Tranche 1 Scoping Papers

FEEDBACK SUMMARY – (Languages - German Level 2)

RESPONSES: 2   REPRESENTING: 11 people

Strengths and Weaknesses of existing courses - Feedback response	Respondents' suggested ways forward	Summary of respondents key themes and ways forward from feedback	CL Response / Ways Forward
Weakness for existing course: too much content no prescribed vocabulary therefore little guidance for teachers Structures and functions do not closely align with themes and topics Strength for current course: themes and topics are good but could be updated focus on skill acquisition is good functional language focus is excellent	None provided	**Key Themes** Current German Level 2 course has too much content, lacks teacher support elements and close alignment between structures, functions, themes and topics. Needs some updating. Concern about lack of vocabulary list. Range of themes and topics, focus on skills and functional language all seen as strengths.	Ways forward: Review current Level 2 German content in comparison with the NESA Beginners' German course to identify potential significant differences in demand. The curriculum redevelopment process will provide an opportunity to work with the stakeholders to review the current language structures and characters to identify appropriate, contemporary language and align effective current themes with future concepts. Review integration of intercultural competence in future courses. Address the concern about a lack of vocabulary lists.

		Ways forward	Draw on the current strengths of functional language and skill acquisition to gradually build learners' language skills.
		There were no suggested ways forward.	
The main aspects to address in the new course, that would improve on the current version are: - clear, straight-forward criteria - Adding a vocabulary list to modules and themes - Reduce the number of grammatical structures required - Criteria 5 is difficult to assess: cultural understanding is embedded in all writing and listening	None provided	Key Themes Respondents indicated a need to review assessment, content and cultural understanding criterion in current Level 2 German course. Ways forward There were no suggested ways forward.	Ways Forward: Respondents' concerns are noted and will be considered during the course development process. It will be important to review content and language to ensure it is current, but also important to ensure that appropriate level of complexity in the course is achieved. Investigate what and how the knowledge, skills and understanding could be assessed. Investigate integration of intercultural competence in future courses.

Course Rationale - Feedback response	Respondents' suggested ways forward	Summary of respondents key themes and ways forward from feedback	CL Response / Ways Forward
The team felt that it had to disagree with the first question as dot points two and three are not articulated in the rationale i.e what is meant by chosen content?	None provided	Key Themes Some responses disagreed with the course rationale as it did not provide the information they were seeking.	Ways forward: Clarify difference between Rationale and Course Description. Redraft Rationale to ensure it fulfils the intended role. Share draft course description at future consultation opportunities, including the Draft CCAFL.

		Language/terminology was unclear because it lacked details. **Ways forward** Clarify how the modules will work.	Collaboratively explore contemporary terminology (e.g. concepts, perspectives etc) for inclusion in the course.
The Rationale seems reasonable, however, we are not sure how the "Personal, Community and Global perspectives" relate to the concepts of the CCFAL Framework - this appears to be an added extra complexity that makes the rationale unclear and may be unnecessary. The alignment with the CCAFL framework is hard to comment on without seeing the framework.	While the three modules have not yet been defined, it should be clarified in the Course Design that in order to complete the designated level, students must have studied and passed all three modules in a designated order. Cumulative modules are necessary for languages.	**Key Themes** Lack of clarity in the Rationale. Concern regarding the use of Perspectives. Lack of knowledge of the Draft Collaborative Curriculum and Assessment Framework for Languages (CCAFL) caused concern. **Ways forward** Clarify structure of the German Level 2 course, ensure continuity of learning.	**Ways forward:** The need for clarity in articulating the modules (designated by concept) and the perspectives is noted for further development. Clarify structure of the Level 2 German course, including the use of concepts to shape each module and ensure continuity of learning.

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
0	1	0	1	0

Ways Forward:

Different respondents took different approaches here. Further detail to be provided at future consultation opportunities will add clarity to this and the rationale will be revised accordingly.

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	1	0	0	0

Ways Forward:

Consistent support for the placement of German Level 2 in Discipline-based Study, course development to progress as planned.

General Capabilities - Feedback response	Respondents' suggested ways forward	Summary of respondents key themes and ways forward from feedback	CL Response / Ways Forward
No	We are answering no to this question due to the lack of information provided in the scoping papers concerning content. Moreover, we are concerned that these general capabilities will be formally assessed, simply adding to teacher workload and taking time away from planning and delivery of relevant content. These capabilities are reminiscent of the Key competencies that were adopted and abandoned by TASC in the past. The 6 general capabilities have already been addressed through the Australian	Key Themes. There is a need to clarify how the General Capabilities would be used, whether they would be assessed etc. Support for inclusion is varied. Concern that perceived past weaknesses in curriculum design will be repeated if incorporation of GC is not judicious. Recognise Languages as evidence of the literacy "tick".	Ways Forward: • Positions regarding the incorporation of General Capabilities in courses to be clarified and communicated. • Acknowledging that there is a difference of opinion across regarding the role of General Capabilities, the use of these in course development will be relevant, logical, serve a purpose and contribute to the learner's engagement with German. • What is referred to as the "Literacy tick" is the Reading, Writing and Communication (in English) standard. The incorporation of the level of English and the evidence of this required to meet the standard as currently defined may detract from the focus of the course and time spent on language learning. • The opportunity to meet the Computers and the Internet standard (ICT tick) can be explored during course development.

