

ENGLISH WRITING (ENW315114)

FEEDBACK FOR STUDENTS AND TEACHERS

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

It was very heartening and affirming to see an increase in students enrolled in English Writing in 2018, escalating from 2017, with 755 students receiving final awards for external assessment. Although it is always disappointing that a number of these did not submit external folios, and there was a percentage that did not achieve a pass standard, these are very healthy enrolments that reflect the engagement and achievements of English Writing students statewide. It was also most encouraging to see the maximum subject score rise from 19.5 in 2017 to 21.1 in 2018, which better rewards the skills and efforts of candidates in English Writing.

The course is clearly one that is interesting and beneficial for students, developing knowledge and skills that prepare students for an array of workplace and university pathways. This subject is so much more than 'making up stories': it is learning about the world, its people and issues; an opportunity to understand and explore different forms, techniques and purposes in writing; enhance skills in planning, crafting and refining texts; and developing a clear and confident voice on the page to communicate with a variety of intended readers in different ways. This is in addition to the course fostering wide and critical reading in an age where literacy and command of the English language is crucial.

Teachers of the subject are to be thanked for their commitment and guidance, working with the course requirements and criteria standards to direct students to achieve their best outcomes. However, it remains concerning that many of the same constructive feedback and suggestions need to be reiterated year after year in this report. It is disadvantageous to students of English Writing if they and their teachers do not read and heed the advice of all the external markers that are compiled in this key annual document. Future students' success really does rely on the suggestions provided in this report.

Thank you to all the markers who submitted comments for this report. Your expert and considered input, based on your experience of the 2018 external marking process, is invaluable in providing this feedback for future teachers and students. It is a privilege and a pleasure to be the Marking Coordinator for this wonderful subject, and I thank all members of the marking team for their commitment and professional expertise, along with teachers throughout the year who raise important questions and invite conversation about how we can continue to refine and achieve excellence in our teaching and student outcomes in English Writing.

GENERAL COMMENTS ON 2018 FOLIOS

Again, there were some highly polished, engaging and original folios presented for assessment in 2018. However, most markers reported less outstanding folios this year. Overall, most were easy to read with plenty of white space and paragraph breaks clearly indicated, but there were a significant number that needed to be more mindful and exact in meeting presentation requirements.

While many folios were more precise and accurate than previous years, there were still a significant number that lacked requisite polish and clarity as is expected in a Level 3 folio based subject. The average folio was noted as 7000 words in length, but many longer folios would have benefited from editorial pruning; the number of words does not necessarily equal quality and thus high ratings.

There were many shorter folios (6000 words) that featured effective, tight structures, with well-chosen passages of description and pithy dialogue that revealed convincing characterisation and plot development. The maximum 8000 words for the folio does not need to be met; many of those that were close to the upper limit would have been more effective with ruthless editing to increase precision and, as a result, engagement and impact.

Many candidates still referred to the Writing Project and two supporting pieces, and often these were unbalanced. Short and/or underwritten folio pieces make success difficult.

There were a number of folios this year where supplementary pieces were too short in terms of developing ideas and effectively demonstrating elements of form and structure. Ideally, pieces in addition to the Writing Project are advised to be around 1000 words in length in order to effectively demonstrate sophistication in ideas and characterisation, along with elements of form and structure. There are instances where shorter pieces are appropriate and effective, but these should be balanced with the other inclusions.

Candidates are again reminded that pieces within the folio do not required being linked by theme or other feature, and attempting to do so can inhibit imagination and diversity. Each folio piece should be inspired, crafted and developed in its own right, with individual purpose, style and technical features. Candidates who did this were more successful overall, as each piece demonstrated uniqueness, purpose and impact.

Overall, the folios covered a wide range of topics and forms in writing. There was less non-fiction writing noted in 2018, and much of this was not of a high standard. Students are advised to remember that originality and engagement, along with control of features of form, are necessary for success.

There remain issues with careful proofreading in order to present pieces of writing that are clear and accurate. Teachers and candidates are reminded that as this is a Level 3 subject, and folios should be refined and polished; clarity and accuracy is paramount and standards of presentation must be maintained to preserve the integrity of the subject.

There were a number of submissions in 2018 that were evidently weak in accuracy, concept and execution. Schools and teachers must be proactive in advising students if they are capable of the Level 3 standard to avoid PA and NN results. This course is recommended for students in Year 12, so that experience in either English 3 or English Literature in Year 11, in addition to another year of life experience, better prepares candidates for success.

