

Public Consultation Report 2020

Hospitality

ACT Board of Senior Secondary Studies

Public Consultation Report 2020

Hospitality A/T/M/V

- 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 writing team.
- Amendments to the course have been made where required, as a result of the consultation process.

Public Consultation Report 2020

Hospitality

Topic	Comment	Developers Response
<p>Q1 Which school are you from?</p>	<p>4 respondents</p>	
<p>Q2 COURSE RATIONALE</p> <p>The rationale provides clarity about the scope of the course, its distinctive nature, and outcomes for students.</p>	<p>1. It is incredibly disappointing that the valuable feedback and comments made in the Hospitality shape paper by a number of people have been explained away by the BSSS outlining that consultation with industry experts has occurred, (a UC academic with friends at CIT). which really only addresses the T component of the course. This will impact on all student outcomes the majority of which do not (86%) undertake a T hospitality course. It is also concerning this Hospitality course reduces options and outcomes for students which is in direct conflict of the national and local VET agenda as outlined by the relevant Ministers. This is reinforced by the last sentence of this rationale, which outlines that this course provides a range of opportunities across a range of industries but then only identifies the pathways to further study as a tertiary one. What about CIT as an alternative pathway? There has been no inclusion of patisserie in this course (currently in the C course). Given there is a commonwealth agreement for trade skills centres signed by the Director General of Education and the Commonwealth Government, I am then assuming Patisserie will be included when the C course is rewritten or alternative arrangements made under the current course if there is no C course which I understand is going ahead. A rationale (and course) should not be written under a framework (technologies) based on the T component of a course</p>	<p>1.The issues raised here have been addressed in the responses provided to public consultation on the <i>Shape Paper: Hospitality</i>.</p> <p>Ongoing consultation with experts has been feature of the course development process, with relevant Hospitality experts from university and CIT.</p> <p>The VET opportunities in the existing Hospitality course have not been reduced in this course.</p> <p>Patisserie is not part of the existing Hospitality course and has not been included in the new course.</p> <p>CIT is an important alternative pathway and is considered a third tier of study, after primary and secondary, since tertiary means third stage or post-secondary.</p> <p>Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) Senior Secondary certification requirements are that a Senior Secondary Course must educate students to engage in higher-order thinking, creativity, and the wide range of skills suggested in the General Capabilities.</p>

Public Consultation Report 2020

Hospitality

Topic	Comment	Developers Response
	<p>of which currently only 14% of students across the ACT are enrolled in. What about the remaining 86% of students who are currently enrolled in an A Hospitality course. The Industry and services framework is far more suited to this course as we all know. This rationale is out of touch with rationales and Hospitality courses from other jurisdictions and does not align to the content descriptors or competencies. Given the lack of alignment, I am not sure how the teachers will be able to actually deliver and assess this. The lack of alignment was also raised as an issue in the shape paper.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Note even commentary on the VET component. Why is this course saying social media? Why not media and food trends- this allows for a larger range to be covered and looks at interests from a large area of influences. Technologies should include a range of Marketing influences not just social media. VET competencies that are attached to the course means that you have to deliver it in the sequence from Yr 11- Yr 121-Hospitality Essentials, 2-Hospitality Operations, 3- Hospitality Industry, 4- Hospitality Management 	<p>Procedural skills are the building blocks for developing and designing Hospitality products. Such skills will be the means by which higher order concepts are implemented.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Social media has been included more specifically in the course on the advice of the experts consulted, to reflect contemporary trends in Hospitality. Consideration of a range of market influences falls within the scope of the course.
<p>Q3 COURSE GOALS</p> <p>The course goals are clear about the intended learning but allow flexibility.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No they are not. They are disconnected and there is no real mention of industry context which when writing a course into which competencies will be included must be a consideration regardless of whether the course is TVA and M. Nothing about VET or industry is mentioned in the goals at all Same as existing course document 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> In BSSS course design specifications, the course goals are taken from the relevant framework. These are the overarching goals for the course, not the specifics of implementation. In BSSS course design specifications, the course goals are taken from the relevant framework.