	Curriculum since its inception and the intention is for 11 years of schooling (F-10). Therefore, there should be no need for duplication in years 11 and 12.		
Yes	All the general capabilities are highly relevant to the study of languages, especially ethical understanding and intercultural understanding. It is also a learning area that requires a high degree of literacy in students and therefore should be designed to be eligible for the reading and writing capability with TASC and, indeed, the ICT capability.		As above.

Cross Curriculum Priorities - Feedback response	Respondents' suggested ways forward	Summary of respondents key themes and ways forward from feedback	CL Response / Ways Forward
This is extremely difficult to comment on now, as we have not been given enough direction on the content of any new Foundation language course. These types of priorities are more clearly identified and incorporated once writers have a general sense of where a course is heading. Some of these priorities could possibly fit some languages but at this stage things are too vague. It is also artificial to imply that all courses should include	None provided	**Key Themes** Concern that the CCP should not automatically be included without consideration for the nature of the course. Varied support for the inclusion of CCP. **Ways Forward** None provided.	Ways Forward: The position regarding the incorporation of Cross Curriculum Priorities in courses to be clarified and communicated. During course development there will be consultation with stakeholders as to where and how Cross Curriculum Priorities can be incorporated as appropriate.

Cross Curriculum Priorities when they may not be appropriate. By overlaying the courses with the CCPs without considering the unique nature and content of a course is reductive as it trivialises the main focus of a course and therefore impacts on the student's learning experience.			
We are assuming that the cross curriculum priorities referred to are those of the Australian curriculum: sustainability, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and culture and Asia and Australia's engagement with Asia. Sustainability is the only cross curriculum priority relevant to the European languages syllabuses, and is highly relevant. Asia and Australia's engagement with Asia is highly relevant to the Asian languages.	None provided		As above.

Core concepts, big ideas, essential learning or important considerations - Feedback response	Respondents' suggested ways forward	Summary of respondents key themes and ways forward from feedback	CL Response / Ways Forward
Please find below a list of our concerns about the current scoping documents. We find it impossible to make any suggestions given the extremely generic nature of these scopes. We would not know what	None provided	**Key Themes** Respondents indicated there was a lack of information provided for teachers in the Scoping Papers.	**Ways Forward:** Further consultation opportunities with stakeholders will be used to share information about: o the structure of proposed courses o the use of concepts to shape the three modules (Identity, Responsibility and Legacy)

we were making suggesting about as the descriptions included in the scopes are too general. Our concerns are as follows: How the course will be constructed? Themes? Topics? Concepts? How will it be assessed ? Will we still be using criterion-based assessment? Do we assess the general capabilities alongside the macro-skills or are they embedded or are they assessed separately? Workload for both teachers and students? Are the 3 modules stand alone and individually assessed? if so, does this mean they can be done in any order? This would not work at all for languages whose knowledge and skills are sequentially taught and acquired. Modularisation does not work for languages. Other questions: These scopes do not give you a clear idea of how this syllabus will look in a classroom. Will we be able to use our current materials or will we need to completely change all our teaching materials? Do we now have a new macro-skill		The Scoping Papers have raised a large amount of questions with teachers, including implications for script-based languages Need significant clarifications for teachers around themes, perspectives, GC, etc What is "viewing"? **Ways Forward** Listen to stakeholders' views on themes, perspective, balance of skills, unsuitability of modularisation etc	o the use of perspectives (Personal, Community and Global) to provide a relationship for each of the concepts and to gather further feedback. Positions regarding the incorporation of Cross Curriculum Priorities and General Capabilities in courses, as well as assessment, to be clarified, communicated and applied within the development of the course.

called "viewing"? How does that fit with languages? A definition and examples are required. All languages scope look the same. Why is this the case when there are clear differences between script and non-script based languages? This does not seem to have been taken into account. Overall, the scopes seem to be full of general statements which do not clarify the way forward in developing the courses. It would be very easy to approve these scopes but the consequences of doing so cannot be foreseen due to the nature of the documents. In short, the scopes tell us nothing but do raise many red flags in their current form because they lack any useful information that allows us to interact with the document, make observations and offer informed opinions.			
Suggestions for the themes, vocabulary and structures that sit under each of the core concepts could be done through discussion with Languages teachers - we propose a working party during exam week. While big concepts are useful as a way of providing overarching structure to the courses, there would need to be fairly prescribed themes under each of these that have a defined vocabulary set and allow for the	None provided		As above.

| teaching of particular grammatical structures. This would give teachers reassurance that they are covering requisite content for exams and assessments and ensure equity for students across classes and schools as they will be exposed to same knowledge and skills. Further, we need to ensure that each of the modules addresses all four micro skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scoping papers for this new course.			