More humorous pieces would be appreciated to balance the predominance of serious, dramatic inclusions – although these should be selective and intentional. There were some engaging examples of black humour, satirical writing and teenage situational comedy that were positively noted this year. There was more historical fiction in 2018, which was again a positive, and these pieces were usually effective in showing evidence of research to enhance the writing's context and authenticity.

Many enthralling pieces were set in Tasmania and mainland Australia that clearly evoked a sense of place and told genuine Australian stories. Contrarily, too many unconvincing pieces were set in the USA complete with proms, leaves changing colour in Fall, sorority house parties and characters going off to College. Again, unless there is a specific reason for an American setting, students should avoid this. There is great benefit in writing what you know! True to themselves, pieces based on own experience were strong, and there was often a distinct sense of social conscience in writing, which was pleasing to note.

It is obvious teachers are successfully guiding many students in terms of sourcing and developing their ideas, and in the provision of resources and readings to assist their crafting and refinement of work in timely and expert interventions. There are, however, some students who seem to pursue whatever suits them, and them only, with very little teacher intervention apparent. Student writers really should consider the advice of their teachers, rather than bombast about being 'shut down' when writing about their writing journey and experience in their writing folio.

WRITING PROJECTS

Candidates should refer to the Writing Project, not Major Writing Project.

The Writing Project should demonstrate the candidate's ability to compose a sustained piece of writing or exploration of theme or text type and features. Too many Projects this year featured a loosely connected series of texts that did not show a high level of control or development. Some very strong extended narratives developed a small number of complex and engaging characters and employed strong use of language devices to create convincing settings.

Poetic Writing Projects, although fewer, were predominantly free verse, some with very short lines. There needs to be a greater understanding of what constitutes a 'substantial' line of poetry; whilst this is difficult to quantify, a guide of four to five words per line might be considered. Overall the poetry did not show expertise in the use of figurative language and imagery. Punctuation was an issue with little apparent consideration given to line endings, enjambment and caesura. Few students wrote in any of the classic forms, although there were some that were to be commended for their efforts in challenging themselves to apply the conventions of such poetic forms.

It was noted that there was not as much variety in the Writing Projects this year: generally they were close to the minimum word count, and did not fully develop their ideas. Conversely, there were also submissions that really could have been more effective with editing of words to enhance precision and pace, and thus have greater impact on the reader.

The Writing Project, as the most substantial inclusion in the folio and the one that is most recently created, really should demonstrate the epitome of the student's skills and ideas. They should evidence careful and thorough planning, crafting and refinement, and represent the best elements of the writer's achievements in the course.

LIST OF CONTENTS AND CRITERION I

PRESENTATION AND RANGE OF TEXTS IN FOLIOS

Most folios included a clear, accurate and detailed List of Contents page. Identification of both form AND genre on the List of Contents page was often missing or problematic. Inventive names for genres are reasonable, in the sense of natural fusion – genre is not a pure science – but obscure, multiple and/or misleading genre identification is to be avoided. There were some ambiguous genres, including ‘fictional biography’ which should either be defined as a true life story or narrative. The Ideas and Issues module is not a genre.

Word counts were largely overt and accurate, but in some cases poetry word counts were unclear and/or inaccurate, and candidates must be mindful of clarity to effectively fulfil overall word count requirements and demonstrate honesty and integrity. There were a number of folios that featured pieces that were significantly over or under prescribed word counts – notably in the Reflective Statement and Writing Project. There is a wide scope provided in the Folio Guidelines, and so there is no excuse for submitting pieces that are beyond the minimum or maximum. Put simply, such pieces either require effort or editing.

Time management is still an apparent issue in a number of folios, leading to a significant impact on marks. Sufficient time must be allowed at the end of the composition process for polishing and refining of the entire folio prior to submission. There were still too many folios presented in 2018 that contained (in some cases, were riddled with) spelling and punctuation errors that indicate a lack of attention to detail in proofreading. This includes American spelling of words. Accurate indenting and correct punctuation of direct speech made dialogue easy to read and appreciate; conversely, those that were incorrectly formatted were problematic and distracting. Likewise, pieces that were single line spaced were hard to read due to the density of the text on the page. Poetry inclusions are the only pieces that should be single line spaced.

