

The logo of the ACT Board of Senior Secondary Studies is a large, light blue watermark in the background. It features a stylized 'A' with a 'B' and 'S' intertwined within it, all enclosed in a light blue outline of a building with a gabled roof.

ACT Board of Senior Secondary Studies

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

- This report has been prepared following public consultation.
- All feedback submitted as part of the consultation process has been recorded and analysed.
- The responses to the feedback have been compiled following the deliberations of the Framework writing team.
- Amendments to the Framework have been made where required, as a result of the consultation process.

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| Topic | Comment | Framework Developers' Response |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Q1 RATIONALE The rationale provides clarity about the subject's broad scope, distinctive nature and importance.</p> | <p>1. I believe that the rationale should include the word "writing" in paragraph 2, line 3 along with the other language macros as it is a necessary activity in developing the ability to appreciate and evaluate texts along with reading, viewing, speaking and listening.</p> | <p>'Writing' has been inserted into the rationale.</p> |
| | <p>2. There is no clear mention of the 'distinctive nature' of EAL/D learners, pedagogy or assessment.</p> | <p>This is the English Framework and the opening paragraph emphasises language modes and other cultures. Rationale has been reworked to recognise EALD learners.</p> <p>In addition, EALD Achievement Standards have been developed to show the distinctive nature of EALD learners.</p> |
| | <p>3. The subject as written is generally not focused on basic skills, and I think it's good that the rationale mentions more advanced skills, and literary/non-literary texts.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>4. The subject rationale provides clarity on English course both A and T, but not the EALD A/ T. Suggest EALD rationale needs to be: -aligned with the Australian curriculum subject rationale -as per the previous ESL framework: English is the official language of Australia and is increasingly the language of international communication. Effective participation in Australian society requires an ability to understand the various uses of the English language and to employ them successfully. Students from Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Backgrounds who require English as a Second Language (ESL) provision should have access to programs which address their specific language needs. The study of ESL is designed for students for whom English is an additional language. It facilitates the acquisition of</p> | <p>BSSS Design Specification requires only 1 rationale. The opening paragraph emphasises language modes and other cultures. Rationale has been reworked to recognise EALD learners.</p> <p>In addition, EALD Achievement Standards have been developed to show the distinctive nature of EALD learners.</p> |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>skills for communication and learning in an English language context. It enables students to develop critical and creative thinking and strategies to meet the demands of their current studies while embracing a new culture. In addition, the study of ESL can assist students in their personal lives, employment, future learning and participation in a democratic society. Students studying ESL have the right to learn and succeed within a curriculum, which is sensitive to and inclusive of their prior learning and experiences. As an integral part of an inclusive curriculum, ESL courses value and affirm the diversity of interests, backgrounds, knowledge and abilities of all students. The study of ESL fosters students' self-esteem by enabling them to use the English language confidently.</p> | |
| | <p>5. The framework does not include EALD in the title. They are very different areas of 'learning' I am assuming this was an oversight. There is not reference to EALD in the rationale.</p> | <p>This is the English Framework, for all the English courses including EALD. BSSS Design Specification requires only 1 rationale.</p> <p>Rationale has been reworked to recognise EALD learners.</p> |
| | <p>6. Yes, to the latter two aspects. However, the rationale is heavily weighted towards engagement with texts. The EALD courses have language as the primary focus, so a greater recognition of language development would be helpful.</p> | <p>Rationale has been reworked to recognise EALD learners. In addition, EALD Achievement Standards have been developed to show the distinctive nature of EALD learners.</p> |
| | <p>7. I found the rationale to be clear and concise.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>8. Quite clear</p> | <p>Noted</p> |
| | <p>9. I would suggest that "critically" should be added to "Students...reflect (critically) on their own processes of responding and composing."</p> | <p>The language of the rationale needs to reflect diverse learners. The courses and Achievement Standards provide detail about critical thinking.</p> |
| | <p>10. Improved from previous rationale due to clearer articulation of subject-specific skills</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>11. Very good apart from the removal of focus on investigating.</p> | <p>An investigation task is still required.</p> |

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | Added into rationale: Students are encouraged to analyse, <i>research</i> , reconsider and refine meaning, and to reflect on their own processes of responding and composing. <i>Investigate</i> has also been added to the rationale and the goals. |
| | 12. The goals cover a wide range in such a way that touches on all areas involved. | Noted. |
| | 13. rationale doesn't really recognise the modified student expectations | The language of the rationale needs to reflect diverse learners. The courses and Achievement Standards provide detail about learning outcomes for modified students. |
| | 14. Disagree with the framework's statement that student learning is solely the responsibility of the teacher. How can we students have any agency if they are not at least partially responsible for their own learning. | Rationale has been reviewed to make students the active subject. Paragraph 2 focuses on the student. <i>Students focus on developing their skills in responding...</i> |
| | 15. I like the statement about the skills that English seeks to develop in students. | Noted. |
| | 16. Rationale specifies "intercultural understanding" which is too limited. This is only ONE result of looking at texts from diverse times, places and societies. There is no mention of "empathy" / "empathising" which is a critical component of English (often experiences through story-telling) which is an important life skill, serving to reduce the impulse to demonise those who are different. Otherwise good! | Inserted 'empathy' after the phrase intercultural understanding. |
| | 17. Rationale provides a good overview of the thought process behind the course. One positive aspect of this is the reflection on the importance of preparing students for "the dynamic world of the 21st Century" - this is an important inclusion. | Noted. |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>18. Why are we still commenting on 21st Century learners? Isn't it just for learners? We are now well into the 21st century. We also cannot predict what will be needed in the next 10,20 or 50 years. Delete 21st century. Why are we limiting learning to 'their world'? Surely the idea of education is to develop the students' understanding of 'the world', in the expectation that they will be contribute positively globally. Intracultural understanding is as important as intercultural understanding. The research shows that so many live in their own echo chamber and it is important for students to realise how they are being positioned by their own immediate influences.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>19. The rationale is more comprehensive than the previous framework.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>20. There is no real need for putting effort into finessing a rationale because we have the Australian Curriculum to refer to.</p> | <p>This is the rationale for all BSSS English courses that have been developed in the ACT, integrating the Australian Curriculum.</p> |
| | <p>21. Good work - clear and easy to follow. Good explanation of how English fits into student lives.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| <p>Q2 GOALS The goals comprehensively describe the intended learning.</p> | <p>1. Little differentiation between EALD and English.</p> | <p>The goals in the framework are for all courses written under the framework. The differentiation can be more clearly seen in the particular courses, such as EALD, and in the specific unit goals and content descriptions for those courses.</p> |
| | <p>2. Is there a possibility of framing a goal around students producing texts? It's implied in several of the goals, but perhaps clearly stating "produces texts which communicate..."</p> | <p>Producing texts is stated in the goals: <i>communicate creatively and critically in a range of modes for a variety of purposes</i></p> |
| | <p>3. Suggested achievement standards for EALD do not align with Australian Curriculum EALD achievement standards. Suggested EALD standards are closely related to English/ literacy not language proficiency. It is important to distinguish the difference between learning a language (EALD) with</p> | <p>The Australian Curriculum EALD achievement standards have become a little dated, as they do not align with the General Capabilities or 21st Century Learning dispositions. The new Achievement Standards have been developed in with reference to the Australian Curriculum EALD standards and the contemporary context.</p> |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | learning in a language (English). Can you compare apples with oranges? | There is difference between English and EALD Achievement Standards. The EALD course and Programs of Learning will also make these courses distinct. |
| | 4. These can apply to EALD. | Noted. |
| | 5. The addition of a reflection goal is great. This adds a wonderful component to student learning. | Noted. |
| | 6. Intentions were clearly stated. | Noted. |
| | 7. Include "critically" reflect on won thinking and learning. | The language needs to reflect diverse learners. The courses and Achievement Standards provide detail about critical thinking. |
| | 8. The ideas are somewhat nebulous as yet. To what end do we want students to reflect on their learning? (this is a worthy aim but needs clarification as to the reason for it). In the second goal, perhaps we should add 'understand, appreciate AND CONSTRUCT language for effective communication'. These goals could still be refined for clarity. | The Achievement Standards align with the General Capabilities and 21 st Century Learning dispositions. Courses being developed across the curriculum incorporate reflection on their own learning. The Achievement Standards and content descriptions unpack the goals. |
| | 9. Agreed! | Noted. |
| | 10. Are we asking M students to critically analyse? Perhaps the range is too large to have a one size fits all approach which is to the detriment of m students who are not really acknowledged | M Achievement Standards indicate the cognitive demand in the analysis continuum. The purpose of the goals is aspirational and sets the highest standard. |
| | 11. Missing a goal around creating | Creating is the 6 th goal |
| | 12. I like the language used in the goals. Provides a clear intention for the course and also points to what a successful student should/could be able to do. | Noted. |
| | 13. Although "investigating" is not one of the assessment criteria. | Responding and Creating are the assessment criteria. Investigating appears under the responding criteria. |
| | 14. Goal cover the key aspects of English well. | Noted. |
| | 15. It is good that there is a goal that focuses on effective communication. | Noted. |
| | 16. There is no real need for creating ACT specific goals because we have the Australian Curriculum to refer to. | All BSSS Frameworks contain goals that relate to the ACT curriculum. The ACT senior secondary English curriculum |

