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Abstract

The study we have undertaken aims at finding out whether the experts in the field are aware of the existence of the new curriculum and, what is more, whether they get involved in its implementation. We also aim at finding out whether the teachers are aware of these changes and of the novelties brought forth by the new curriculum within the instructive-educational process. To this effect, we have drafted and applied a questionnaire to Physical Education teachers who work with primary school pupils. The questionnaire consisted of 15 closed-ended questions with a single choice. It was applied to 380 teachers in four counties from South-Eastern Romania (Galați, Brăila, Vrancea, Tulcea). The results were both surprising and contradictory. Most of the specialists have heard of a new curriculum for the subject Physical Education, but they are unable to tell what it brings new compared to the former one. 68% of the interviewees consider that the new curriculum does not bring any new, significant elements in point of contents of learning. An important aspect is that 75% of the experts believe that the present curriculum cannot reach its educational objectives as there are no assessment methods for them. Also, assessment through performance is regarded as relevant in the context in which physical exercise becomes a means for health, leisure and social integration and not one for sports and performance in the context of the general competences formulated by the new curriculum. The main conclusion is that this new curriculum is not sufficiently known so as to be successfully implemented in the practical activities during the Physical Education class.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The concept of curriculum started being used in the Romanian education system after 1990, when an ample reform campaign was launched. This reform has consisted of many foregrounding aspects and directions. Grounds were laid for the turn from reproductive to creative learning, for making the national curricula more consistent with the European ones. At the same time, attempts were made towards a more effective connection between school units at all levels and the economic, social, cultural and business environment. The general reform of Romanian education also targeted related directions, such as the improvement of infrastructure and the implementation of the modern technological systems, the decentralization of school management and increase in the autonomy of school units or the initialization of the advanced international cooperation.

The curricular evolution of a school subject is conditioned by the realities noted during the instructive-educational process, by the legislative process, by the social demand regarding learning necessities and by the cultural and geographical context in which this process takes place [9].

The curriculum primarily represents a system of learning experiences offered to educable people and interiorized by the latter. It doesn't only refer to planned finalities, syllabi and curricula, methodologies and assessment – it must also direct the activity from teaching – an activity which belongs to the teacher – to learning (which belongs to the student) [5].

As a result of this ample reform process, the subject Physical Education, as part and parcel of the instructive-educational process has taken the same direction of constant adaptation to social realities. This adaptation of the curriculum to an ever-changing social reality is reflected in the researchers' preoccupation at the world level [6, 11, 12, 20, 21].

Drafting new curricular documents for the primary education cycle was of utmost importance. This necessity raised from the process of incorporating the final pre-school year at the school level. This transfer entailed the presence in the school activities an age for which there had not been any regulations regarding the contents and activities that should have been carried out with the students.
The prior planning documents for Physical Education were directed at objectives attainment [14, 17, 18]. The framework objectives contain reference finalities which define the acquisitions that can be internalized by students through the study of the respective discipline in combination with the other disciplines in the respective curriculum [2].

The present curriculum of Physical Education for primary education was drafted from 2013 to 2014 [15, 16], and it started being applied in the school year 2015-2016. This curriculum aims at a progressive development of competences and of the other acquisitions made by students by valorizing the age-specific experiences, by emphasizing the affective-attitudinal dimensions of personality formation. Competences are integrated assemblies of knowledge, skills and abilities of applying, operating with and transferring acquisitions, which allow the successful carrying out of an activity, the effective solving of a problem or a category of problems/ situations; competences have cognitive/ intellectual, affective-attitudinal and psychomotor components [13].

The school curriculum for Physical Education aims at acquiring key competences and, at the same time, gives the possibility for transdisciplinarity, both within the limits of the discipline and in relation to other school disciplines [15].

The formation of competences is carried out with the help of the learning contents proposed by the specialized curriculum in practical lessons. The Physical Education class differs from the other classes through contents, structure, methodology, dynamics, spatial framework and learning specificities [23].