Block paragraphing or indented paragraphs are both acceptable, as long as there is consistency across the folio. Manuscript formatting conventions do require indented paragraphs, as is evident in published texts, but in reading and assessing student folios of work, block paragraphing can be clearer in indicating exactly where a new paragraph is included. In a number of pieces within folios, uneven distribution of line spacing detracted from the presentation and sustained readability of the work. This was particularly evident between paragraphs and between lines of dialogue. This may be a default Word (or other) setting, but teachers and students should seek to adjust these so that spacing is clear, accurate and consistent. Formatting of stanzas in poetry was clearly indicated.

The degree of accuracy in expression and presentation is a significant factor in success, enabling the reader to clearly share their ideas and intentions, and avoiding the disruption from engagement that errors prompt in the reader. This also includes a final checking of the PDF to ensure that, if formatting glitches have occurred in the process of conversion, there is time for these to be rectified. Ultimately, it is the student's responsibility to check the final document is exactly what they intend to submit to TASC.

Using a form merely for the sake of a different text type is not beneficial if it does not demonstrate understanding of the literary conventions or fulfil (or challenge) the requirements of the chosen form. For example, a poem must be poetic in its ideas and features, and dramatic pieces must be accurately identified and constructed, and purposeful in their intention. There were a number of folios where three narrative pieces – or those including a different form - were too much the same in voice, style and structure, which reveals limitations in the writer's skills. However, once again there were also folios comprised of three narratives that did demonstrate effective diversity in structure and style.

Referencing requirements still require clarification, but students were rewarded in Criterion I for consistency and fullness of details in referencing. There were a number of folios that lacked comprehensive referencing details – as an example, one where 'all quotes sourced from XXX' was clearly insufficient.

Markers found footnoting an effective way of referencing, as they are less intrusive to the candidate's writing, although teachers and markers clearly do not desire a specific referencing method. Ultimately, it is incumbent on the student to select and conform to the conventions of a particular style – which is reflective of the variations available according to institutions and disciplines, and ultimately, good practice.

Most students were to be commended on their clear and consistent use of referencing methods to acknowledge their sources of inspiration. Plagiarism was an issue in some folios: even snippets of poems or riddles sourced from elsewhere **MUST** be referenced. Students do need to know the difference between a Reference List and a Bibliography.

CRITERION 2 - LANGUAGE

Standout 2018 folios included works that were polished, contrasting and nuanced in terms of vocabulary and imagery for effect. Sophistication of expression that was precise, evocative and engaging was a highlight of the most successful folios. Flair in the use of language characterised the best writing submissions. There was considered choice of verbs and nouns, an absence of qualifiers, and experimentation with word choice as befitted the context and the image rather than scouring a thesaurus for 'big words.' Similes, metaphors, symbols and motifs were used with precision and timing to assist the reader make meaning rather than for decorative effect. The best candidates were able to use words as art with an absence of artifice. Correspondingly, they could close the gap between what they wanted to say and achieving this through careful crafting and re-crafting.

There were many submissions featuring poor and limited language choices, with this emerging evidence of diminishing vocabulary a real concern for markers. Banality, cliché and 'dead' words from popular print and non-print texts characterised the least successful manipulations and applications of language. In some cases, adjectives and adverbs clogged sentences and therefore obscured meaning and progression.

The solution is to READ, not text messages and social media or skimming online websites, but real and engaged reading of stories and quality articles in a range of text types and genres. Students enrolling in this subject must be acutely aware that this really is an English Writing and Reading course; the two are inextricably connected and interdependent.

Words such as got, gotten and relatable were featured regularly and indicative of lack of lexical command and complexity, along with American spelling of words. Best folios aside, submissions largely lacked control and precision in their language choices, and generally did not alter voice and vocabulary range from piece to piece, despite suggesting different purpose and audience in their Reflective Statements.

Writing good dialogue is challenging. Conversations in narrative should be precise and purposeful, featuring only the necessary and interesting details, and candidates should be mindful of creating authentic voices and characters. Careful editing, and reading aloud lines of dialogue, can really assist students in presenting effective and engaging dialogue. There are still far too many laborious dialogue tags being utilised that really distract the reader and slow down the pace. Dialogue tags should be sparing.

It is far better to break up lines of dialogue with actions and scene details that can be more effective in enhancing the evocation of setting and characters.

