschoolers in centre-based childcare: A systematic review. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 15(1), 117-133.
- O'Farrelly, C., & Hennessy, E. (2014). Watching transitions unfold: a mixed-method study of transitions within early childhood care and education settings. *Early Years*, 34(4), 329-347.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2014.968838>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2017). *Starting strong V: transitions from early childhood education and care to primary education*.
https://ch-sodk.s3.amazonaws.com/media/files/2017_OECD_Report_on_ECEC_Transition.pdf
- Page, J. (2018). Characterising principles of professional love in early childhood care and education. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 26(2), 125-141.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2018.1459508>

- Pálsdóttir, K., & Kristjánisdóttir, S. (2017). Leisure-time centres for 6–9 year old children in Iceland; policies, practices and challenges. *International Journal for Research in Extended Education*, 5(2), 211-216. <https://doi.org/10.3224/ijree.v5i2.08>
- Pascal, C., Bertram, T., & Cole-Alback, A. (2017). *The hundred review: what research tells us about effective pedagogic practice and children's outcomes in the reception year*. Early Excellence.
- Pascal, C., Bertram, T., & Rouse, L. (2019). *Getting it right in the early years foundation stage: a review of the evidence*. Centre for Research in Early Childhood. <https://shop.earlyeducation.org.uk/sites/default/files/EYFS%20Coalition%20Chris%20Pascal%20slides%20for%20sharing.pdf>
- Perso, T., & Hayward, C. (2015). *Teaching Indigenous students: cultural awareness and classroom strategies for improving learning outcomes*. Allen & Unwin.
- Peters, S. (2010). *Literature review: transition from early childhood education to school: report to the ministry of education*. Ministry of Education, New Zealand.
- Quay, J., & Jensen, A. (2018). Wild pedagogies and wilding pedagogies: teacher-student-nature centredness and the challenges for teaching. *Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education*, 21, 293-305. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42322-018-0022-9>
- Queensland Department of Health. (2018). *How to talk to young children about mental health*. <https://www.health.qld.gov.au/news-events/news/how-to-talk-young-kids-children->
- Queensland Children's Activity Network (QCAN). (2020). *The Showcase: action research 2020*, Brisbane: QCAN https://8801d745-805a-4dc7-baf0-c9f227b59b8c.filesusr.com/ugd/5b9443_4bf40091f6be41c896a74358b33b0e4a.pdf
- Queensland University of Technology [QUT] (2021). *ARC centre for excellence for the digital child*. <https://www.qut.edu.au/research/australian-research-council-centre-of-excellence-for-the-digital-child>.
- Riley-Ayers, (2014). *Formative assessment: Guidance for early childhood policymakers (CEELO Policy Report)*. Retrieved from Center on Enhancing Early Learning Outcomes. http://ceelo.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/ceelo_policy_report_formative_assessment.pdf
- Robinson, C. (2019). Young children's spirituality: a focus on engaging with nature. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 44(4), 339-350.
- Rosanbalm, K., & Murray, D.W. (2017). *Self regulation snapshot 1: a focus on infant and toddlers*. Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/opre/infantstoddlerssnapshot_accessible_508_compliant_updated.pdf
- Rouse, E. (2015). Mixed-age grouping in early childhood: creating the outdoor learning environment. *Early Child Development and Care*, 185(5), 742–751.
- Rouse, E. (2019). *Partnerships in the early years*. Oxford University Press.
- Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. (2017). *Final report*. Commonwealth of Australia. <https://www.childabuseroyalcommission.gov.au/final-report>
- Salmon, M., Doery, K., Dance, P., Chapman, J., Gilbert, R., Williams, R. & Lovett, R. (2019). *Defining the indefinable: descriptors of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples' cultures and their links to health and wellbeing*. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Team, Research School of Population Health, The Australian National University, Canberra.
- Saunders, R. P., Dowda, M., Pfeiffer, K. A., Brown, W. H., & Pate, R. R. (2019). Childcare center characteristics moderate the effects of a physical activity intervention. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(1), 101-113.
- Schenetti, M., & Guerra, E. (2018). Emotion map making. Discovering teachers' relationships with nature. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Research in Early Childhood Education*. 12(2), 31-56.
- School Curriculum and Standards Authority and Standards Authority. (2014). *Kindergarten Curriculum Guidelines*.

