Tranche 1 Scoping Papers

FEEDBACK SUMMARY – (Technologies - Engineering Design Level 2-3)

RESPONSES: 1 REPRESENTING: 7 people

Strengths and Weaknesses of existing courses - Feedback response	Respondents' suggested ways forward	Summary of key themes and ways forward from feedback	CL Response / Ways Forward
The current Engineering Design Level 2 course was designed to meet some specific unmet needs for a significant student cohort for whom a Level 2 course was appropriate, and has done so successfully. In particular, it met needs of students who might not aspire to tertiary engineering study	None provided	Current Engineering Design Level 2 is fit for purpose in terms of intended cohort.	Ways Forward: In light of feedback, ensure that proposed course continues to meet the needs of a broad student cohort. Continue with course development building on the strengths of the current course at level 2.

Course Rationale - Feedback response	Respondents' suggested ways forward	Summary of key themes and ways forward from feedback	CL Response / Ways Forward
Engineering Design as described in the rationale might fit software design	Could it for example be used for students wishing to engage with app development or game development?	Potential for course to enable software design.	Response and ways forward: The current Engineering Design course is used for software design because there is no other suitable course available. The development of a Level 2-3 Computer Science course can be designed to specifically enable software design.

The course rationale is appropriate and clearly describes:

- the intended audience,
- why the chosen content is important for students and outlines the broad scope of learning to be expected
- the particular skills knowledge and understandings students will develop

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	0	0	0	0

Ways Forward:
Strong unanimous support that the course rationale is appropriate, course development to proceed as planned

In considering the focus areas identified in the Years 9 to 12 Curriculum Framework and this course rationale, do you believe the course is placed in the appropriate focus area?

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	0	0	0	0

Ways Forward:
Strong unanimous support that the course is placed in the appropriate focus area, course development to proceed as planned

General Capabilities - Feedback response	Respondents' suggested ways forward	Summary of key themes and ways forward from feedback	CL Response / Ways Forward
Yes	None provided	The respondent agrees with the proposed General Capabilities.	Ways Forward: The inclusion of the proposed General Capabilities will be considered as part of the course writing process.

Cross Curriculum Priorities - Feedback response	Respondents' suggested ways forward	Summary of key themes and ways forward from feedback	CL Response / Ways Forward
All 3 cross curriculum priorities could potentially be included as considerations for how solution designs might need to address particular perspectives.	None provided	Potential to include all three cross-curricula priorities.	Ways Forward: Design the course so that there is flexibility in the application of the Cross-Curriculum Priorities.

Core concepts, big ideas, essential learning or important considerations - Feedback response	Respondents' suggested ways forward	Summary of key themes and ways forward from feedback	CL Response / Ways Forward
It is important for Engineering Design to be a flexible course to support the development of this generation's capacity for start-up STEM/STEAM related businesses, pop-up marketing or entrepreneurial success models for new ways of earning like Tasmania's success with paddock to plate. Its flexibility should allow for study within different branches and subcategories of engineering, including those already being delivered under the current Engineering Design Level 2 course such as robotics, game design etc.	The current Engineering Design Level 2 course was designed to meet some specific unmet needs for a significant student cohort for whom a Level 2 course was appropriate, and has done so successfully. A Level 3 course might be more aimed at students who wish to pursue tertiary engineering studies. In some ways this reflects the different meanings of "engineering" in society, from technician and trade level engineering through to graduate and postgraduate design and construction. It is important however that the Level 2 course should remain relevant to those students whose aspirations are not in the tertiary engineering field	Courses should be flexible and support a variety of needs. Flexibility to support the development of innovation and entrepreneurship. Level 2 course should retain its relevance for students who are not aspiring to tertiary engineering (technician and trades). The course should enable different subcategories of Engineering including those already being delivered, e.g. robotics, game design, etc.	Ways Forward: • Include core concepts, big ideas, and essential learnings identified where possible in new course design • Consider how different subcategories of Engineering, including those already being delivered e.g. robotics, game design can be included where possible in new course design • In consideration of all suggested feedback, develop a position on the scope of the course. Consult with the LAG to define and refine the scope of the course content with a supporting rationale. • Course writer to be cognisant of the important considerations such as flexibility and broad pathways.