Public Consultation Report 2020

Hospitality

Topic	Comment	Developers Response
<p>Q4 Hospitality Essentials</p> <p>The unit description clearly describes the focus and scope for this unit and informs in the planning of the program of learning.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="622 292 1285 608">1. The unit description would if you were only delivering the T component of the course and given only 14% of students across the ACT are doing T hospitality I am wondering why this course has only been written to provide outcomes for them. What about the remaining 86% of students? Writing a course to ensure rigour and then trying to embed competencies as an afterthought does not work. This issue is reflected in this course. <li data-bbox="622 1098 987 1129">2. Clear description provided 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1337 276 1995 379">1. The course has been developed following the Board endorsed course development guidelines and course design specifications. The VET competencies have been embedded in the course, so that they can be taught and assessed concurrently. The competencies are industry package training skills. They are not aligned with the Australian Curriculum or the General Capabilities. Year 11 and 12 students are still engaged in senior secondary education. They have the right to access the literacy, numeracy, ICT knowledge skills and understandings, as well personal and social capabilities, and ethical and intercultural understandings that have been prioritised in the Australian Curriculum. The community and employers have expectations of the skills and 21st Century learning dispositions students demonstrate at the end of their years of schooling. The curriculum has been developed in light of these expectations and to provide for a range of pathways post school. <li data-bbox="1337 1074 1469 1106">2. Noted.
<p>Q5 Hospitality Essentials</p> <p>The specific unit goals are clearly outlined and appropriate to the unit.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="622 1153 1285 1257">1. Unit goals require inclusion of reference and application to industry given the competencies have been included as part of the course. <li data-bbox="622 1265 1285 1361">2. The goals for both T and A courses are exactly the same- these should be different to allow for different level of learning in these courses. Students 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1337 1137 1995 1273">1. The unit goals describe the knowledge, skills and understanding that are important. They relate to all students undertaking the course and not only VET students. <li data-bbox="1337 1281 1995 1417">2. The content descriptions are differentiated for T and A, to indicate the difference between the two levels of study – in depth and detail, and in intellectual rigour.

Public Consultation Report 2020

Hospitality

Topic	Comment	Developers Response
	<p>should not be completing the same level of learning in an A and T course.</p>	
<p>Q6 Hospitality Essentials</p> <p>The content descriptions clearly elaborate on the unit description and the specific unit goals.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Again the issue of content descriptors does not work with the competencies embedded. A more appropriate outcome would have been to write the streams of the course to ensure it provided good outcomes for all students rather than focusing on the design brief and technologies for the T students. 2. Content descriptor don't allow for differentiation in course type as students cover the same content. T students should critically analyse- this is the only change in the content descriptors which is not enough variation in the two courses. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The content descriptions outline the knowledge, skills and understanding that are important. They relate to all students undertaking the course and not only VET students. Competencies have been carefully mapped to content. The content descriptions are not the Training Package. 2. Blooms taxonomy is reflected in the language of content descriptions. The content descriptions are differentiated for T and A, to indicate the difference between the two levels of study – in depth and detail, and in intellectual rigour. The content will be differentiated in teachers' programs of learning, to reflect the expectations of T and A students .The Achievement Standards clarify these expectations.
<p>Q7 Hospitality Essentials</p> <p>The content descriptions allow flexibility for a teacher to plan a program of learning that addresses the learning needs and interests of their students.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 . Might meet the needs of T but certainly needs to include more mention of application to industry when competencies from an Industry training package have been included in this course. competencies do not align with the content descriptions. 2. The content descriptors allows for teacher to form a foundation of some skills and knowledge that students must learn but it is the same content for both the T and A students. How is this a suitable course and why would students pick a T course if they learn the same content in a A course? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please see previous response to this comment. The course has been developed following the Board endorsed course development guidelines and course design specifications. 2. Blooms taxonomy is reflected in the language of content descriptions. The content descriptions are differentiated for T and A, to indicate the difference between the two levels of study – in depth and detail, and in intellectual rigour. The content will be differentiated in teachers' programs of learning, to reflect the expectations of T and A students. The Achievement Standards clarify these expectations.

Public Consultation Report 2020

Hospitality

Topic	Comment	Developers Response
<p>Q8 Hospitality Operations</p> <p>The unit description clearly describes the focus and scope for this unit and informs in the planning of the program of learning.</p>	<p>1.The unit description would if you were only delivering the T component of the course and given only 14% of students across the ACT are doing T hospitality I am wondering why this course has only been written to provide outcomes for them. What about the remaining 86% of students? Writing a course to ensure rigour and then trying to embed competencies as an afterthought does not work. This issue is reflected in this course.</p> <p>2 Yes it clearly outlines the focus of the course.</p>	<p>1.Please see previous response to this feedback.</p> <p>2.Noted.</p>
<p>Q9 Hospitality Operations</p> <p>The specific unit goals are clearly outlined and appropriate.</p>	<p>1. Unit goals require inclusion of reference and application to industry given the competencies have been included as part of the course.</p> <p>2 Only difference in the unit goals is "evaluate technologies" in the T course from the A. No other changes or differences present. rather than focusing on the design brief and technologies for the T students.</p>	<p>1.Please see previous response to this feedback.</p> <p>2. Blooms taxonomy is reflected in the language of content descriptions. The content descriptions are differentiated for T and A, to indicate the difference between the two levels of study – in depth and detail, and in intellectual rigour. The content will be differentiated in teachers' programs of learning, to reflect the expectations of T and A students. The Achievement Standards clarify these expectations.</p>
<p>Q10 Hospitality Operations</p> <p>The content descriptions clearly elaborate on the unit description and the specific unit goals.</p>	<p>1. Again the issue of content descriptors does not work with the competencies embedded. A more appropriate outcome would have been to write the streams of the course to ensure it provided good outcomes for all students rather than focusing on the design brief and technologies for the T students.</p>	<p>1. See previous response to this comment.</p>

