

**BRIEFING NOTE FOR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER,  
THE TASMANIAN QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY**

**SUBJECT:** English as an Additional Language or Dialect (EAL/D) TQA 2, size value 15.

**PURPOSE:** To seek accreditation of the proposed course.

**BACKGROUND:** At its meeting of 4 April 2012 (Item 2.1) the Authority noted that English courses – including ESL – had accreditation expiring at the end of 2013 and made a set of decisions regarding the use of ACARA-developed material in the construction of replacement courses.

At its meeting of 6 June 2012 (Item 2.3.2) the Authority noted recommendations made by workshops.

At its meeting of 5 December 2012 the Authority noted, “*ESL has not progressed due to a lack of interest from potential writers. Current approaches are being made to teachers on the ESL assessment panel. We are awaiting ACARA's final course to determine the applicability of the EAL (English as an Additional Language) content and achievement standards to the level 1, 2 and 3 ESL courses.*”

The Authority has been updated on work on the replacement TQA 2 course in EAL/D at its meetings of 6 February 2013 (Item 2.3.3), 5 June 2013 (Item 2.5), 7 August 2013 (Item 2.3), and 2 October 2013 (CEO Report Item 4).

At its meeting of 3 April 2013 (Item 2.3.4) the Authority determined that the TQA level 3 EAL/D course should not include an element of personal and critical response to literary or other texts. This TQA 2 course had been developed to support such a TQA 3 course.

At its meeting of 6 November 2013 (Item 2.4) the Authority made a set of decisions regarding the TQA 3 and 2 courses in EAL/D. In regard to the TQA 2 course, the Authority decided to: “*proceed immediately with the exposure draft and accreditation stage using the current draft TQA level 2 EAL/D course noting that*

1. *refinements are possible under the established course amendment procedure*
2. *this will help those going from the TQA level 2 course in 2014 to be well-prepared for the new TQA level 3 course in 2015.*”

The Office has undertaken work to construct a replacement course in EAL/D level 2 using:

- Australian Curriculum *EAL/D* Units 1 & 2 materials
- some aspects of the current course document, and recently accredited TQA 2 courses (for generic criteria).

A draft was circulated for general comment in the period 11 until 28 October 2013. We received no comments. See also Issue #1 below.

An Exposure draft was published as part of the accreditation process in the period 8 until 22 November 2013. We received comments from:

- Nina Pavic, teacher, Elizabeth College - See **Attachment A**
- Two meetings of southern teachers from various providers - See **Attachment A**
- A group of teachers from Rosny College - See **Attachment A**.

In addition, we received comments on 20 November from a DoE ESL teachers meeting that was held on 21 October 2013. See Issue #1 below.

The proposed course has been analysed against the TQA's Course Accreditation Criteria. See **Attachment B**.

**CURRENT SITUATION:** The following course document is ready for accreditation consideration (**Attachment C**):

<b>New course:</b>	<b>Replacing:</b>
English as an Additional Language or Dialect TQA 2 size value 15	English as a Second Language TQA 2 size value 15

**ISSUES:**

1. On 19 November 2013 we received an email asking if we had received comments from a meeting of DoE ESL teachers held on 21 October 2013. We had not. We received a copy of the feedback on 20 November. These comments, with TQA Annotations, are given in **Attachment A**. Most of the suggestions have now been actioned. That we published the Exposure draft without making any such changes to the draft for general comment might have appeared to some that we had ignored this feedback, when in fact we had not received it.
2. There have been a number of changes made to the Exposure draft of the course document in the light of comments received and the Analysis. The document

presented here for accreditation consideration has:

- additional learning outcomes to reflect the addition of new generic criteria, and refinement of some outcomes to clarify alignment with ACARA-material
  - some minor clarifications and amendments to the course content
  - explicit mention of ACEEA007 in contents
  - refinements to the criteria headings, order and standard elements
  - major refinements to Work Expectations.
3. Comments received requested a change to the standard elements of the three criteria related to creating oral, written and multimodal texts. These elements are two of the six standard elements used to differentiate ratings in the ‘responding’ criteria (1, 3 & 5). They are based on two of four standards in the ACARA-developed set for ‘responding’. The ACARA-developed Achievement Standards, the Exposure draft standard elements, suggested changes and the final version presented here for accreditation consideration are given at **Attachment D**, along with copies of email discussion on this issue.

