

ACT Board of Senior Secondary Studies

Public Consultation Report 2022

Commerce 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.

B S S S

**Public Consultation Report 2022
Commerce 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>5 agree no comments</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Q2 GOALS The goals comprehensively describe the intended learning.</p>	<p>5 agree no comments</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>3 strongly agree 1 agree 1 skipped</p> <p>1. The variety of task types is fine however there should be more flexibility with regard to weightings for students doing 0.5 unit. Setting a maximum of 50% weighting means the two assessment items need to be of very similar difficulty if a teacher only chooses to do two. In reality, this may not be the case as one assessment item may be significantly more difficult and assess more of the assessment criteria. I would suggest a maximum of 60% for one assessment item.</p> <p>2. Greater flexibility for teachers to design assessment tasks to meet the needs and interests of students.</p>	<p>1. The developers will discuss this proposal. The majority of feedback received approved the 50% task weighting. The developers discussed the recommendation but concluded that potentially having such a large task at 60% put too much emphasis on a single task for the students. Flexibility might be achieved by breaking tasks into smaller components/ stages.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p>

**Public Consultation Report 2022
Commerce Framework**

Topic	Comment	Framework Developers' Response
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.	2 strongly agree 3 agree	Noted
Q5 ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS The A-E grade descriptors are clear and comprehensive descriptions. Please explain your perspective.	4 agree 1 disagree 1. There is no separation between "knowledge and understanding" and "skills" for A/T. 2. It would be nice to see a standard which focuses on the idea of students understanding past, current, and future direction of commerce, particularly as future commerce does not have to comply with current commerce theories. This would help the courses more freely embrace entrepreneurship.	1. The formatting in the document has been rectified. 2. The developers concluded that this goal of using and challenging commerce ideas, and entrepreneurship is covered in the 'create' strand. We have also added 'universality' as a point of analysis to encompass considering change over time.
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.	4 agree 1 disagree 1. It seems that the Y11 T Achievement Standards are very similar to the Y12 A Achievement Standards. 2. There is room for rewording and clarity in some of the achievement standards. The first achievement standard for year 11 A is wordy and confusing.	1. The cognitive expectation is similar, but the developers have narrowed the scope of the requirements in Year 11 A and Year 12 A. 2. The phrasing has been clarified.

Public Consultation Report 2022
Commerce Framework

Topic	Comment	Framework Developers' Response
	3. The only difference is the 12 T have "critically" analyses oppose to the 11 T where it has analyses. The 11 T achievement standards are the same as 11A and 12A.	3. 'analyse' and 'critically analyse' place substantially different cognitive and methodological expectations on students. The cognitive expectation is similar, but the developers have narrowed the scope of the expectation in Year 11 A and Year 12 A.
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.	4 agree 1 disagree	
	1. In the 3rd row of the Y11 A achievement Standards, for the C student it should be "explain possible solutions to identified problems", not "plausible solutions".	1. This oversight has been corrected.
	2. The 11 T achievement standards are the same as 11A and 12A.	2. The cognitive expectation is similar for 11 T and 12 A, but the developers have narrowed the scope of the expectation in Year 11 A and 12 A.
Q8 ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS Are the Commerce Modified Achievement Standards for Years 11 and 12 students with a mild to moderate disability appropriate? Please explain your perspective.	4 agree 1 disagree	
	1. The standards seem very low considering for students with a mild intellectual disability. There is no difference between Y11/Y12.	1. The developers have taken advice from educators in this area and expanded the number of strands of assessment and expectations around those strands. The design parameters do not require separate AS for students in M courses.