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | integrates the Australian Curriculum and has been developed in the ACT. |
| | 17. Yes, they do. but are students REALLY expected to craft a multimodal text every semester as is implied by p6? | Students must, “create a variety of texts in a range of modes and mediums” |
| Q3 ASSESSMENT Do you think the Assessment Task Type table provides flexibility for colleges to assess students according to their needs and interests? Please provide a comment. | 1. the suggested duration for oral response is not made clear for EAL/D courses. I recommend a separate dot point as in the suggested lengths of written responses. | Duration or length of student responses should be determined by the nature of the task and the Achievement Standards. Determining lengths of spoken and written work is a school decision. “Colleges are responsible for the education and assessment of students.” (p.31 Policy and Procedures) |
| | 2. Great flexibility. This is much better. | Noted. |
| | 3. The weighting appears to indicate that 60% of assessment needs to be supervised, i.e. IN CLASS. This is completely unreasonable and also contrary to best practice. It needs to be clearly articulated that 40% of tasks should be in class. Anything over that will have a hugely detrimental effect on teaching, learning and attainment. BE CLEAR and REASONABLE in the Frameworks. | Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting. |
| | 4. What is the point of making the investigative task a de facto inclusion through the "requirements" as opposed to a clearly defined task type? I like the inclusion of non-live versions of "oral" task. | <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding</i> |
| | 5. I agree that assessment task types provide flexibility to assess student learning, but not the achievement standards. | Noted. |
| | 6. Appropriate for EALD | Noted. |
| | 7. Plenty of flexibility should inspire innovative assessment items. | Noted. |
| | 8. The compulsory 60% supervision of tasks will make it very limited to work with students on crafting their writing. This needs to be revised. | Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting. |

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | 9. There is a broad range of forms of assessment in order to provide opportunities for growth and differentiation. | Noted. |
| | 10. Confusing - mentions that total components of unsupervised tasks should be no greater than 40%. Does this mean 60% of work should be done out of the classroom? (at home) | Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting. |
| | 11. Two types work well as there was overlap before that seemed unclear and unnecessary. | Noted. |
| | 12. Teaching at T-level appears to be largely assessment-driven: 'finish' one task, start preparing for the next. It comes down to the skill of the teacher to juggle these and encourage the students to use the skills learnt in the previous item. | Noted. |
| | 13. Some concern that only 2 types are listed yet Investigation is integral | <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding</i> |
| | 14. No - if there are requirements to produce a minimum % in class, would it be fair to ask students to produce creative in class? Why doesn't this survey ask us about the Investigating Task? "Students are required to conduct an independent investigative task each semester." | Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting. |
| | 15. The task types, responding and creating, are clear. However, the note that each student needs to complete an independent investigation in the semester is not clear in terms of how this is done in correlation with the responding and creating tasks. Is the independent investigation a separate task or is it done as part of the creative or responding task? | <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding</i> |
| | 16. I genuinely feel the advice on word counts and time limits is a huge area for concern. There is way too much scope. The bottom end in both Accredited and Tertiary needs to be pushed up so there is equity between the tasks colleges set. 300 words for Essential English students and 800 words for | Duration or length of student responses should be determined by the nature of the task and the Achievement Standards. Determining lengths of spoken and written work is a school decision. "Colleges are responsible for the education and assessment of students." (p.31 Policy and Procedures) |

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | Tertiary English students does not provide them with enough scope to demonstrate higher order thinking/creativity/analysis. | |
| | 17. We may need to move existing practice in a range of colleges - many colleges design tasks before meeting students. If the idea is to generate assessments for the students - optimal we need to emphasise that not all materials need to be prepared in advance. | Not the domain of the Framework. "Colleges are responsible for the education and assessment of students." (p.31 Policy and Procedures |
| | 18. The removal of the investigative is a shame. This task allows for student choice, interest and breadth when the majority of English is geared toward close analysis. This is the most relevant to 21st century skills. | The investigative task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester</i> - included under Responding |
| | 19. Yes, however, I think the investigative component in the "requirements" is now a little confusing as this section has been moved from the assessment criteria, but investigating it is still specifically noted in the grade descriptors. | Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester</i> - included under Responding |
| | 20. There is no category for Investigating. The percentage breakdown of different areas is unclear. Does this mean that 60% of assessments must be completed under exam conditions? | Investigation task is a requirement <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester</i> - included under Responding Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting. |
| | 21. it's problematic to have a 60/40 split over two assessments types - "No task to be weighted more than 60% " implies that it's possible for teachers to set ONE 60% exam - this is not a great way to assess student learning and doesn't take into account needs/potential modifications etc. Sorry to work in a deficit model but looking at the WORST outcome is useful here (e.g. a 60% exam and a 40% task, not a | For a standard unit (1.0), students must complete a minimum of three assessment tasks and a maximum of five. For a half standard unit (0.5), students must complete a minimum of two and a maximum of three assessment tasks. |