Public Consultation Report 2020

Hospitality

Topic	Comment	Developers Response
	<p>2. Only changes in the descriptions are some of the wording is critically analyse or analyse and evaluate. This doesn't provide variation in courses.</p>	<p>2. See previous response to this comment.</p>
<p>Q11 Hospitality Operations The content descriptions allow flexibility for a teacher to plan a program of learning that addresses the learning needs and interests of their students.</p>	<p>1. Again the issue of content descriptors does not work with the competencies embedded. A more appropriate outcome would have been to write the streams of the course to ensure it provided good outcomes for all students rather than focusing on the design brief and technologies for the T students.</p> <p>2. The content descriptors allows for teacher to form a foundation of some skills and knowledge that students must learn but it is the same content for both the T and A students. How is this a suitable course and why would students pick a T course if they learn the same content in a A course?</p>	<p>1. Please see previous response to this comment.</p> <p>The course has been developed following the Board endorsed course development guidelines and course design specifications.</p> <p>2. The content descriptions are differentiated for T and A, to indicate the difference between the two levels of study – in depth and detail, and in intellectual rigour. The content will be differentiated in teachers' programs of learning, to reflect the expectations of T and A students. The Achievement Standards clarify these expectations.</p>
<p>Q12 Hospitality Industry The unit description clearly describes the focus and scope for this unit and informs in the planning of the program of learning.</p>	<p>1. The unit description would if you were only delivering the T component of the course and given only 14% of students across the ACT are doing T hospitality I am wondering why this course has only been written to provide outcomes for them. What about the remaining 86% of students? Writing a course to ensure rigour and then trying to embed competencies as an afterthought does not work. This issue is reflected in this course.</p>	<p>1. Please see previous response to this comment.</p>

Public Consultation Report 2020

Hospitality

Topic	Comment	Developers Response
	<p>2. The unit description states the use of social media and marketing. We suggest that SITXEBS001 - Use social media in a business be imported from the Cert III Hospitality as it closely aligns with the content of the unit. This will fit under Cert II in Hospitality. We suggest this is a may not a must. This would provide schools with a contemporary opportunity to show what the emerging hospitality industry is about. The rationale talks about entrepreneurship being fostered and this competency taps into this opportunity</p> <p>3. Yes it clearly outlines the focus of the course. Limited to social and marketing when food trends need to be considered from a variety of sources.</p>	<p>2. In response to feedback, SITXEBS001 - Use social media in a business has been added as an option in Hospitality Industry for Cert III.</p> <p>This competency hasn't been added to Cert II, as two competencies have already been imported from Cert III. RTO schools may choose to deliver this competency in addition to the competencies required to complete the unit, as specified in the course document.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p>
<p>Q13 Hospitality Industry</p> <p>The specific unit goals are clearly outlined and appropriate.</p>	<p>1. Unit goals require inclusion of reference and application to industry given the competencies have been included as part of the course.</p> <p>2. Limited differentiation between the A and T course.</p>	<p>1. Please see previous response to this comment.</p> <p>The unit goals describe the knowledge, skills and understanding that are important. They relate to all students undertaking the course and not only VET students.</p> <p>2. Please see previous response to this comment. The use of Blooms taxonomy indicates the differentiation for T and A, to indicate the difference between the two levels of study – in depth and detail, and in intellectual rigour.</p> <p>Content descriptions are differentiated for T and A, to indicate the difference between the two levels of study – in depth and detail, and in intellectual rigour.</p>

