

Tranche 1 – Phase 4 – Draft Course

English Inquiry Level 2

Total Responses = 2

Organisations represented	Group	Individual
2	1	1
(representing 4 individuals)		

Content

Summary of feedback regarding implementation of course in relation to content

Key themes	Years 9 to 12 Learning Response
<p>One respondent provided the following feedback on the criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 criteria are too many. 5-7 criteria are enough. • Too much overlap across criteria 6, 7, 8. What is the difference between criteria 1 and 2? • Criteria need to be more specific, concise, and 'stand-alone' to minimise overlap. 	<p>Noted. Years 9 to 12 Learning Course Design requires 8 criteria in each course across each subject.</p> <p>Criteria 1 and 2: C1 deals with control of language and C2 focuses on oral communication clarity, interaction and presentation.</p> <p>Explanation of the purposes and differences across criteria 6, 7 and 8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C6 focuses on the effect of language choices and using language to shape representations of Australian popular culture and is only assessed in Module 1. It specifically aligns to SSAC Essential English Learning Outcome: understand language choices and their effects on audiences in a variety of texts and contexts. • C7 focuses on language analysis and the representation of ethical ideas in different modes,

mediums and contexts and is only assessed in Module 2. It specifically aligns to SSAC Essential English Learning Outcome: Examine how the structure and language of texts varies in different modes, media and contexts.

- C8 focuses on interpretation/ comprehension of ideas and issues, comparison and using persuasive language to justify a personal position and is only assessed in Module 3. It specifically aligns to SSAC Essential English Learning Outcome: (comprehend) represent and interpret information, ideas issues, and language in texts.

Feedback/questions regarding External Assessment of Criteria:

- Which criteria will be externally assessed? No criteria are asterisked.
- Will the external assessment process continue (a) like the current QA meetings? Or (b) follow along the lines of the current Level 3 external assessment model?
- Option (b) would extend the time frame necessary to determine final awards – especially given the school timetable and the duration of the school year, cut into allocated module duration (Term 3 / 4), create administrative issues and increase teacher and provider workload.
- Will student adjustments and individual learning plans be considered in allocating external ratings?
- Who will perform the external assessment?

Noted.

- There are no externally assessed criteria in English Inquiry Level 2.
- The generic reference to externally assessed criteria will be removed from page 11 of the course document.
- The Office of TASC determine the quality Assurance model for the course.

Work Requirements

Summary of feedback regarding implementation of course in relation to Work Requirements

Key themes	Years 9 to 12 Learning Response
<p>A respondent noted the following regarding the Work Requirement 3: Module 1 Maximum of 800 words is too long.400-500 words is sufficient.</p>	<p>Noted. The size of the work requirements are maximums. Curriculum Leader has revised advice in the course document so that providers can determine the size and range (minimum and maximum) for an assessment task, but it must not exceed the specified maximum.</p>
<p>Feedback was also provided on Work Requirement 3: Module 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Focus area: transdisciplinary projects. Size suggested is a word limit of 1800 words and a time limit of two minutes for multimodal. There is a doubling up of text types for the Negotiated Inquiry and folio.• It is unclear as to whether the Negotiated Inquiry and folio are separate work requirements. The maximum words are not as valuable as the minimum to maximum words option.• Who is the target audience? We believe the course is for high achieving English Foundation students who want a course that prepares them for pre-Tertiary English subjects.• There is a mismatch between the current work requirements and the proposed course.	<p>Noted. Curriculum Leader will revise advice in Module 3 regarding the Work requirements summary to ensure this is clear and achievable for the target audience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Work Requirement 1: Module 3; There is only one work requirement for Module 3, a Folio which contains three pieces.• Work Requirement 1: Module 3 pertains to the creation of a Folio which must contain three different responses developed and created throughout the Module (class work) and the negotiated inquiry.• The size of the work requirements are maximums.• In consideration of the maximum range, teachers can design their assessment tasks specifying their own range.

Support for Implementation

Summary of feedback regarding support desired for implementation and delivery

Key themes	Years 9 to 12 Learning Response
No feedback received.	No action required.

Further Feedback and General Comments

Summary of other feedback

Key themes	Years 9 to 12 Learning Response
<p>Both respondents commented on the text requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Three texts per module is demanding – especially the work requirements outlined in Module 3, P11 & Appendix 3, P26. Text Requirements (Appendix 6, P48). The text requirements state that three texts will be studied in each module and students will select their own texts appropriate to the focus, content and standards.• Individual student selection of texts for all modules would eat into allocation of module duration and create extra work for teachers in supervising the appropriateness of the student-selected texts to align with the focus, content, criteria and standards/ elements of each module, especially in large, diverse classes.• A combination of teacher/provider and student-selected texts is more appropriate, or teacher-selected texts in Module 1 and 2, and student-selected texts in Module 3.	<p>Feedback noted. Curriculum Leader has revised the text requirements and provided greater clarity regarding size and context for use.</p>
<p>Other general feedback included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I believe this course is written for higher-end English Foundations students and doesn't provide achievement opportunities for a	<p>The learning outcomes, course content, standards, and level of complexity align with National Standards and articulate SSAC Essential English. Further clarity and</p>

Key themes

Years 9 to 12 Learning Response

majority of our current English Foundations and English Applied students.

- Possibly a more direct consultation process whereby teachers from various schools can meet together to give combined feedback. For relief to be provided for this process to take place.
- At this stage, we feel the current document is not ready for practical delivery in a classroom.

refinement of work requirements and text requirements may ameliorate.

Years 9 to 12 Learning provided multiple opportunities, both online and face to face, for consultation, for teachers to meet and discuss the course.

Greater specificity required. Ensure provider is supported through provision of base line resources and direct consultation and provision of professional learning.