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | more even distribution of points over a variety of tasks) | |
| | 22. The time limit for oral presentations is 5-15 minutes, which is a large spectrum and much lower than in previous years' frameworks. This may work if the reasons for such a short time frame is explained. I wonder why the investigating task type has been removed as this allowed for students to go deeper into a text, genre, medium, context etc. Research skills are a focus in this task and allow for individual study and broader choices that when shared with the class add to the breadth of understanding of the unit for all students. | Duration or length of student responses should be determined by the nature of the task and the Achievement Standards. Determining lengths of spoken and written work is a school decision. "Colleges are responsible for the education and assessment of students." (p.31 Policy and Procedures) Investigation task is a requirement <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester</i> - included under Responding |
| | 23. I feel that the lack of an explicit investigating element provides potential for anxiety around this grey area. | Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester</i> - included under Responding. |
| | 24. I am concerned that the stipulation that unsupervised tasks should be no greater than 40%. It is unclear what 'unsupervised' means. Does this mean exam-style conditions? Having the majority of tasks completed in class does not allow students who suffer from text anxiety to demonstrate what they know and be successful and privileges students who perform well under exam conditions. | Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting. |
| | 25. Yes, I think it does | Noted. |
| | 26. There is sufficient variety provided that will allow for flexibility. However, the ratio of hours for supervised and unsupervised tasks should be reversed, with 40% supervised and up to 60% unsupervised. This will allow for a greater variety of pedagogical approaches. | Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting. |
| | 27. Where is 'investigating'? - it's not in the table but is listed below. Misleading? Difficult for a college which is using a trimester to have an investigative | Investigation task is a requirement. |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | task each semester--could do one per year (in the long/semester length unit). | <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i> |
| | 28. Different ways of creating/responding are outlined (e.g. oral, written, multimodal). | Noted |
| | 29. We need to teach students how to 'investigate' in English as well as other courses. If they are just parroting responses back to us from our chosen texts how can they progress or direct their learning. Table is too inflexible with 60% in class. This does not adequately prepare T students for Uni. Term 'Supervised' and 'unsupervised' is not clearly defined, allows dangerous level of ambiguity. | Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i> Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting. |
| | 30. Unclear, investigating seems to have been eliminated, yet is still a requirement? | Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i> |
| | 31. Interesting that the Investigation Task Type has not been included. | Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i> |
| | 32. 5 minutes is too short for oral presentations at T level. It should be a 10 min minimum time limit. Losing the investigating task will make it harder to assign this task type to students each semester. What criteria will be used to assess this task type? | Duration or length of student responses should be determined by the nature of the task and the Achievement Standards. Determining lengths of spoken and written work is a school decision. "Colleges are responsible for the education and assessment of students." (p.31 Policy and Procedures) Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i> |
| | 33. I think it could still be clearer regarding what is meant by the criteria/task type 'responding'. It seems to me that the two task types/criteria are analytical vs creative vs responding and creating. All | An interesting distinction between responding and creating. Language used is drawn from the Australian Curriculum: English. |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>creation is in the response of something and all responding requires some kind of creation. But creative vs analytical skills are more discreet. Also, by so explicitly aligning assessment criteria with assessment task type, the risk is a culture will develop that only the responding descriptors will be used for rubrics of responding tasks and vice versa, only creating descriptors will be used for rubrics of creating tasks. I think this is problematic and will lead to arbitrary rubrics as opposed to rubrics that signpost to students explicitly how the components of the task align to the marking rubric.</p> | <p>It is possible to include both responding and creative elements in a rubric. The rubric links the task to the Achievement Standards.</p> |
| | <p>34. It's very flexible and open. A little more detail would be helpful to guide teachers.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>35. I am disappointed that investigation is missing as this does not assist information literacy in English.</p> | <p>Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i></p> |
| | <p>36. The total component of unsupervised tasks should be no greater than 40%. This means 60% of the work must be in class. This needs to be revised</p> | <p>Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting.</p> |
| | <p>37. No mention of poetry, (which includes spoken word poems, such as rap), or theatrical scripts. These should be included as they are commonly taught and created by students.</p> | <p>Poetry and theatrical scripts have been included in the list.</p> |
| | <p>38. I realise that there are concerns with the 60% of the weightings being in-class. Also, I am concerned that there is no need for investigating, yet the first point is that there must be an investigating task. Is the assumption being that investigation is a form of responding? This is not clear and raises a number of concerns, both for the teaching and the learning opportunities for students. I acknowledge that there were problems with applying the investigating strand when this course was initially instigated,</p> | <p>Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting. Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i></p> |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | however, over the last 5 years many colleges have risen to the challenge of creating investigating tasks that are rich, varied, interesting and relevant. | |
| | 39. Need to have the same percentage of at home tasks versus school tasks as existing framework as this is a nice balance between school and home; allows for validation | Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting. |
| | 40. There is good variety in the text type suggestions and good examples of oral presentation types which allow teachers to create assessment pieces which reflect real world texts and have connection and meaning for students. | Noted |
| | 41. Why has investigating been removed from the Framework? This is particularly important in the "21st Century" with the increased unreliability of sources. This is a major skill to teach, to engage with research critically, evaluating information and reliability. How is there equity between the times / word lengths suggested? A 15 minute oral in Year 12 or a 5 minute oral there is no similarity in these tasks and they cannot be fairly moderated equally. Similarly, an 800 word or a 1200 word essay - where is the equity in that. Suggest that a range for Yr 11 and a higher range for Yr 12 be included. What is an unsupervised task? Does this mean that 60% of assessment now needs to be completed in class? Is an oral an unsupervised task - it is prepared independently but presented to an audience? If the aim is to prepare students for the world, there must be increasing independence and these task requirements do not reflect that. | Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester</i> - included under Responding. Duration or length of student responses should be determined by the nature of the task and the Achievement Standards. Determining lengths of spoken and written work is a school decision. "Colleges are responsible for the education and assessment of students." (p.31 Policy and Procedures) Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting. |
| | 42. Except the 60% for supervised tasks - an error? | Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting. |
| | 43. There is a danger that there is somewhat less scope for student interest with the removal of the | Investigation task is a requirement. |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>investigative task type. Creative tasks may allow for some scope and some inquiry, but ultimately they are limited by the constraints of the course content. Investigation allows students to take ownership of their understanding and direct it in new ways.</p> | <p><i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i></p> |
| | <p>44. "The total component of unsupervised tasks should be no greater than 40%" I strongly disagree with this, especially in regards to 0.5 units. It is too much to have 60% of assessment tied up in a single in-class essay. Expecting students to produce three assessment pieces in an 8 week window is also not a realistic approach. Returning the figure to 50% is the only sensible solution, especially for colleges running 0.5 units.</p> | <p>Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting.</p> |
| | <p>45. Not sure if this comment refers to this question or the next. There is a major issue with the statement that 60% of assessment must be undertaken under supervised conditions. This is a huge change to the current guideline that says only 40% has to be done at school. The English Faculty at Narrabundah College recognises the desire to have more assessment done at school to limit the opportunities for parents/tutors etc to have input into student work and hence influence assessment. However, it seems extreme to change a whole system based on a minority of offenders. Students need to have the opportunity to go home and think deeply, consider, reflect, craft, draft and edit their work. This type of considered approach is much more realistic in terms of what they will encounter should they undertake tertiary study and, more significantly, how they will operate in the workplace. We strongly suggest that the frameworks remain at 40% done under supervised conditions, or at the very most, 50%.</p> | <p>Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting.</p> |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>46. Yes, but it is strange that it is a compulsory requirement to have an 'investigating' task, yet the table only refers to responding and creating. Why not include investigating in the table?</p> | <p><i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i></p> |
| | <p>47. However, there needs to be some clarification around what 'unsupervised means'. For instance, if the preparation for the oral presentation is done outside of class but the oral is viewed and marked in class, is it supervised or unsupervised? This has implications for take home essays alongside creatives or oral presentations. I don't feel that 60% of classwork should be 'supervised', if this in fact means exam conditions. Also, I think the meaning and place of 'investigative' needs some clarification since it is no longer a task type.</p> | <p>Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting.</p> <p><i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i></p> |
| | <p>48. + bottom of page five is a pointless and vague list. The opposite of what we need. + recommend remove reference to assessment criteria being used 'holistically' and replace with the expectation that they should be developed specifically for the task in question. + removal of investigating - what's the rationale behind this? Does this mean that research tasks are not allowed in English? Can the ATT table include 'research task' under the responding criteria, please?</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Assessment criteria are used holistically.</p> <p>Investigation task is a requirement.</p> <p><i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i></p> |
| | <p>49. Yes, but I do question the reasoning for taking out investigating task type. Also, the time limits required of a T student for an oral presentation is very low - 5 minute speech is a very low expectation and I think this needs to be revised.</p> | <p>Investigation task is a requirement.</p> <p><i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i></p> <p>Duration or length of student responses should be determined by the nature of the task and the Achievement Standards. Determining lengths of spoken and written work is a school decision. "Colleges are responsible for the</p> |

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | education and assessment of students.” (p.31 Policy and Procedures) |
| <p>Q4 ASSESSMENT Do you think the Assessment Task Type table makes provision for a range of pedagogical approaches (i.e. instructional and inquiry-based learning)? Please explain your point of view.</p> | <p>1. The requirement for no more than 40% of the tasks to be unsupervised is problematic. Given that teachers will naturally lean towards any creating tasks to be completed outside of class, there is very limited scope to be able to innovate or in the responding tasks or investigative task. For instance, documentaries are noted as a valid form for students to take in a responding task, but that is unlikely to be used, given the need to complete supervised responses. I fear people will naturally default to having a number of in-class essays or oral presentations every semester in order to satisfy the 40% requirement. Perhaps if this was inverted, with students needing to complete at least 40% of assessment under supervised conditions, it would be more manageable.</p> | <p>Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting.</p> |
| | <p>2. there is a flexibility similar to previous frameworks that allowed for a range of pedagogical approaches.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>3. Yes</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>4. I was hesitant about combining the investigating element into either responding or creating and I still believe that it will cause problems in terms of equity between schools and even classes. It may also prove difficult to moderate. However, I appreciate that the intention was to provide greater flexibility.</p> | <p><i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i></p> |
| | <p>5. Two issues: 1) the 60% in-class requirement is completely unworkable with the pedagogical approach that I take with some of my classes and antithetical to the subject rationale and assessment task types. Students need to be able to undertake tasks such as a creative task and an investigating/responding at home, not just at school. Oral presentation tasks are not "in class" if</p> | <p>Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting.</p> |