A distinctive voice style – and an ability to diversify this according to form and purpose in writing – usually characterises the EA folios. Successful candidates adopted perspectives and voices that were pertinent to the fictional or non-fictional context. This was true of a range of third person narrative perspectives, first person pieces, and within myriad character voices. In the best folios the voice possessed vulnerability, humanness and/or warmth in texts that carefully evoked tone allowing the writer and reader to co-construct a fictional reality, while at the same time enabling the reader to form an emotional bond with the narrative, and elicited reactions to the characters or persona trusted with relaying events or capturing ‘the moment.’

Many pieces lacked a noticeable narrative voice, and students are reminded to consider the authorial voice that is 'telling' the story and avoid merely summarising the events of the narrative. This is often clearly connected to the ability to 'show', by bringing the setting, characters and events to life on the page, rather than simply 'tell', or recount details and occurrences. Once the first draft of a piece has been completed, students really need to refine their texts to ensure that they shape the detail and balance of their writing so that it best enhances the delivery of the plot and ideas.

CRITERION 3 - STRUCTURE

Strongest pieces in engaging and impacting on the reader were clearly planned, constructed and executed with a keen sense of intention and ultimate effect. The overall unity of a piece, and clear sense of direction building to a climax and resolution is paramount, and future candidates are urged to be more attentive to these narrative elements in writing. This notion is also applicable to non-fiction texts and poetry. A strong sense of audience, linked to timing and structure, characterised the most successfully crafted pieces, with the intentional placement of compositional 'stepping stones' designed to deliberately lead the reader to revelations within the text.

This year's candidates tended to use linear structures and were less experimental than last year, although there were a number of effective pieces that did incorporate variety in structure that enhanced engagement and impact. Further to the comments regarding the formatting of paragraphs and dialogue in Criterion 1, students need to be conscious of when new paragraphs should be applied: in narrative, this is conventionally when a shift in time, place, character or idea/event occurs. More substantial shifts - and those that flash back or forward, or present an alternate narrator, for example - can be indicated with section or scene breaks, i.e.

*

*

*

Candidates evidently require more exposure to quality examples of script forms. Some students seemed to think that studying Drama or Theatre Performance gave them automatic skills and qualifications in writing monologues or other script forms. They need to be more attentive and specific as to the insights they have gleaned into what makes a text written for performance on stage successful and compelling. As is often the case with poetry, simply calling it a script or monologue does not necessarily equal achievement of this. Students must understand and apply the conventions of form and structure, and be particularly conscious of word choice, sequencing of ideas and structural elements to control pacing.

More able students used the monologue to create engaging characters and their dilemmas that clearly featured development and intention. Weak examples often allowed these to be emotional outpourings or clichéd life stories without a sense of purpose and structure. There was often confusion between different types of monologues, such as dramatic and interior. A number of writers' confused script and stage conventions, and some even included a narrative voice and description, along with multiple hard-to-stage scene changes. Stage directions should be precise, sparing and practical, enabling directors and actors to interpret these according to their own artistic intentions.

Personal essays often struggled to find an audience and purpose unless they were presented as an opinionative column, blog or feature article. Clarity of form, purpose and audience is imperative to success in such non-fiction pieces. This was also true of some journalistic pieces, whereby some pieces became too heavy with facts and research at the expense of developing a unique voice and engaging the reader's imagination. Life writing has so much potential to impact on the reader, but careful crafting to engage a reader other than the student writing the piece is important. Better examples employed a variety of structural devices, voices and tense to develop a theme or observation, rather than merely relate an event.

Stronger poetic pieces created compelling imagery to explore complex themes, demonstrating a command of phrasing and punctuation elements utilised to superbly execute their intentions. Once again, there was a clear divide between poetry that was sophisticated, nuanced and evocative and that which was rudimentary in ideas, language and construction.

Too many pieces did not feature varied sentence and/or poetic structures – or even basic command and control in some cases - and a number of students were unable to manipulate pacing of texts and manage tense. The semi colon was often over-used by some students, resulting in fragmented sentences and loss of pace and rhythm. In general, inaccurate and/or ineffective application of punctuation marks often detracted from creating a positive impression on the marker and enhancing expression of ideas.

CRITERION 4 - ORIGINALITY AND ENGAGEMENT

There were a number of distinctive folios in 2018 that really pushed the boundaries of form and style as they explored unique and complex ideas that were both relevant and thought-provoking. The best writing pieces explored and provided insight into the human condition. There was richness in the concept and therefore intellectual engagement was elicited in the reader. Most importantly, the reader's emotions were active, meaning that there was both heart and mind in the reader's response to the work. Candidates achieved this in different ways, but in all cases they were authentic, focused, purposeful and tightly constructed.