For the primary cycle, but not only, the quality of the educational process depends on the necessity of the conscious selection of the education means, methods and procedures [25].

An important aspect of the instructive-educational process is the students’ assessment [1]. This is a qualitative process which shows the extent to which the students acquired new competences in agreement with the ones formulated by the curriculum.

The necessity for a curricular evolution is of relevance for many international experts [3, 7, 8, 10, 19, 22]. Research in this direction is carried out as the integration between competences, contents and assessment should be balanced at all times [24]. We have accordingly considered that a study of the implementation of curricular changes may be useful for the Romanian experts.

2 METHODOLOGY

Taking into consideration the implementation of a new curriculum for Physical Education in primary education [15] and the fact this is in its second year of implementation at the national level, we wanted to know the specialists’ opinion with regard to the way it is carried out. The importance of becoming aware of the planning documents implementation level is also the objective of some studies published at the international level [4].

To this end, we have elaborated a questionnaire which consists of 15 closed questions and we applied the Likert scale for the evaluation of the answers. Out of 15 questions, 3 are related to aspects which pertain to group demographics. They collect information about the county in which the respondents carry out their activity, their level of expertise expressed in seniority in education and the environment in which the activity is carried out (rural or urban).

The other questions in the questionnaire target four dimensions, as follows:

1. The interest in the changed occurring in the field and the awareness level in what concerns the curriculum which has been implemented starting with the year 2015 at the primary education level;
2. Awareness of the conceptual changes proposed by the new curriculum;
3. Awareness of the changes proposed by the new curriculum at the level of learning contents and the way they lead to the accomplishment of the finalities of education;
4. Awareness of the possibilities of applying the evaluation system and the way in which it complies with the proposed finalities of education.

The questionnaire was applied in four counties from the south-eastern part of Romania, namely Galati, Vrancea, Braila and Tulcea. The questionnaire was applied online by delivering a link to the respondents, and their answers were automatically centralized.
The questionnaire was responded to by a number of 380 of teachers of Physical Education. In order to generate answers as sincere as possible, which will thus reflect the reality of the implementation of the new curriculum of Physical Education in primary schools, the questionnaire did not require personal information or other data which may lead to the identification of the respondents.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Having applied the questionnaire, we centralized the data and analyzed and interpreted it in order to discover the degree to which the specialists in Physical Education have assimilated the proposals of the new curriculum and how they contribute to its successful implementation in the practical activity. The results are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Specialists’ answers on the implementation of the new Physical Education curriculum in primary education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you know anything about a new curriculum for Physical Education in primary schools?</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.58%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25.79%</td>
<td>8.15%</td>
<td>9.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you believe that a curricular change was necessary for Physical Education in primary schools?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
<td>12.36%</td>
<td>16.32%</td>
<td>67.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How much interested are you in knowing the new curriculum for Physical Education in primary schools?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.89%</td>
<td>9.48%</td>
<td>26.84%</td>
<td>60.79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you believe the conceptual changes brought by the new curriculum to be significant in relation to the previous curriculum?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td>18.68%</td>
<td>42.37%</td>
<td>23.42%</td>
<td>60.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you believe that the contents of learning in the new curriculum are significantly different from the ones in the previous curriculum?</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.27%</td>
<td>33.68%</td>
<td>6.58%</td>
<td>10.79%</td>
<td>13.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are the planning documents elaborated in the last year consistent with the general competences stipulated by the new curriculum for Physical Education in primary schools?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.26%</td>
<td>28.42%</td>
<td>56.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you believe that the extant evaluation system is able to establish the level of the general competences acquired by students in compliance with the new curriculum for Physical Education in primary schools?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.68%</td>
<td>8.16%</td>
<td>21.32%</td>
<td>27.10%</td>
<td>39.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How significant is the assessment process in relation to the contents of learning present in the new curriculum for Physical Education in primary schools?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34.74%</td>
<td>20.79%</td>
<td>29.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How relevant to do you consider the sport and performance component of the instructive-educational process at the primary school level for the good development of the student?</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.21%</td>
<td>8.42%</td>
<td>23.95%</td>
<td>22.89%</td>
<td>30.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How important do you think it is for students to practice physical exercise as means for health in the instructive-educational process at the primary school level for the good development of the student?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21.84%</td>
<td>24.74%</td>
<td>53.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do you consider that the contents of learning of the new Physical Education curriculum are able to form the general competences stimulated?</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.74%</td>
<td>10.27%</td>
<td>20.26%</td>
<td>31.05%</td>
<td>23.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. In the assessment process for Physical Education at the primary school level, can you establish the degree of psychomotor development, the competences of using the specialized language and the favorable behavioral attitudes of the students?</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.37%</td>
<td>33.42%</td>
<td>17.89%</td>
<td>6.32%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can assert from the beginning that the results were biased because they generally indicated the respondents’ wish to give answers which corresponded to a favorable state of facts and not necessarily to reality or to concrete opinions reflecting reality.
The discussion on the responses gathered from specialists starts with the second question, which aimed to underline whether the curricular change for Physical Education in primary school education was necessary or not, in their opinion.