Public Consultation Report 2020 English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>the student has had time to work on them at home, and if they haven't, then the impact both on the amount of class time and the students' ability to research deeply is concerning. If the reasoning is around fears of plagiarism, then there are other ways to deal with that. 2) the word counts are extremely low, particularly in the Accredited courses. Students are able to "cruise" through these courses as they have had significantly higher word limits in high schools. I also have concerns about the capacity for extension through the creation of complex texts in the T courses, and the disparity between the English word limits and those in other Frameworks such as History. I think that a dot point or statement giving teachers the suggestion that word limits may be increased for end-Y12 students would empower staff and students to be more experimental.</p> | <p>Duration or length of student responses should be determined by the nature of the task and the Achievement Standards. Determining lengths of spoken and written work is a school decision. "Colleges are responsible for the education and assessment of students." (p.31 Policy and Procedures)</p> |
| | <p>6. I agree that assessment task types provide flexibility to assess student learning, but not the achievement standards.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>7. At least one task in each of year 11 and year 12 must be delivered... EALD students should be mandated to do an Oral Presentation each semester - it is a vital skill for language acquisition.</p> | <p>Students are required to create "a variety of texts in a range of modes and mediums in a course of study". It is envisaged that EALD students will complete oral work as well as written and visual.</p> <p><i>A requirement is: At least one task in each of Year 11 and 12 must be delivered through speaking or speaking and listening tasks, such as: interviews, workshops, speeches, seminars, podcasts, debates, group discussion etc.</i></p> |
| | <p>8. By limiting the take homework to 40%, this reduces the amount of time to work on inquiry based work. An investigation can't be conducted under test conditions, which means that the creative is more</p> | <p>Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting.</p> |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | likely to be attempted under test conditions - highly undesirable! | |
| | 9. Not really - but the previous one did not either. However, this is covered in the rationale and the teaching strategies section (page 4) | Noted. |
| | 10. A wide range of choices that allow for different preferences and learning styles. | Noted. |
| | 11. table does allow for varied pedagogical approaches | Noted. |
| | 12. Not in table but connected - a range of 5 - 15 minutes for T oral presentations is too great. How will this difference work at moderation? | Duration or length of student responses should be determined by the nature of the task and the Achievement Standards. Determining lengths of spoken and written work is a school decision. "Colleges are responsible for the education and assessment of students." (p.31 Policy and Procedures) |
| | 13. Just a comment about the word limits and speaking time limits. I think the 300-500 word range for Accredited English is too broad. 300 words is not enough. More is expected in Primary Schools. I am concerned that we are 'dumbing' down the expectations for our Accredited students. The same goes for the speaking time limits with Accredited. In relation to Tertiary Speaking time limits 5-15 minutes, again this is too broad. No point in the Moderation process if there can be a 10 minute difference in speaking time for Tertiary kids. We all need to be on the same page and getting the students to extend themselves. A 5 minute Tertiary speech is not appropriate for this level at all. WE are not doing our students justice if we allow all students to get through with the 'bare minimum'. These word and time limits actually contradict the Rationale and the high standards displayed in the Grade Descriptors. | Duration or length of student responses should be determined by the nature of the task and the Achievement Standards. Determining lengths of spoken and written work is a school decision. "Colleges are responsible for the education and assessment of students." (p.31 Policy and Procedures) |
| | 14. Yes, but I don't see how making the investigation aspect vague allows for more pedagogical freedom. | <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i> |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>It just confuses the requirements of an investigation further (it has been clear in moderation days that some schools simply have comparative tasks as their investigation which is not really in line with what it means to investigate).</p> | |
| | <p>15. I think that sometimes creating is a form of responding and that the distinction between these criteria is semantic rather than separate categories that exist in actuality. Separating these is somewhat artificial given the requirements of a rationale/statement of aims which explicitly refers to some critical analysis. Unless we are to mark the rationale separately to the creating task, this seems to need further development... I do think they provide scope for a range of approaches but think that most tasks involve responding and creating simultaneously by these definitions.</p> | <p>An interesting distinction between responding and creating. Language used is drawn from the Australian Curriculum: English.</p> <p>It is possible to include both responding and creative elements in a rubric. The rubric links the task to the Achievement Standards.</p> |
| | <p>16. The table does not include inquiry... see above comment</p> | <p>Investigation task is a requirement.</p> <p><i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i></p> |
| | <p>17. As above. Why has the investigating category been removed? The skills of research, synthesis, evaluation are important and not adequately covered.</p> | <p>Investigation task is a requirement.</p> <p><i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i></p> |
| | <p>18. how would a limit of 2 assessment task types provide a better range of pedagogical approaches? in what way would this be of benefit to students? how does this give them more range or options when they're demonstrating their skills and understanding? This is limiting flexibility, not expanding it. "Requirements: Students are required to conduct an independent investigative task each</p> | <p>The two task types, responding and creating, are based on the Australian Curriculum: English.</p> <p>Investigation task is a requirement.</p> <p><i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i></p> |

Public Consultation Report 2020 English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | semester. An investigative task requires students to plan, enquire into and draw conclusions about texts and/or key unit concepts." - if it's significant enough to mention in 'additional information' why not make it an assessment type (what's the rationale behind axing the Investigation task anyway?) | |
| | 19. Without an investigation task, inquiry based learning may recede. | Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i> |
| | 20. It might be useful to extend the suggested lengths of written responses (eg, between 8001500 words) to provide scope to really extend the capacities of advanced students. | Duration or length of student responses should be determined by the nature of the task and the Achievement Standards. Determining lengths of spoken and written work is a school decision. "Colleges are responsible for the education and assessment of students." (p.31 Policy and Procedures) |
| | 21. Investigating as an assessment task provided strong scope for collaboration and inquiry based learning, by taking that out is there a risk that the skill is devalued? | Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i> |
| | 22. The task types provide enough options for teachers to employ different approaches; this is really up to individual teachers and their willingness to engage with a variety of task types and pedagogical approaches. | Noted. |
| | 23. The table is very broad and non-specific. This allows for a variety of approaches. | Noted. |
| | 24. No explicit mention of pedagogical approaches. | See page 2: Underpinning Beliefs and Learning Principles are both outlined. Specific pedagogical approach is the domain of the school. |
| | 25. Lack of investigating component prevents full pedagogical approach. | Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i> |

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | 26. The relationship between assessment and the investigation tasks is unclear in the document. Do we assess them? | Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i> |
| | 27. Cutting investigating as an official task type has narrowed this. Also, the suggestion that 60% needs to be done in-class is negating teaching students independence. | Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i> Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting. |
| | 28. An Investigation Task Type does allow for rigorous inquiry into canonical texts. Responding and Creative Task types could be effectively achieved without studying canonical texts. | Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i> Responding and Creating are not attached to any texts and can be explored through the texts that teachers choose for their students. |
| | 29. It seems that it would - I have no particular opinions on this. | Noted. |
| | 30. Provided the above comments are taken into account (re nomenclature), I think there is great scope for task types. There is a typo in stipulation for inquiry task (students will enquire should be inquire). | Noted. Enquiry is more for an informal request – to ask, inquiry for a formal investigation. Word to be changed to research |
| | 31. Not Clear. Should there be an investigative task each semester? | Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i> |
| | 32. There is no suggestion of pedagogical approaches to take other than one needs to be an independent investigative task and another must be an oral. | See page 2: Underpinning Beliefs and Learning Principles are both outlined. The specific pedagogical approach is the domain of the school and the classroom teacher. Students are required to create “a variety of texts in a range of modes and mediums in a course of study”. |