Most successful pieces showed evidence of curious imagination, with topics and language styles explored and delivered in novel ways, triggering sometimes powerful responses in the reader. Again, this was the product of exposure to, and interest in, the wider world of literature and media feeding the students' minds, their creativity and their writing.

Many folios, however, featured pieces that lacked maturity in ideas and were often limited to adolescent experiences and stereotyped scenarios. Inspired by video games, television shows, juvenile texts, YouTube clips, social media and popular culture, least successful candidates presented pieces that featured at times incredulous and irritating character and narrative voices.

In this Level 3 subject, students really need to be reading widely and actively engaging with the world around them, thus exposing them to broader and more mature experiences and ideas. Reading more diverse and quality texts, such as short stories by meritable authors, is advised to introduce students to more sophisticated concepts and techniques.

There needs to be a greater consideration of audience and intention in writing, and understanding that good writing effectively incorporates and balances sensory descriptions, action and dialogue. There were too many pieces that were evidently too bogged down in action, and often these lacked tension and intrigue. Greater consideration of content was required in some pieces; this needs to be more complex than a 'just an ordinary day' narrative. Too much telling of what is happening fails to engage the reader in an intellectual way; restraint, gaps and silences, hinting at backstory and characters, and other such techniques, draw the reader in to the narrative, making them think, feel, wonder and reflect.

Strong and well-developed characters and experimentation with perspective were two aspects evident in the best folios of 2018. It was noted that there was less variety or experimentation with perspective and fewer memorable characters in this year's submissions. Markers noted an apparent shift away from character development, and future students should be more mindful of character motivations and challenges and aim for more complexity within the narrative in 2019 and beyond.

Character names can enhance pieces – or not. Students should be particularly careful in their choice of names so that these do not actually jar the reader and detract from the ultimate impact of the texts.

There were instances where gratuitous violence and pornographic writing were noted as very concerning and clearly inappropriate: students really need to consider the context in which they are writing, and their audience. Such purely provocative pieces of writing lack purpose and fail to engage or impress the marker, suggesting self-indulgence and a lack of consideration of reader and literary intention.

Markers were sometimes put in the awkward position of reading autobiographical accounts of very personal and painful experiences, including unwanted pregnancies, family deaths, suicide attempts and domestic violence. There was then present the concern that low marks could have quite detrimental, damaging impacts on students already vulnerable. It required some hardening of the heart to stay neutral and apply criteria standards with 100% objectivity. Students, with the advice of their teachers, should really think carefully about what information is relevant for inclusion in a TASC assessment folio and what should be omitted.

CRITERION 5 – THE REFLECTIVE STATEMENT

Students who were most successful in this element of the folio utilised the maximum words allocated for this piece. It was disappointing – and clearly affected ratings – where students failed to maximise the word count, or indeed even meet the minimum 750 word requirement. Reflective Statements CANNOT be over the 1000 word maximum. Solution: edit. Many students clearly need to spend more time crafting and refining this piece within the folio to be as accurate, detailed and relevant in content as possible. Pieces should be discussed in the same order as they are presented in the folio and as listed on the Contents page.

Introductory statements should indicate the intent of the folio and the pieces within it, rather than reflect on where the writer has come from. Internal reflections on process and product are meritable, but the external Statement submission should be objective and specific to the pieces presented. Students need to be more considerate of the purpose and audience of the Reflective Statement, and avoid pointing out their own faults or extolling their own praises for their 'masterpieces', both of which negatively impact on the marker. Objective analytical discussion with a focus on specific literary elements is key. Let the work be presented and assessed on its own merit, without influence. Demonstrate self-deprecation, rather than hubris.

Again, a strong personal and/or creative voice characterised more successful Reflective Statements that engaged the reader and demonstrated skill and impact as a writer. Some markers commented that Reflective Statements are the least successful pieces in the folios, with students rarely addressing all elements of the criterion. A strong voice in this introductory folio text is vital in impacting on the marker, and the detail in explaining features of the folio submissions is crucial.

There is still too much devotion to citing generalised reading lists and quotations that are not pertinent to the writing discussed in the Reflective Statements. References to writers and/or quotations without being able to specifically explain or analyse their influence signals a lack of insight into their impact on students' writing. These became distracting for the markers and superfluous to the purpose of the Reflective Statement in introducing and explaining the intentions and techniques of the folio inclusions. Citations from quotation websites usually indicate a lack of awareness of the purpose of these inclusions in discussing students' own work. Candidates should minimise analysis of other writers' texts and focus more on their own.