Most specialists considered the change of curricular orientation for the primary school level was necessary. Thus, 67.37% of the respondents opinioned that this change was very necessary and 16.32% that it was necessary.

We consider that one of the reasons that led to this opinion is the conceptual component of the Physical Education curriculum, which set new competences that have to be acquired by the primary school students. We also consider that the expectations for the change in the learning contents of the practical activities have led to the idea that a new planning document was necessary for the subject Physical Education. These directions are outlined in the questions 4 and 5.

Surprisingly, although at the declarative level, most specialists in Physical Education agree to the curricular change, the vast majority admit that they do not know or know too little about the existence of such a document meant to regulate the practical activity at the primary school level. Thus, 56.58% of the respondents declared that they did not know or knew very little about the existence of a new Physical Education curriculum for primary education. Also in regard to the awareness of the new curriculum, only 17.63% declared that they possessed good (8.15%) and very good (9.48%) knowledge of the existence and implementation of the new planning document.

The results for the third question were as expected. Most of the respondents declared that they were interested (26.84%) and very interested (60.79%) in being informed and in knowing more thoroughly the changes proposed by the new curriculum.

The answers received to this question have confirmed to a high extent that, at the moment, the new curriculum is not known by the vast majority of the specialists, although they must carry out activities in compliance with it.

We consider that providing information to teachers is a priority in this respect and that the unawareness with regard to the curricular changes is a limitation factor in reaching the general competences by the primary school students.

The fourth question wanted to reveal whether the specialists in the field are aware of the conceptual changes brought by the new curriculum and whether they consider these changes relevant. The analysis of the answers is in agreement to the answers received for the first three questions.

If the number of those who do not know anything about the existence of a new Physical Education curriculum for primary education is large, it is only natural that the changes proposed at the conceptual level by this curriculum to be proportionally little known. As such, the majority responded that these changes were of little significance (18.68%) and significant enough (42.37%). An important percentage is that of those asserting that the changes proposed are significant and very significant (37.63%). This fairly large percentage is in contradiction with the fact that those who declared that they had good and very good knowledge of the existence of a new Physical Education curriculum for primary school was of only 17.63%. We consider that the answers to this question were not sincere, even though the questionnaire did not collect personal data. This is because the number of those who affirm that the changes are significant is high above the number of those who claim to have good and very good knowledge about the new curriculum.

In the authors’ opinion, the changes made at the level of the finalities of Physical Education are conceptually significant and have reoriented the practice of physical exercising towards its use as means for health, social integration and the formation of adequate behaviors for the social integration of the future adult [9].

