Course Review 2024 Digital Technologies Level 2

Response to feedback for newly accredited courses first delivered in 2024.

In collaboration with TASC, DECYP implemented a range of significant amendments across the suite of new courses, including <u>Digital Technologies Level 2</u>.

The 2024 <u>Phase 1 Review</u> identified opportunities for improvement, with a particular focus on assessment.

Senior Secondary Provision and TASC developed a matrix to assess the scale and risk of identified issues. Courses were divided in three categories:

- High priority amendments
- Moderate priority amendments
- Lower priority amendments

Subject Matter Experts met to validate and provide feedback on the proposed solutions to identified issues (the amendments).

What we heard

The following table represents background data related to the course review:

- Number of providers offering the course in 2024
- Total number of feedback responses received
- Percentage represented by the number of feedback responses out of the total number of providers offering the course

	Providers offering the course in 2024		Percentage of providers represented by feedback
			responses
Numbers	6	2	33%



Summary of identified issues and recommended solutions:

IDENTIFIED ISSUES	
	RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS
Lack of clarity with wording of elements	Elements reviewed for clarity and detail, including use of command words
Resourcing to provide clarity and detail of content	Resource development, including more explicit detail in
and/or work requirements	the course implementation guide

Course amendments:

• Please see Clarifications below.

Clarifications:

The following clarification/s have been provided:

- Courses for updates were ranked as either high, moderate or low priority, using a matrix which considers number of enrolments / providers, volume of feedback, merit of feedback, risk of inaction, complexity of issue etc.
- The course amendments noted for this course will be noted for actioning in 2025 for 2026 course delivery

Recommendations:

Some feedback received was outside of the scope of this phase of the course review process. As a result, the following recommendations have been made for future consideration:

• Nil.