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | A requirement is: <i>At least one task in each of Year 11 and 12 must be delivered through speaking or speaking and listening tasks, such as: interviews, workshops, speeches, seminars, podcasts, debates, group discussion etc.</i> |
| | 33. 300 words for A English is not sufficient as a minimum. It should be stated that 300 is only appropriate for a minor task. 600 - 800 is more appropriate for a > 25% task. This needs to be addressed. | Duration or length of student responses should be determined by the nature of the task and the Achievement Standards. Determining lengths of spoken and written work is a school decision. "Colleges are responsible for the education and assessment of students." (p.31 Policy and Procedures) |
| | 34. Inquiry-based learning is encouraged, but 'Investigating' is no longer a component of assessment? Also, it says on the framework: Students are required to conduct an independent investigative task each semester. An investigative task requires students to plan, enquire into and draw conclusions about texts and/or key unit concepts. I think this will become very confusing for schools in developing their assessments Also, in advice and duration, the differences do not seem equitable. The range/difference is far too large: See the following: – for Tertiary course 5-15 minutes – for English Tertiary course 800-1200 words | Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i> Duration or length of student responses should be determined by the nature of the task and the Achievement Standards. Determining lengths of spoken and written work is a school decision. "Colleges are responsible for the education and assessment of students." (p.31 Policy and Procedures) |
| | 35. No. Mandating 60% tasks to be completed under supervision does not allow for a range of tasks that need to be completed outside of class time, such as creative responses and research tasks. | Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting. |
| | 36. There are limits to the examples that have been provided. If you are going to list "letters", you also need to include poetry, and a broader range of text forms. Or don't list examples at all. | The task type table does make provision for students to compose poetry etc. Poetry and theatrical scripts have been added to the list. |
| | 37. I think we need to have the oral presentation task articulated otherwise it won't be used | Students are required to create "a variety of texts in a range of modes and mediums in a course of study". |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>38. A major concern is the requirement that "The total component of unsupervised tasks should be no greater than 40%." - this is a move towards a more exam-style assessment schedule and does not allow for a number of assessment strategies, such as inquiry based learning where students can work unsupervised on tasks to achieve their best efforts. It also does not allow students to edit and revise their work to a meaningful degree, but rather puts pressure on students to create texts in time-pressured situations without effective planning, editing and perfecting. This is not reflective of real world skills at all and seems to conflict with the statement in the rationale: "The study of English fosters skills to work both independently and collaboratively, equipping students for the dynamic world of the 21st Century, and the future demands of work and life".</p> | <p>Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting.</p> |
| | <p>39. It would seem there has been some acceptance of digital submissions as valid assessment tasks. Is this what is meant by 'multimodal'?</p> | <p>Digital submissions are valid assessment tasks. Multi modal responses convey meaning through varying combinations of modes – such as written and visual, spoken and visual etc.</p> |
| | <p>40. I am concerned that the removal of the Investigating task type shifts the focus away from a student directed task and makes it very difficult for the teacher to encourage students in any kind of inquiry-based learning. It seems to me to be directed toward a more instructional style.</p> | <p>Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i></p> |
| | <p>41. The length range for the orals for the T course is too broad: 5 - 15 mins to ensure parity across Colleges. The effort involved for a 5 minute oral worth 30% v a 10 - 15 for the same marks is highly problematic. Let's look to ensuring the framework both respects College and student learning differences and also maintaining standards. Otherwise we could be</p> | <p>Duration or length of student responses should be determined by the nature of the task and the Achievement Standards. Determining lengths of spoken and written work is a school decision. "Colleges are responsible for the education and assessment of students." (p.31 Policy and Procedures)</p> |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | facing moving towards an external exam system like the rest of Australia. | |
| | 42. The statement that 60% of assessment needs to be undertaken under supervised conditions creates an assessment straight jacket which limits pedagogical approaches. It prevents students from doing a creative and a take home investigative essay in the one semester. The frameworks should remain at 40% under test conditions or, at most, 50%. | Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting. |
| | 43. Yes, but it would be worth specifying another row in the table to show that 'investigating' is required and is the main inquiry-based aspect of the English course. | Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester</i> - included under Responding. |
| | 44. Yes - this table means we can have a unit that is entirely assessed in a creating format, with no responding. And vice versa. This allows for great versatility. Thank you! + "the total component of unsupervised tasks" - does this mean all 'take home' tasks, in total, cannot add up to more than 40%? So, 60% of assessment must be completed in class? Like exams? This undermines the ability to implement instructional or inquiry-based learning activities. Please revise the language if you mean that "any unsupervised task cannot be weighted at more than 40% of the unit score". + What is meant by "conduct an independent investigative task"? + 5-15 minutes is unacceptably short for tertiary, with too much space for variance. 10-15 is more appropriate. + Suggest reinforcing that the use of 1200 or 800 as a maximum word limit (T/A) is a guide only - individual courses may increase the maximum if that suits their learning goals. | Students must respond and create. Changed to: The total component of unsupervised tasks should range between 40-60% weighting. Duration or length of student responses should be determined by the nature of the task and the Achievement Standards. Determining lengths of spoken and written work is a school decision. "Colleges are responsible for the education and assessment of students." (p.31 Policy and Procedures) |

Public Consultation Report 2020 English Framework

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Q5 ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS The A-E grade descriptors are clear and comprehensive descriptions. Please explain your perspective.</p> | <p>1. the term 'fluently' is not recommended for the EAL/D achievement standards as it holds a connotation of 'native-like' which is an unrealistic aim for a student in any EAL/D Course. Any student who is regarded as fluent or native-like should not be in this course. Using any term related to fluency is therefore not appropriate for this grade descriptor.</p> | <p>The communication criterion has been reviewed for EALD and “fluently” has been removed.</p> |
| | <p>2. Why are the grade descriptors the same for EALD and mainstream English?</p> | <p>There are differences for Year 11 T and for the communication criterion of Year 12 T.</p> |
| | <p>3. This appears to have some depth of thought in the progression. Please make sure that spelling is correct when producing a system-wide survey. Check the word PERSPECTIVE. This is a pretty silly mistake to make, especially when dealing with English teachers.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>4. I like that the E is a more defined set of characteristics for students -- I suspect there will be more Es now! There is a spelling error in the Y11 T standards: "principals" in the E grade descriptors. I think some unpacking of how the "reflects on their learning" descriptor will be assessed would be helpful to teachers, particularly beginning educators. EALD descriptors do not reflect the range of EALD learners -- it's not appropriate to expect staff to interpret the levels differently for different students, because it undermines the idea that the grade descriptors are a distinct standard that students are marked against (i.e. that teachers across the ACT interpret them consistently). Given that EALD teachers have students across the ESL continuum in their classes, are we as a subject saying that only kids who are at a 4 on the continuum are capable of getting an A? This seems to me like a way to quickly disillusion new language</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Corrected.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Validity of credential for tertiary entry requires specification of a standard.</p> <p>Students who cannot achieve at the set, objective standard described In the ESL T AS should be in the Bridging ESL A course. At this point in their studies, the credential for ESLT seeks to indicate readiness for tertiary study, Students in T must have an English proficiency necessary to achieve in a tertiary program, and thus the Achievement Standard in ESL T measure students against that objective standard rather</p> |

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>learners, particularly if they are usually high achievers in other areas.</p> | <p>than a subjective standard relative to student progress as would be appropriate in other ESL education contexts.</p> <p>The EALD language progression measures language proficiency. It is not assessing student achievement in the BSSS EALD course.</p> |
| | <p>5. There is some distinguish between A to E descriptors in one strand. But, the descriptors themselves do not relate to learning outcomes of EALD learners.</p> | <p>The EALD descriptors have been written for the needs of EALD students.</p> <p>Validity of credential for tertiary entry requires specification of a standard.</p> <p>Students who cannot achieve at the set, objective standard described In the ESL T AS should be in the Bridging ESL A course. At this point in their studies, the credential for ESLT seeks to indicate readiness for tertiary study, Students in T must have an English proficiency necessary to achieve in a tertiary program, and thus the Achievement Standard in ESL T measure students against that objective standard rather than a subjective standard relative to student progress as would be appropriate in other ESL education contexts.</p> |
| | <p>6. Many of the achievement standards for the tertiary EALD students are unattainable. For example, 'manipulates linguistic and stylistic features...' These are expectations of a first language speaker. A student who gets an A in EALD could also get an A in English? The focus for EALD is on language acquisition - the achievements standards do not reflect this.</p> | <p>Validity of credential for tertiary entry requires specification of a standard.</p> <p>Students who cannot achieve at the set, objective standard described In the ESL T AS should be in the Bridging ESL A course. At this point in their studies, the credential for ESLT seeks to indicate readiness for tertiary study, Students in T must have an English proficiency necessary to achieve in a tertiary program, and thus the Achievement Standard in ESL T measure students against that objective standard rather than a subjective standard relative to student progress as would be appropriate in other ESL education contexts.</p> |

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | Achievement Standards for EALD are different to the English Achievement Standards. |
| | 7. Clear and fluent. Clear distinctions between the Year 11 and 12 standards. | Noted. |
| | 8. Descriptors appear to be clear. | Noted. |
| | 9. These are clear. I think the idea of separate year 11 and year 12 descriptors is a great idea | Noted. |
| | 10. concerned that achievement standards for ESL T students appears to be a copy of those for English T | Achievement Standards for EALD are different to the English Achievement Standards. |
| | 11. Plenty of relevant detail. | Noted. |
| | 12. I'm not sure why Investigating has been removed. I can't see the benefits of the new achievement standards over the old ones if they're not backed up by increased word limits and time restrictions. | Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i> Duration or length of student responses should be determined by the nature of the task and the Achievement Standards. Determining lengths of spoken and written work is a school decision. "Colleges are responsible for the education and assessment of students." (p.31 Policy and Procedures) |
| | 13. They fit the criteria well. Some exemplars of this kind of work would be a useful PL at a moderation day annotating where an 'A' standard response demonstrates critical analysis vs a 'B' task - these criteria are still vague for a range of teachers. | Noted. |
| | 14. yes - have these been changed? | Yes. |
| | 15. I strongly endorse the different descriptors for Year 11 and 12. However, I feel that the investigating component is lost and awkward without its own standard. | Noted. Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i> |
| | 16. Grade descriptors are clear and comprehensive. | Noted. |
| | 17. Appears to be clear in distinction between levels - modified is less so and seems more reliant on level | Modified standards are in line with all the other Modified standards across all curriculum areas. BSSS Framework |