Other questions aimed to emphasize the approaches to practical activities during the Physical Education classes in the compulsory school timetable in what concerns the contents and the way in which it is perceived by the specialized teachers. In this respect, five questions have been elaborated, in an attempt to comprise various aspects of the contents of the practical activities and the way in which they can contribute to the acquirement of the general competences formulated by the new curriculum.

To Question 5, “Do you believe that the contents of learning in the new curriculum are significantly different from the ones in the previous curriculum?”, the majority responded that the changes are insignificant (35.27%) or of little significance (33.68%). Those asserting otherwise are represented by 10.79% (significant changes in contents) and 13.68% (very significant changes of contents).
The answers to this question are again discrepant. It is true that the curricular changes are not significant in what the contents of learning is concerned [9]. It is, however, relevant to notice that the large number of those who affirmed so is inconsistent with the number of those who declared that they did not know anything about the existence of a new Physical Education curriculum for primary education.

We consider that this answer was indicated only as a result of the actual activities carried out in class by teachers. Because this content has been identical for years, the teacher was not influenced by the specific contents belonging to a certain curriculum, but by the way in which the activity was effectively carried out.

Also in relation to the contents of learning is the question which targets the importance of sport and performance component in the process of students' growth and development (Q9). A very small percentage (22.63%) answered that this component is of little importance in the growth and development process. The rest of the respondents were in favor of the importance of this component, 23.95% asserting that this is important enough, 22.89% that it is important and 30.53% that it is very important. Therefore, a total of 77.37% of the specialists in the field consider that physical exercising is necessary for the child’s growth and development, in the sense of the influences of exercising in the improvement of sport performance. This is in contradiction with the orientation of the new curriculum and the general competences formulated in the new planning documents [15, 16]. The answers have confirmed that the number of those who are aware of the conceptual changes of the new curriculum is small. Also, through the answers collected, we could observe that the number of teachers who do not know anything about a new Physical Education curriculum for primary education is large (56.58%).

This confirms the fact that the majority of teachers valorize the sport component of practicing physical exercise as a stereotype to which they have adapted due to the fact that the evaluation system comprises only sport performance criteria.

In what concerns the importance of practicing physical exercise in view of maintaining an optimal state of health, a question targeted whether the specialists considered this exercising beneficial for the growth and development process of the primary school students (Q10). The answers to this question had only favorable variants. There were no teachers who considered that practicing physical exercising as a means of maintaining health would not be beneficial for the students' growth and development. Thus, 21.84% of the answers indicated that practicing physical exercising was important enough, 24.74% - important, and 53.42% - very important.

In this context, of a unanimous acceptance of physical exercise as a means of health, for the positive growth and development of the primary school students, we consider that its role in the school syllabus is very important. We also believe that practicing physical exercise outside school has a good influence over the primary school students' growth and development, as well as over their school performance. Thus, the exercises proposed by teachers, the movement games, the pleasure of interacting with other children during the practical activities in the physical education class may represent beneficial influences to be transferred towards the extra-school activities. This way, we believe that the finalities of education proposed by the new Physical Education curriculum for primary education can be attained.

We could note a certain contradiction between the answers to questions 9 and 10. The large number of those who consider the sport component important for the growth and development process is somehow in disagreement to the fact that physical exercising is a means for health. This contradiction results from the fact that, in order to participate in the class activities, one should not prove special performance. Only a few students are predisposed to acquiring performance. In addition, at this age, the lack of certain motor skills makes difficult the attainment of outcomes that can qualify as performance. On the other hand, the competitive nature of the activity negatively influences the students’ participation in the sense that they who are not able to complete some activities or actions might avoid to participate in the activity proposed by the teacher in order to avoid the psychic discomfort generated by failure. This is the reason why we agree to the idea that, for the contents of the practical activities during the physical education class, only means that can be carried out by the majority of students should be selected. This will stimulate their participation, their involvement in collective activities, communication, the development of collaborative skills, aspects which overlap the general competences advanced by the new Physical Education curriculum for primary education.