- https://k10outline.scsa.wa.edu.au/media/documents/outline_downloads/Western-Australian-Kindergarten-Curriculum-Guidelines-pdf.pdf
- Sedgwick, F. (2012). *Learning outside the primary classroom*. Routledge.
- Segal-Drori, O., & Ben Shabat, A. (2021). Preschoolers' views on integration of digital technologies. *Journal of Childhood, Education & Society*, 2(1), 29-42.
- Silva, J. M., & Langhout, R. D. (2011). Cultivating agents of change in children. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 39(1), 61-91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2011.10473447>
- Solomon, J. (2016). Gender identity and expression in the early childhood classroom. *Young Children*, 71(3), 61-72.
- Stamopoulous, E., & Barblett, L. (2018). *Early childhood leadership in action: evidence-based approaches for effective practice*. Allen and Unwin.
- Straker, L., Zabatiero, J., Danby, S., Thorpe, K., & Edwards, S. (2018). Conflicting guidelines on young children's screen time and use of digital technology create policy and practice dilemmas. *The Journal of Pediatrics*, 202, 300-303.
- Stratigos, T., & Fenech, M. (2021). Early childhood education and care in the app generation: digital documentation for learning and parent communication. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 46(1), 19-31.
- Sumsion, J., Harrison, L., Letsch, K., Bradley, B.S., & Stapleton, M. (2018). 'Belonging' in Australian early childhood education and care curriculum and quality assurance: opportunities and risks. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* (19) 4, 340-355.
- Sydenham, E. (2019). *Ensuring equality for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children in the early years*. Early Childhood Australia.
- Taggart, G. (2016). Compassionate pedagogy: the ethics of care in early childhood professionalism. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 24(2), 173-185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2014.970847>
- Taggart, B., Sylva, K., Melhuish, E., Sammons, P., & Siraj, I. (2015). *Effective pre-school, primary and secondary education project (EPPSE 3-16+): how pre-school influences children and young people's attainment and developmental outcomes over time*. Department for Education (DfE).
- Taylor, C., Ishimine, K., Cloney, D., Cleveland, G., & Thorpe, K. (2013). The quality of early childhood education and care services in Australia. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 38(2), 13-21.
- Taylor, A. (2011). Coming, ready or not: Aboriginal children's transition to school in urban Australia and the policy push. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 19 (2) 145-161, DOI: [10.1080/09669760.2011.602593](https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2011.602593)
- Taylor, M.E., & Boyer, W. (2020). Play base learning: evidence – based classroom research to improve children's learning experiences in the kindergarten classroom. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 48(2) 127-133.
- The LEGO Foundation. (2020). *Children, technology and play. Summary report*. The LEGO Foundation.
- Trew, S., Russell, D.H., Higgins, D.J., & Walsh, K. (2021). *Effective delivery methods and teaching strategies for child sexual abuse prevention: a rapid evidence check*. Institute of Child Protection Studies, Australian Catholic University. <https://doi.org/10.26199/rdbq-xm46>
- Tribolet, K-A. (2020). *The provision of movement experiences in Australian early childhood curriculum: Examining educators' practices and children's participation in physically active play*. [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Charles Sturt University.
- UNESCO (2006). *Guidelines on intercultural education*. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001478/147878e.pdf>.
- van Rooijen, M. & Newstead, S. (2017). Influencing factors on professional attitudes towards risk-taking in children's play: a narrative review, *Early Child Development and Care*, 187(5-6), 946-957. DOI: [10.1080/03004430.2016.1204607](https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2016.1204607)
- Verdon, S., Mackenzie, N., McLeod, S., Davidson, C., Masso, S., Verdon, L., & Edwards-

- Groves, C. (2018). *Assessment of Children as effective communicators in early childhood education and care: literature review*. Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (VCAA).
https://www.vcaa.vic.edu.au/Documents/earlyyears/EYLitReview_Communication.pdf
- Virgara, R., Phillips, A., Lewis, L. *et al.* (2021). Development of Australian physical activity and screen time guidelines for outside school hours care: an international Delphi study. *International Journal of Behavioural Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 18(3), 1-14.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-020-01061-z>
- Walsh, R. L., Hodge, K. A., Bowes, J. M., & Kemp, C. R. (2010). Same age, different page: overcoming the barriers to catering for young gifted children in prior-to-school settings. *International Journal of Early Childhood (IJEC)*, 42(1), 43-58.
- Warren, J., & Harden-Thew, K. (2019). Transitions outside the mainstream: stories of children and their families. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 44(1), 63-75.
- White, A. D., & Fler, M. (2019). Early childhood educators' perceptions of the Australian early years learning framework (EYLF): engaged professional learners. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 44(2), 124-138.
- White, E. J., Rooney, T., Gunn, A. C., & Nuttal, J. (2021). Understanding how early childhood educators 'see' learning through digitally cast eyes: some preliminary concepts concerning the use of digital documentation platforms. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 46(1), 6-18.
- Wood, E. A. (2014). Free choice and free play in early childhood education: troubling the discourse. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 22(1), 4-18. DOI: [10.1080/09669760.2013.830562](https://doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2013.830562)
- Wood, E., & Hedges, H. (2016). Curriculum in early childhood education: critical questions about content, curriculum and coherence. *The Curriculum Journal*, 27(3), 387-405.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2015.1129981>
- World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED). (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford University Press. <http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf>
- World Health Organisation (2001). *International classification of functioning, disability and health*. WHO.
- Xiao, Y., & Watson, M. (2019). Guidance on conducting a systematic literature review. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 39(1), 93-112.
- Xu, P. (2019). Positioning children citizens: exploring discourses in early childhood curricula in China and Aotearoa New Zealand. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 24, 58-74.
<https://doi.org/10.26686/nzaroe.v24i0.6324>
- Yildirim, B. (2021). Preschool STEM activities: Preschool teachers' preparations and views. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 49, 149-162. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-020-01056-2>
- Zabatiero, J., Straker, L., Mantilla, A., Edwards, S., & Danby, S. (2018). Young children and digital technology: Australian early childhood education and care sector adults' perspectives *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood* 43 (2) 14-22
- Zilliacus, H., Holm, G., & Sahlström, F. (2017). Taking steps towards institutionalising multicultural education – The national curriculum of Finland. *Multicultural Education Review*, 9(4), 231-248, <https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615X.2017.1383810>
- Zosh, J. M., Hopkins, E. J., Jensen, H., Liu, C., Neale, D. Hirsh-Pasek, K. Solis, S. L., & Whitebread, D. (2017). *Learning through play: a review of the evidence*. The LEGO Foundation.
https://www.legofoundation.com/media/1063/learning-through-play_web.pdf