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | of support required which seems to be making a judgment based on their disability rather than capacity. Is it their fault that they are unable to access without support? If they are working to the best of their ability and showing some understanding, then they should not be penalised for levels of support - the support creates equity but assessing this way you are removing the equity | specifications have been followed for the creation of the Modified Achievement Standards. |
| | 18. The descriptors provide clarity regarding expectations of attainment for each level. Ideally the teacher should then modify these to incorporate specifics that relate to the tasks set. | Noted. Teachers create rubrics informed by the Achievement Standards but linked to the task. |
| | 19. Criteria is clear and detailed for each grade. | Noted. |
| | 20. The vocabulary is consistent across courses and the different expectations are clearly articulated. | Noted. |
| | 21. They are there, but difficult for teachers and students to know the difference between 'employs' and 'manipulates' for example. Providing a more clear description for these might make a difference for students further down the track. | Manipulates is a deliberate and considered action. Employs is a lower level verb and means using. |
| | 22. Language used in the descriptors clearly differentiates between the range of possible student responses and allows for teachers to closely match student work to a variety of descriptors. | Noted. |
| | 23. But what about this investigating task that has to be completed each semester? How will that be assessed? | The Investigation task is a requirement and will be assessed using the Achievement Standards. |
| | 24. Please change heading on Achievement Standards to indicate application to all courses within the band e.g. add s to English courses not course, Same with Science and Maths ASs Clear differentiation between A and T EALD Ach S | Completed. |
| | 25. Well-written, clearly explained. Appendix B & C are very helpful! | Noted. |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>26. Why do we have reflecting? Is that an assessable skill?</p> | <p>This is important for students to develop meta-cognition. It is assessable.</p> |
| | <p>27. English Achievement standards for 11 seem to lack any form of evaluation alongside criticism. By Year 11, students achieving an A grade should be able to evaluate as well as critically analyse. Year 11 English - B grade - what is meant by 'thoughtful' ideas - how do you assess thoughtful? Suggest 'complex' ideas and concepts. Year 11 English - a C grade student (which is a pass grade) should be able to communicate clearly using accurate expression - "mainly" accurate expression is surely a D grade level. This is Tertiary English not Accredited Essential English. Year 12 Essential English - this is very problematic as the expectations have been significantly lowered. The 2014 B grade is now an A grade, C a B etc. Some explanation of why these lower standards is needed. This does not reflect the basic standards expected in current standardised testing. If anything, standards for Essential English, especially in the area of communication skills, should be raised, to reflect a working standard of literacy. Year 12 T - achievement standards seem to refer only to Unit 3 and not Unit 4 – e.g. 'comparison of texts'. 12 T - need to include the ability to critically evaluate as an A grade. At the moment you have 'critically analyse' but not 'critically analyse and evaluate'. Again, the standard seems to be dumbed down.</p> | <p>The Achievement Standards form a progression across the two years. The terms used reflect the progression of Bloom's taxonomy and are based on the ACARA standards. Evaluation is evident in the Year 11 Achievement Standards in the A criterion.</p> <p>"Thoughtful" ideas are a distinction from the C category of "ideas". "Complex" is used in the A criterion.</p> |
| | <p>28. I think that the new descriptors are far more clear and easy for students to understand. The separation of descriptors for year 11 and 12 is also beneficial.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>29. Good use of Bloom's style verbs; the 'E' descriptors are too generous / positive though. E really means the student missed that criterion. 'Insufficient</p> | <p>The descriptors align with BSSS Framework writing specifications. E grade encompasses a large spectrum of</p> |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>evidence' might be a better descriptor for some of those.</p> | <p>students and there are both positive and negative features described in the standard.</p> |
| | <p>30. Some significant repetition between the D and E categories, with both levels focused on what the students can't do, not what they can do. This deficit model means that we're painting students into a corner of "you can't achieve in English" rather than "you're developing your skills in English". See below examples. + Responding, D, "with some adjustment" and "some" ideas- please quantify 'some'. + Responding, D, "using inaccurate referencing" remove negative language. This should work from a positive frame, not a deficit model. + Using "inaccurate referencing" how do I quantify the difference between the D and E inaccuracies? + + Where "rubrics should be available for students prior to completion" replace with "prior to commencement" to ensure best practice. Note that there are several formatting errors that require addressing, including words where there is no space between. Particularly in the EALD A 12 achievement standard table.</p> | <p>The descriptors align with BSSS Framework writing specifications. E grade encompasses a large spectrum of students and there are both positive and negative features described in the standard.</p> <p>There is a difference between D and E in this criterion: E = "using inconsistent and inaccurate referencing techniques" D = using inaccurate referencing</p> <p>Change made.</p> <p>Formatting was checked.</p> |
| <p>Q6 ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS Do the Year 12 T Achievement Standards reflect higher expectations for students learning in comparison to the Year 11 T Achievement Standards? Please explain your perspective.</p> | <p>1. However, WHY are the EAL/D achievement standards exactly the same as the English achievement standards? Where is the difference indicated in the two courses? EALD is a different focus. Why are we assessing on exactly the same skills? This is not what is reflected in the Australian Curriculum. NSW and Victoria differentiate between EALD and English achievement standards. Why isn't ACT?</p> | <p>Achievement Standards for EALD are different to the English Achievement Standards. There are differences for Year 11 T and for the communication criterion of Year 12 T.</p> |
| | <p>2. Progression appears clear. Again, please ensure that spelling on a document being sent to professionals is correct. The word perspective is again misspelled.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>3. With the caveats around EALD I had above, I think they're clear and challenging. I also think that relaxing word counts for end-Y12 students will help them to meet these standards.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Duration or length of student responses should be determined by the nature of the task and the Achievement Standards. Determining lengths of spoken and written work is a school decision. "Colleges are responsible for the education and assessment of students." (p.31 Policy and Procedures)</p> |
| | <p>4. EALD language learning proficiency cannot be measured against an achievement standard chronologically. It needs to be assessed against proficiency levels as Beginner, Intermediate or advances. At least this needs to be measured across year 11 and 12 as a whole. If you start learning a foreign language in your age, would you rather have measured against your chronological age or your proficiency level. Same theory applies to EALD at senior secondary level.</p> | <p>Validity of credential for tertiary entry requires specification of a standard.</p> <p>Students who cannot achieve at the set, objective standard described in the ESL T AS should be in the Bridging ESL A course. At this point in their studies, the credential for ESLT seeks to indicate readiness for tertiary study, Students in T must have an English proficiency necessary to achieve in a tertiary program, and thus the Achievement Standard in ESL T measure students against that objective standard rather than a subjective standard relative to student progress as would be appropriate in other ESL education contexts.</p> |
| | <p>5. Yes, there is a clear progression between year 11 and 12. However the EALD year 12 T Achievement standards appear to be the same as English, not allowing for the different cohort. Fluent language cannot be expected of students in the EALD course; otherwise they would be studying the English or Lit course.</p> | <p>Achievement Standards for EALD are different to the English Achievement Standards. There are differences for Year 11 T and for the communication criterion of Year 12 T.</p> |
| | <p>6. The learning is extended, and the expectations are clearly higher.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>7. Achievement Standard seem clear.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>8. Great idea</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>9. There is certainly a step up but do check the standards in relations to ESL students. Some appear to be a direct copy of the English standards.</p> | <p>Achievement Standards for EALD are different to the English Achievement Standards overall. There are differences for Year 11 T and for the communication criterion of Year 12 T.</p> |