In view of establishing the way in which the general competences can be achieved through the contents present in the new curriculum, we have formulated the question “Do you consider that the contents of learning of the new Physical Education curriculum are able to form the general
competences stimulated?” (Q11). Most of the answers (54.73%) prove that the specialists in the field consider that the competences can be achieved through contents of learning, asserting that they can be acquired to a great extent (31.05%) and to a very great extent (23.68%). This shows a favorable orientation towards the contents of the activities that the teachers carry out during the practical classes. Added to these is the percentage of those who believe that the general competences can be sufficiently acquired with the help of the contents of activities (20.26%). The number of those who have a negative opinion in regard to the contents of activities and their possibility to lead the students to the proposed general competences is low. Thus, 14.74% assert that students cannot acquire the general competences through the present contents, while 10.27% indicated that they can be acquired only to a limited extent.

One of the questions which reflect the contents of the subject Physical Education and the way it is approached and organized referred to the method of drafting the planning documents. In these documents, the contents of learning are apportioned so as to lead the students towards acquiring the general competences, in other words, so as to accomplish the finalities of education of the discipline.

On the other hand, the planning documents rigorously elaborated show the understanding level of the teacher in balancing the content elements based on the competences they should form. Placing them in a logic, natural succession will determine a favorable response from the students. By using the contents in the sense of the conceptual changes proposed by the new curriculum, most of the students should carry out psychomotor-oriented activities, should use physical exercise as a means for health, for social integration and for the formation of individual and group behaviors. The contents should not be regarded as oriented towards sport performance and, as a result, the contents of the planning documents should also reflect this new orientation.

The responses collected show that most of the respondents (84.74%) consider that the planning documents elaborated during their current year of activity were well drafted (28.42%) and very well drafted (56.32%). A very small percentage belongs to those who believe that their planning documents were sufficiently well drafted (15.26%), admitting the possibility that they might not comply with the new elements of the curriculum which must be implemented at the primary school level. No one considered that their planning documents were non-compliant with the requirements.

We consider that these answers do not reflect reality. It is highly unlikely that these planning documents are so well elaborated by so many, when the majority of the respondents answered that they knew little or nothing about the existence of a new Physical Education curriculum for primary education. Also, the answers to this question contradict the answers regarding the awareness of the conceptual changes introduced by the new curriculum. As long as the competences are different, it is improbable that the planning documents are compliant with them.

The fact that the content elements are not significantly different from the ones in the previous curriculum [9] makes us assert that these documents have been copied from the previous years and that they have not been amended in compliance with the new requirements of the finalities of education of the Physical Education subject for primary education, a curriculum which has been implemented in the Romanian education system starting with 2015-2016 school year. Evolution of answers from content point of view is presented in Figure 1.
Finally, we shall analyze the answers recorded for three questions which refer to the application of the assessment system [1], in view of determining the level of acquiring the general competences at the primary school level.

With Q7, we have tried to figure out whether the specialists in the field consider that the present assessment system is capable of establishing the level of the general competences formulated by the new Physical Education curriculum for primary education. Most of the respondents confirmed that the evaluation system is effective. This, 39.74% asserted that the level of competences could be assessed to a great extent, 27.10% to a good extent, and 21.32% - to a reasonable extent, being relevant for the assessment process. A very small number of the respondents indicated that the present assessment system is completely irrelevant (3.86%) or that it was of little significance (8.16%).

This small number is probably part of the equally small number of those who know the requirements of the new curriculum. The general competences differ a lot compared to the previous curriculum. It follows that an assessment system which was not adapted to the new competences cannot be an assessment system capable of providing accurate information of the students’ acquisition levels. From this perspective, we consider that the majority of the respondents do not possess knowledge of the way in which these new general competences can be assessed.