At the other end of the spectrum, it was alarming that some candidates failed to mention ANY authors or texts of influence in their Reflective Statement. Unsurprisingly, the folio pieces were often bland, contained few specifically targeted scenes to 'show', and maintained a pedestrian pace through tedious chronological telling. Unless students are prepared to read as writers, to challenge and extend their own reading experiences, their own writing will invariably be mundane.

Once again, markers request students avoid quoting their own writing in the Reflective Statement. The examples will be observed as the marker reads the pieces, and these quoted lines often prove simplistic and become an unnecessary distraction and evident 'word fill.' Weaker candidates continued to simply list examples of techniques rather than explaining how and why they were used for effect. Statements such as 'I used a simile' followed by said simile were tedious to read, creating a shopping list style of Statement.

Many candidates struggled to effectively identify their target reader and successfully consider their choices with reference to audience. Age, gender and life experience and attitudes are more typically identified qualities of the intended reader, but many students simply stated their pieces to be 'aimed at a young adult reader' without clearly and comprehensively explaining why. Better candidates were able to articulate this, and make references to how certain ideas and features were utilised to engage and position their reader. Strong writers were clearly attuned to understanding where the reader is situated in their understanding of events, character dynamics and emotional state at carefully planned moments in a poem or piece of prose.

Plot summaries should really be limited to one to two sentences, with the greater focus of discussion directed to the structural and stylistic elements and how these contribute to achieving artistic purpose and connecting with intended audience. Better exemplars focused on the most important features of each text, which were discussed in some detail rather than superficially attempting to cover all (and/or the same) elements for each piece. Furthermore, more successful Statements considered genre features and characteristics of the text types selected, clearly explaining the reasons for their choices.

This year, there was too much emphasis on ideas and sources at the expense of structural and stylistic techniques that were employed to achieve intention and impact. There was not enough discussion of explaining how the 'styles and techniques of others' were adopted and utilised in the texts and for what purpose. More focused discussion of how stylistic features and techniques is needed, rather than generalised inspiration. Overall, too few students explained the intended audience in any detail or how the selected subject, themes and stylistic devices might engage and affect the reader.

Most students did not accurately or effectively explain their poetic crafting choices in the Reflective Statements. Instead, discussion was pedestrian in explaining ideas, form and some stylistic devices in a 'list like' manner.

In many cases, students need to be more varied and skilful in their range of specialist language in discussing their own texts, and in their consideration of these choices in terms of intended audience. Whilst students were often clear on the sources of their ideas, they were not always able to clearly discuss the crafting choices they made to develop these to suit purpose and audience.

SUMMARY OF FINAL KEY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TEACHERS AND STUDENTS

- Keep experimenting with ideas, techniques and forms, challenging conventions and expectations. Seek new perspectives and concepts, and really explore the realms of your imagination, and persist in bringing these to life on the page.
- Rigorous proofreading to present polished pieces for submission is vital for success.
- Presentation requirements are clear and simple: a new page for each piece, centred and bold headings, 1/12 to 2 line spacing for all pieces (single line spacing for poetry), include page numbers and a word count at the end of each piece within the folio (for ease of marker reference).
- Accuracy in dialogue formatting is essential. The following is a useful reference site: <https://firstmanuscript.com/format-dialogue/> otherwise, teachers and students are advised to refer to published texts as exemplars.
- Fulfil the word count requirements. There is a range of scope available to students and thus no excuses for non-compliance.
- Edit for precision and impact. Make every word count.
- Reference fully and consistently.
- READ. Read regularly and widely, across a range of forms and genres. Read beyond your comfort zone. Rich writing is a reflection of rich reading. Teachers have an important role in actively guiding and challenging students in their breadth and depth of independent reading.

A Final Note for present and future teachers and students of English Writing (and an example of a footnote reference):

‘Literacy is more important than ever it was, in this world of text and email, a world of written information. We need to read and write, we need global citizens who can read comfortably, comprehend what they are reading, understand nuance, and make themselves understood.’¹

¹ N Gaiman, "Neil Gaiman: 'Why our future depends on libraries, reading and daydreaming', in *The Guardian*, 2013. <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2013/oct/15/neil-gaiman-future-libraries-reading-daydreaming> (accessed December 15, 2018)