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | 10. while higher expectations are obvious the implication of this for final grades against different standards is a concern for the final weightings. | Noted. |
| | 11. They are a step up. | Noted. |
| | 12. Maybe a little more detail needed with some suggested examples. Work samples might be a good idea for all Achievement Standards. | Noted. |
| | 13. Yes, they do, but some large jumps are evident across the descriptors. 11T A descriptor for responding only mentions purpose and audience shaping meaning but 12T A responding identifies attitudes, values and effect which seems like a large gap. | The Achievement Standards form a progression across the two years. The terms used reflect the progression of Bloom’s taxonomy and are based on the ACARA standards. |
| | 14. See above comments. | Noted. |
| | 15. This is a worthy improvement and shows the increasing capacities of students across college. May pose a problem for schools that combine 11 and 12 students but really should be quite achievable and will work in my context. These could be further differentiated in terms of the kinds of work in Unit 1 and 2 vs Unit 3 and 4 with their higher level of abstraction. | Noted. |
| | 16. Yes, there are slight differences in the word choices, however, are two Achievement standards needed? | The Achievement Standards form a progression across the two years. The terms used reflect the progression of Bloom’s taxonomy and are based on the ACARA standards. |
| | 17. My understanding was that the course does not need to run sequentially. Are we saying that the units should be of progressing difficulty? If so, this needs to be clear. Also, a semester 1 Year 11 unit and a Semester 2 Year 12 unit are both potentially of equal value in determining an ATAR. If a student chooses to use both their Year 11 units for their ATAR, does this mean that they have an unfair advantage, as the criteria for achieving an A grade is easier for these units? | Progression from 1 to 4 would be the expected implementation pattern. However, difficulty is described by the Achievement Standards, not the units, and they are clearly more difficult to achieve in Year 12. Students must include a unit 3 or 4 from the English course to have a major. Students commonly complete minors in many subjects and there is no inherent advantage to doing so. The unit score is a measure of relative performance so there can be no advantage from stopping in Year 11. The |

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | best 80% rule depends on the score not on the grade. The score is based on relative position, so there is no relative advantage. Also, the English score is not necessarily included in the ATAR, and the students cannot choose which scores are included in the ATAR. |
| | 18. seem to be minimal changes, though. I'm disturbed that the investigating task, and skills this task developed, has disappeared - what's the rationale here? | Investigation task is a requirement. <i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i> |
| | 19. They emphasise a clear and well nuanced expectation that is really important for Year 12 students which will help both year groups in terms of what they will expect of themselves. | Noted. |
| | 20. The achievement standards are too similar to reflect higher expectations | The Achievement Standards form a progression across the two years. The terms used reflect the progression of Bloom's taxonomy and are based on the ACARA standards. |
| | 21. Descriptors appear to increase in expectation and depth | Noted. |
| | 22. I believe that the standards do not need to be separate for Years 11 & 12. Whilst there are some differences evident, I am not sure that they discriminate significantly or that this is necessary. | The Achievement Standards form a progression across the two years. The terms used reflect the progression of Bloom's taxonomy and are based on the ACARA standards. |
| | 23. Yes, and it's a good idea to make the change. | Noted. |
| | 24. Achievement Standards for Year 12 explicitly outline the higher level required. | Noted. |
| | 25. The wording does reflect higher expectations, but as with all achievement standards, personal interpretation of the terms will determine the way in which teachers award student achievement. | Noted. Moderation Day is the opportunity to discuss interpretation of standards in light of student work. |
| | 26. Too much 'describes 'in the C column. C students can do more. | The Achievement Standards form a progression across the two years. The terms used reflect the progression of Bloom's taxonomy and are based on the ACARA standards. |
| | 27. Yes, they clearly show a development in outcomes. | Noted. |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | 28. I like the idea of Year 12 students be assessed at a higher skill level than Year 11. This makes sense in a practical manner. | Noted. |
| | 29. This is clearly stated and explained. | Noted. |
| | 30. Effective explanation of the difference between years 11 and 12. Thanks for acknowledging that our role as college educators is impactful! - our students actually progress between years 11 and 12. | Noted. |
| | 31. This is a great distinction and evolution with the framework. It shows at least one year of growth in the C grade descriptors and accurately reflects the learning and development of students from year 11 to 12. | Noted. |
| | 32. Good transition between the two; further clarity about wording needed in core curriculum elements | Noted. Core curriculum elements have been in this format for many years now. |
| | 33. The step up from Year 11 to Year 12 seems fine. | Noted. |
| | 34. No, there is no clear difference between 11 and 12 Achievement Standards. There are just more words in the Year 12 Achievement Standards which give more detail of what teachers should be looking for. It would actually be better if this more explicit information was given in the Year 11 Achievement Standards to help guide Year 11 teachers. | The Achievement Standards form a progression across the two years. The terms used reflect the progression of Bloom's taxonomy and are based on the ACARA standards. |
| | 35. The descriptors in the year 12 achievement standards have additional expectations that are appropriate for a year 12 level. | Noted. |
| | 36. Very pleasing to see at last in the ACT English Framework recognition of the difference between the capabilities of a Year 11 and a Year 12 student instead of leaving it up to the teacher to make some vague judgement about the difference. | Noted. |
| | 37. Whilst the achievement standards are appropriate the BSSS and the framework developers should consider creating rubrics alongside these standards for T, A and M. This will save hundreds of hours of | Noted. Rubric writing is part of the assessment process and needs to relate to the task the teacher creates. The BSSS run a PD workshop to help with rubric writing. |

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>teacher work as colleges all across the system develop rubrics in their silos and duplicate work that could be streamlined through the framework. We understand that the framework designers want teachers to create their own rubrics that reflect their specific tasks - and this is generally a good idea. However, teachers need a place to start. They need to start with a good solid rubric which reflects the achievement standards which they can then mould slightly without putting in hours of time.</p> | |
| | <p>38. The achievement standards for 11 & 12 appear to be practically identical. While this does not mean that expectations for 11 & 12 are the same, I don't think it's clearly reflected in the achievement standards if the goal is to make a distinction.</p> | <p>The Achievement Standards form a progression across the two years. The terms used reflect the progression of Bloom's taxonomy and are based on the ACARA standards.</p> |
| | <p>39. No. The twelve achievement standards just use 'critically' a few more times in the A grade. The language and phrasing of the descriptors appear most identical, except lower criteria focus on what the student can't achieve more heavily in 12.</p> | <p>The Achievement Standards form a progression across the two years. The terms used reflect the progression of Bloom's taxonomy and are based on the ACARA standards.</p> |
| <p>Q7 ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS Do the Year 12 A Achievement Standards reflect higher expectations for students learning in comparison to the Year 11 A Achievement Standards? Please explain your perspective.</p> | <p>1. Please see comments in Tertiary section.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>2. As above. And note the word perspective.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>3. Same as above -- however, suggest putting the standards for each course together, as opposed to each year.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>4. EALD language learning proficiency cannot be measured against an achievement standard chronologically. It needs to be assessed against proficiency levels as Beginner, Intermediate or advances. At least this needs to be measured across year 11 and 12 as a whole. If you start leaning a foreign language in your age, would you rather measure against your chronological age or your proficiency level. Same theory applies to EALD at senior secondary level.</p> | <p>Validity of credential for tertiary entry requires specification of a standard.</p> <p>Students who cannot achieve at the set, objective standard described in the ESL T AS should be in the Bridging ESL A course. At this point in their studies, the credential for ESLT seeks to indicate readiness for tertiary study, Students in T must have an English proficiency necessary to achieve in a tertiary program, and thus the Achievement Standard in ESL T measure students against that objective standard rather</p> |

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | <p>than a subjective standard relative to student progress as would be appropriate in other ESL education contexts.</p> <p>The EALD language progression measures language proficiency. It is not assessing student achievement in the BSSS EALD course.</p> |
| | 5. Appropriate | Noted. |
| | 6. clear progression of skills and proficiency levels | Noted. |
| | 7. Descriptors appear to be clear. | Noted. |
| | 8. They are a step up. | Noted. |
| | 9. As above | Noted. |
| | 10. As above, some similar issues. | Noted. |
| | 11. See above comments. | Noted. |
| | 12. This seems a bit more similar from the time I've had to study them and could be refined further. | The Achievement Standards form a progression across the two years. The terms used reflect the progression of Bloom's taxonomy and are based on the ACARA standards. |
| | 13. Yes, there are slight differences in the word choices, however, are two Achievement standards needed? | The Achievement Standards form a progression across the two years. The terms used reflect the progression of Bloom's taxonomy and are based on the ACARA standards. |
| | 14. as above | Noted. |
| | 15. seem to be minimal changes, though. I'm disturbed that the investigating task, and skills this task developed, has disappeared - what's the rationale here? | <p>Investigation task is a requirement.</p> <p><i>Students must complete an independent investigation task each semester - included under Responding.</i></p> |
| | 16. They emphasise a clear expectation that is really important for both year groups which will help in terms of what they will expect of themselves and be able to work towards. | Noted. |
| | 17. The achievement standards are too similar to reflect higher expectations | The Achievement Standards form a progression across the two years. The terms used reflect the progression of Bloom's taxonomy and are based on the ACARA standards. |
| | 18. Descriptors appear to increase in expectation and depth | Noted. |