Another question related to the assessment system attempted to reveal its significance in relation to the contents of learning proposed by the new Physical Education curriculum for primary education. Most of the answers indicated that the assessment system was significant (20.79%) and highly significant (29.47%) in relation to the learning contents present in the new curriculum. Unexpectedly and surprisingly, a large number of respondents indicated the present assessment system as sufficiently significant (34.74%). This is because the contents oriented towards sport performance aspects can be considered in agreement with the assessment system.

The present content of the curriculum, which was not significantly modified in what concerns the contents of learning [9], was adopted wholly in the practical activities by the teachers who did not see the difference between the two planning documents (the former curriculum and the present one). The answers recorded reflect the truth to a high extent. But they are not the result of knowing and implementing the new school curriculum for Physical Education at the primary school level, but that of the application of the means integrally taken from the previous curriculum. They generally aim at performance and not at the aspects formulated by the new general competences. The variation of answers from evaluation system point of view is presented in Figure 2.
The last question in the questionnaire set the assessment system in relation to the general competences formulated by the present curriculum. This time, these competences were explicitly formulated in Q12. This question resembles to Q7. The difference between the two resides in the general character of Q7 and the concrete, explicit nature of Q12. The answers to this question contradict the answers to the thematically related Q7. This time, the majority (42.37%) asserted that the present assessment system of Physical Education for primary school cannot establish the level of psychomotor development, the specialized language skills and the students’ favorable attitudinal behaviors. A significant percentage (33.42%) declared that these competences can hardly be evaluated through the present assessment system. These statements contradict all the answers to Q7, where 66.84% stated that the assessment system could establish the level of students’ acquisition of general competences.

Due to the significant differences recorded for these answers, we can conclude that they come from the unawareness of the specialists in the field in what concerns the competences.

From another perspective, in the case of Q12, there was no favorable opinion regarding the possibility to establish the degree of psychomotor development, the competences in using the specialized language and the favorable attitudinal behaviors of the students. This comes in complete contradiction with the answers to Q7, which state the opposite.

4 CONCLUSIONS

Following the application of the questionnaire related to the awareness and implementation of the new Physical Education curriculum in primary school to specialists in Physical Education, we have recorded inconsistent answers. These answers can be summarized according to a few criteria.

In what awareness is concerned, most of the respondents declared that they were interested in knowing the elements of novelty in their specialty. Nevertheless, most of the teachers know little to nothing about the existence of a new Physical Education curriculum for primary education. The sincerity of the answers is challenged.

In reference to the new conceptual elements, fundamentally different from the previous – the teachers do not know what they are. They also do not know the difference between learning through objectives and learning in view of acquiring competences. As a result, neither is the implementation of the finalities of education accomplished.

The contents of learning have been taken from the previous curriculum, which makes the specialists fail to understand that this discipline has a new curriculum and confusions can be made between the former and the present curriculum. Also, while they consider that the general competences can be acquired through contents and evaluation, the teachers understand that they do not have assessment means compliant with these competences.
Although the vast majority declared that their planning documents were well elaborated, this response cannot be considered sincere since they did not know the general competences formulated by the new curriculum. Also, even though the contents of learning are well structured, they cannot lead to the acquisition of competences, as they are in disagreement with the latter.

The aspects related to the assessment process are maintained along the lines of sport performance, as stated in the previous curriculum. The present assessment does not foreground practicing physical exercise as a means for health, social integration and for the formation of favorable behaviors.

The teachers of Physical Education do not have the means to concretely determine the formation of the general competences as outlined by the new curriculum. The assessment system is old [1], outdated by the context of the assessment necessities formulated by the competences in the curriculum which is currently in its implementation phase at the level of the Romanian primary education system.

All these aspects prompt us to state that the implementation of the new Physical Education curriculum for primary education is still at a low level. For its better implementation in practical activities, information sessions should be organized. We also consider appropriate a greater involvement of the specialists in the field through mentoring activities.
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