Public Consultation Report 2020

Hospitality

Topic	Comment	Developers Response
<p>Q14 Hospitality Industry</p> <p>The content descriptions clearly elaborate on the unit description and the specific unit goals.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Again the issue of content descriptors does not work with the competencies embedded. A more appropriate outcome would have been to write the streams of the course to ensure it provided good outcomes for all students rather than focusing on the design brief and technologies for the T students. 2. In this unit there is a lot of content based around Sustainability. There is not a sustainability competency listed in this unit. The sustainability unit is in Hospitality Industry. 3. Only changes in the descriptions are some of the wording is critically analyse or analyse and evaluate. This doesn't provide variation in courses. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please see previous responses. Locating the course under the Technologies Framework will assist all students to develop skills in critical and creative thinking, and in taking responsibility for the completion of tasks from concept to delivery. Students will design and implement Hospitality products. Using the design process will provide students with the skills to manage and complete tasks. Feedback from academics and from industry indicate that these are skills not currently being demonstrated by school leavers entering hospitality pathways post school. Students in Hospitality are learning to design and deliver hospitality products for consumers. Therefore, the design process in the technologies 2. This feedback has been considered and the decision is to leave the competency in this unit. Sustainability is an Australian Curriculum General Capability. It relates to Hospitality in a number of different ways and is therefore relevant to other aspects of study in the course and would be discussed where relevant. To meet the needs of VET students, the competency is aligned to this unit. 3. Content descriptions are differentiated for T and A, to indicate the difference between the two levels of study – in depth and detail, and in intellectual rigour. The Achievement Standards are also differentiated, to make clear the difference in expectations of T and A students.

Public Consultation Report 2020

Hospitality

Topic	Comment	Developers Response
<p>Q15 Hospitality Industry</p> <p>The content descriptions allow flexibility for a teacher to plan a program of learning that addresses the learning needs and interests of their students.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Again the issue of content descriptors does not work with the competencies embedded. A more appropriate outcome would have been to write the streams of the course to ensure it provided good outcomes for all students rather than focusing on the design brief and technologies for the T students. 2. The content descriptors allows for teacher to form a foundation of some skills and knowledge that students must learn but it is the same content for both the T and A students. How is this a suitable course and why would students pick a T course if they learn the same content in a A course? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please see previous response to this comment. 2. Please see previous response to this comment.
<p>Q16 Hospitality Management</p> <p>The unit description clearly describes the focus and scope for this unit and informs in the planning of the program of learning.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The unit description would if you were only delivering the T component of the course and given only 14% of students across the ACT are doing T hospitality I am wondering why this course has only been written to provide outcomes for them. What about the remaining 86% of students? Writing a course to ensure rigour and then trying to embed competencies as an afterthought does not work. This issue is reflected in this course. 2. Yes it clearly outlines the focus of the course. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please see previous response to this comment. 2. Noted.

Public Consultation Report 2020

Hospitality

Topic	Comment	Developers Response
<p>Q17 Hospitality Management</p> <p>The specific unit goals are clearly outlined and appropriate.</p>	<p>1.This unit is more theoretical in nature addressing a very small component of the Hosp industry. More reference to industry as a whole would assist the unit goals to be more appropriate for all students’</p> <p>2.Unit goals are the same for A and T. Limited changes made to content. "Revenue generation" only difference between course.</p>	<p>1. The unit has been developed based on consultation with critical friends. The unit further develops the Management component its of previous course.</p> <p>Feedback from academics and from industry indicate that these are skills not currently being demonstrated by school leavers entering hospitality pathways post school.</p> <p>2. Please see previous response.</p> <p>The difference between the two levels of study lies in the depth and detail, and in intellectual rigour. To reflect this, content will also be differentiated in the teacher’s program of learning.</p>
<p>Q18 Hospitality Management</p> <p>The content descriptions clearly elaborate on the unit description and the specific unit goals.</p>	<p>1. More theoretical in nature addressing a very small component of the Hosp industry. More reference to industry as a whole would assist the unit goals to be more appropriate for all students.</p> <p>2 The content descriptors allows for teacher to form a foundation of some skills and knowledge that students must learn but it is the same content for both the T and A students. How is this a suitable course and why would students pick a T course if they learn the same content in a A course?</p>	<p>1. The unit has been developed based on consultation with critical friends. The unit further develops the Management component its of previous course.</p> <p>Feedback from academics and from industry indicate that these are skills not currently being demonstrated by school leavers entering hospitality pathways post school.</p> <p>2.Please see previous response to this comment.</p>