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| | |
|--|---|
| 19. I believe that the standards do not need to be separate for Years 11 & 12. Whilst there are some differences evident, I am not sure that they discriminate significantly or that this is necessary. | The Achievement Standards form a progression across the two years. The terms used reflect the progression of Bloom's taxonomy and are based on the ACARA standards. |
| 20. Yes, and it's a good idea to make the change. | Noted. |
| 21. As above - Question 6. | Noted. |
| 22. In the "C" category, the Year 11 standard uses the word "explains", as opposed to the Year 12 standard using the word "describes". I think that these should be exchanged because "explaining" is a more complex task than "describing". | Describe and explain are used sequentially across the standards to form a progression. |
| 23. Many Year 11 students, particularly in Semester 1, struggle with the adjustment and step-up from Year 10. | Noted. |
| 24. This is clearly stated and explained. | Noted. |
| 25. I was particularly impressed with the nuances and growth expectations between B-D in the Accredited descriptors. | Noted. |
| 26. Good and challenging | Noted. |
| 27. The step up from Year 11 to Year 12 seems fine. | Noted. |
| 28. No. They're the same! D grade changes 'identifies' to 'describes' from Year 11 to Year 12 in Responding. | The Achievement Standards form a progression across the two years. The terms used reflect the progression of Bloom's taxonomy and are based on the ACARA standards. |
| 29. The descriptors in the year 12 achievement standards have additional expectations that are appropriate for a year 12 level. | Noted. |
| 30. The achievement standards for 11 & 12 appear to be practically identical. While this does not mean that expectations for 11 & 12 are the same, I don't think it's clearly reflected in the achievement standards if the goal is to make a distinction. | The Achievement Standards form a progression across the two years. The terms used reflect the progression of Bloom's taxonomy and are based on the ACARA standards. |
| 31. No. The twelve achievement standards just use 'critically' a few more times in the A grade. The language and phrasing of the descriptors appear | The Achievement Standards form a progression across the two years. The terms used reflect the progression of Bloom's taxonomy and are based on the ACARA standards. |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | most identical, except lower criteria focus on what the student can't achieve more heavily in 12. | |
| Q8 ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS Are the English Modified Achievement Standards for Years 11 and 12 students with a mild to moderate disability appropriate? Please explain your perspective. | 1. Modified achievement standards are suitable. | Noted. |
| | 2. I don't feel able to comment on this as I am not a specialist teacher in the disability sector. But again, the misspelling of perspective in this instrument is annoying at best and woefully unprofessional at worst. | Noted. |
| | 3. These are very broad-brush and have the same issue as the current standards in that the level of support is linked directly to one or more of the outcomes. I would like to see level of support as its own criterion, so that students who show insight but do it with support can be recognised in the A range for their insight, but the D or E range in terms of support, particularly because of the range of interpretations of "support" in M. | Modified standards are in line with all the other Modified standards across all curriculum areas. BSSS Framework specifications have been followed for the creation of the Modified Achievement Standards. |
| | 4. It is important to understand the purpose of Modified English Program at Senior Secondary Level and to use that understanding to word the achievement standards. The main difference between the proposed English (M) A to E achievement standards is that the focus is on the level of independence/ assistance provided, but not on students' literacy skills. Independence rather needs to be a different assessment criteria along with responding and creating at this level. Suggest three different assessment criteria for M English. Teachers of Contemporary English should be able to assess literacy performance of their students without being affected by the independence level of students. The proposed achievement standards do not allow teachers to do that. | Modified standards are in line with all the other Modified standards across all curriculum areas. BSSS Framework specifications have been followed for the creation of the Modified Achievement Standards. |
| | 5. This survey did not encourage or easily allow for comments re: EALD. | Noted. |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | 6. These would not suit an EALD M course, as they do not address language. | Under review. |
| | 7. Appropriate to be one level so that teachers can adjust work on a needs basis. | Noted. |
| | 8. Descriptors appear to be clear. | Noted. |
| | 9. Perhaps there needs to be a separate set of standards for Bridging ESL, because the M standards do not reflect any areas of linguistic or language-acquisition concerns. | EALD A Achievement Standards apply to EALD Bridging. |
| | 10. While I think the descriptors are clear, I query the need to allocate grades, especially with Moderate disability students. | Grades are part of the senior secondary system and M students are entitled to a grade. |
| | 11. Overall, too advanced. | Modified standards are in line with all the other Modified standards across all curriculum areas. BSSS Framework specifications have been followed for the creation of the Modified Achievement Standards. Feedback indicates that teachers find the Achievement Standards effectively describe the achievement levels. |
| | 12. I think these achievement standards are extremely ambitious for Modified students. Working with Independence can be unrealistic for Modified students. | Modified standards are in line with all the other Modified standards across all curriculum areas. BSSS Framework specifications have been followed for the creation of the Modified Achievement Standards. |
| | 13. These look fine though 'literacy skills' is quite broad. | Noted. |
| | 14. Yes, there are differences between A-E but A and B standards which ask for independence may not be accessible to all | Modified standards are in line with all the other Modified standards across all curriculum areas. BSSS Framework specifications have been followed for the creation of the Modified Achievement Standards. |
| | 15. They emphasise a clear expectation which will help in terms of what they will expect of themselves and be able to work towards. | Noted. |
| | 16. However, the grade descriptors for the Modified unit seems to reward students with higher levels of function- having "direct instruction" identified on the E grade descriptor seems to suggest that | Modified standards are in line with all the other Modified standards across all curriculum areas. BSSS Framework specifications have been followed for the creation of the Modified Achievement Standards. |

Public Consultation Report 2020

English Framework

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | students with low literacy/ high levels of need will not be able to achieve above an E. | |
| | 17. I think that the modified a.s. is not viewing levels of support required as a function of providing equity for those with special educational needs and assessing them based on how much support is required given their condition rather than their level of understanding. The differentiation between levels is limited and reads rather as an after-thought not a document that recognises that the onus is on the teacher to ensure support mechanisms allow all students to be assessed on a similar basis | Modified standards are in line with all the other Modified standards across all curriculum areas. BSSS Framework specifications have been followed for the creation of the Modified Achievement Standards. |
| | 18. These standards whilst quite general will allow for adaptation to the often complex needs of students with disabilities. | Noted. |
| | 19. They allow students at different ability levels to achieve their best. | Noted. |
| | 20. The achievement standards are realistic and reflect skill progression and anticipated growth. | Noted. |
| | 21. I have too little experience in this area to comment. | Noted. |
| | 22. As long as they are adhered to by schools | Noted. |
| | 23. Language used in the achievement standards allows for a range of potential student responses. | Noted. |
| | 24. I think it would be good to see some more descriptors on the work itself rather than the amount of assistance given. | Modified standards are in line with all the other Modified standards across all curriculum areas. BSSS Framework specifications have been followed for the creation of the Modified Achievement Standards. |
| | 25. This is clearly stated and explained. | Noted. |
| | 26. There is a clear distinction for the expectations in these standards and they appear to be disability appropriate. | Noted. |
| | 27. Very vague at points - I understand why but it seems a big shift | Noted. |
| | 28. There should be a very clear instruction that these are a guideline only and that the Achievement | Modified Achievement Standards are not for negotiation at the school level. |

Public Consultation Report 2020
English Framework

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Standards for Modified Students will be negotiated at school level. It is also unfair that Modified students' work is moderated as the modifications are individually tailored to the needs of the student.</p> | <p>Moderation allows the work of teachers to be critiqued and for the grades of the students to be confirmed or not, allowing teachers to get advice about their teaching and their assessment. Modified students deserve the same process as other students and to have their credential validated. It is a legislated requirement.</p> |
| | <p>29. Great to see these logically laid out.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>30. I like the straightforward, simplicity of the language for the M standards. I think that this will benefit teachers and students alike.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>31. They seem appropriate but I've never taught that unit so it's hard for me to say.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |
| | <p>32. I think you're setting the bar too low for what these students can achieve when challenged and supported. These criteria don't focus on what the student can achieve, they focus on what support the student received. The skills you're asking for are good, but the focus is on "how unmodified can you be" which implies "how normal are you" is the value.</p> | <p>Modified standards are in line with all the other Modified standards across all curriculum areas. BSSS Framework specifications have been followed for the creation of the Modified Achievement Standards. Feedback indicates that teachers find the Achievement Standards effectively describe the achievement levels.</p> |