Public Consultation Report 2020

Hospitality

Topic	Comment	Developers Response
<p>Q19 Hospitality Management</p> <p>The content descriptions allow flexibility for a teacher to plan a program of learning that addresses the learning needs and interests of their students.</p>	<p>1. The content descriptors allow for some elements of the learning to be addressed. This isn't a diverse course. It is very limited.</p>	<p>1. The course has been developed after extensive research and consultation.</p> <p>The content descriptors provide the learning that must be included in the unit. The teacher's program of learning will enhance and enrich the learning experience for students.</p>
<p>Q20 Negotiated Study</p> <p>The unit description clearly explains the purpose of a negotiated study.</p>	<p>1. I don't understand how this course would work with the unit of competency being taught and how this would align with the completion of the course or units of Hospitality and Kitchen Ops. Further instruction and clarity is needed in this unit.</p>	<p>1. The Negotiated Study follows BSSS course design specifications and provides flexibility for teachers and students. The teacher's program of learning, developed in line with Training Package requirements, will determine the VET competencies to be included in this unit.</p> <p>The course operates in a very similar way to the existing course.</p> <p>A course launch will be made during Term 4 and this will assist in clarification.</p>
<p>Q21 Negotiated Study</p> <p>The specific unit goals are clearly outlined sufficiently flexible for developing a negotiated study.</p>	<p>1. This unit provides limited guidance about the completion of VET units and limited direction for assessment of knowledge and skills. Students would need to complete units of competency outside of course time to allow for assessment of skills.</p>	<p>1. The Negotiated Study follows BSSS course design specifications and provides flexibility for teachers and students. The teacher's program of learning, developed in line with Training Package requirements, will determine the VET competencies to be included in this unit.</p>
<p>Q22 Negotiated Study</p> <p>The content descriptions clearly elaborate on the unit</p>	<p>1. This unit provides limited guidance about the completion of VET units and limited direction for assessment of knowledge and skills. Students</p>	<p>1. See response above.</p>

Public Consultation Report 2020

Hospitality

Topic	Comment	Developers Response
<p>description and the specific unit goals for developing a negotiated study.</p>	<p>would need to complete units of competency outside of course time to allow for assessment of skills.</p>	
<p>Q23 Negotiated Study The content descriptions allow flexibility and sufficient guidance about what is to be taught.</p>	<p>1. This unit provides limited guidance about the completion of VET units and limited direction for assessment of knowledge and skills. Students would need to complete units of competency outside of course time to allow for assessment of skills.</p>	<p>1. See response above.</p>
<p>Q24 Negotiated Study The content descriptions allow flexibility for a teacher to plan a program of learning that addresses the learning needs and interests of their students.</p>	<p>1. This unit provides limited guidance about the completion of VET units and limited direction for assessment of knowledge and skills. Students would need to complete units of competency outside of course time to allow for assessment of skills.</p>	<p>1. See response above.</p>
<p>Q25 VET Competencies</p>	<p>1. You cannot write a course and then ask teachers to embed competencies as the last thing they do. Teachers then do the absolute best they can to make competencies fit, yet it doesn't work and this is now being reflected in the quality of the VET courses being produced by the BSSS which is very disappointing. The competencies do not work with the current content descriptors or with the Design process and Design solution requirements. Nor does it allow you to work in a simulated environment to industry standard. Not sure why the BSSS has made such changes to the course writing process as we are working to provide outcomes for all students not working to become</p>	<p>1. The course has been developed following the Board endorsed course development guidelines and course design specifications.</p> <p>The course can be delivered in a simulated environment to industry standard, just as the existing course is delivered.</p>

Public Consultation Report 2020

Hospitality

Topic	Comment	Developers Response
	<p>an elitist system providing outcomes for those enrolled in tertiary subjects.</p> <p>2. In Hospitality Operations - suggest "Prepare and present simple dishes" changes from a must to a may select in the Cert II Hospitality. In Hospitality Industry also include "Prepare and serve Espresso coffee" as a may select in Cert II Hospitality. In Hospitality Industry we suggest including the competency SITHFAB004 Prepare and serve non-alcoholic beverages be changed from a must in the Cert II Hospitality to a may.</p> <p>3. They are attached as an after thought - ad hoc, not embedded as they should be.</p> <p>4. VET competencies have been chosen for each of the prescribed units and therefore must be completed in the order listed in the course document due to prerequisites of the hygiene unit.</p>	<p>2. Thank you. The course has been amended in response to this feedback.</p> <p>3. The alignment of VET competencies has been based on consultation and careful planning. The competencies relate to the course as they reflect the skills to be assessed, in the context of the learning taking place through the delivery of the curriculum.</p> <p>4. Noted. This is to meet Training Package requirements, and impacts when the VET component is being delivered. This is only evident in the Hospitality Essentials unit.</p>

B S S S