The suggested changes move the alignment of the TQA rating standards to the ACARA-developed Achievement Standards downwards, lowering the threshold for some C rating standard elements from Achievement Standard D to E. In all other courses redeveloped this year, ACARA-developed Achievement Standards for D have been used as the benchmark for TQA C ratings.

It can be argued that the sum of the TQA standards (i.e. consideration of the full set of six elements) has the effect of offsetting the use of lower ACARA-developed Achievement Standards in the construct of these specific standard elements.

The Analysis report finds that the overall standards of this course are at the upper end of the TQA 2 complexity range. See Attachment B (esp. #4 Assessment, 4<sup>th</sup> dot point, & #11 Size/Complexity, 3<sup>rd</sup> dot point).

It is recommended that this issue be monitored as part of the 2014 Quality Assurance process for this course.

4. We have explored the possible use of an ‘SA’ award or higher in this course as a proxy indicator that a learner has reached the ‘everyday adult’ reading and writing standard of the TCE.

Communications on this issue – focusing on the need for robust evidence of student work for quality assurance

purposes – are given at **Attachment E**. In light of responses to the issues raised regarding minimum work requirements for student writing, this Briefing Note:

- does **not** recommend use of an ‘SA’ award or higher in this course be recognised as a proxy indicator that a learner has reached the ‘everyday adult’ reading and writing standard of the TCE
  - does recommend a change from the current course’s quality assurance mechanism – an audit style QA – to a meeting model. The meeting model would allow the TQA to monitor the scope and standard of tabled examples of student written work and inform future decisions regarding the contribution of this course’s SA+ awards to the TCE’s standards.
5. We have been aware of pressures related to expectations of international fee-paying learners for achievement in the TQA 3 ESL / EAL/D course. Correspondence from a teacher at an Independent school states that, “[international fee paying] *students who enter school at the end of Year 10 and begin Level 2 after only one term of experience in a "western" educational setting. I believe this is often for financial reasons ie trying to gain university entry in the shortest amount of time. They do not come with a rich background knowledge of language and culture and are often better placed at Level 1, but due to the time constraints [sic] ... they need to be accelerated through. ... I have also observed [sic] over my life as an EAL support teacher that the difficulty students experience in analytical and deeper inferential language skills is evidenced by consistently poor results in the other pre-tertiary language-based subjects...*”.
- This feedback suggests that:
- a. there will be pressures on this TQA 2 course relating to expectations of ‘accelerated’ achievement
  - b. courses in ESL have not historically prepared learners for TQA 3 language-based courses.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** That the course English as an Additional Language or Dialect TQA 2 size value 15 be accredited for use from 1 January 2014 until 31 December 2018.

That the course be assigned a robustness level of 3.

That the course be assigned the following characteristics for the TCE:

<b>Course:</b>  English as an Additional Language or Dialect TQA 2 size value 15	<b>TCE Contribution: level/credit points towards participation and achievement standard for PA or higher</b>
	TQA 2, 15 credit points
	<b>TCE Contribution: ‘Everyday Adult’ standard for SA award or higher</b>
	Nil

That the meeting-style model of Quality Assurance be used for this course.

That the impact of using ACARA-developed Achievement Standards at the E level in criteria standard elements noted above in Issue 3 and at **Attachment D** be monitored as part of the 2014 Quality Assurance process for this course.

**PREPARED BY:**

Dr Mike Jenkins  
Liaison and Development Officer, TQA

Date: 6 December 2013

**APPROVED BY CEO:**

*Acting under delegation from the Tasmanian Qualifications Authority to accredit senior secondary courses.*

Delegation to the CEO of the power to make accreditation decisions under Section 26 is limited to those cases which meet the conditions below:

Delegation Conditions	Comment
The course proposed clearly fits all the criteria for accreditation established by the Authority.	The proposed course meets the Authority’s <i>Senior Secondary Course Accreditation Criteria</i> . See Attached Reports.
Accreditation of the proposed course is consistent with Authority policy decisions, including the need to streamline the number of courses.	At its meeting of 4 April 2012 (and subsequent meetings) the Authority decided that this replacement course was required.
An assessment of risk to the Authority’s reputation of a decision to accredit the course is agreed in consultation with the Chair of the Authority to be low.	The CEO and the Chair of the Authority met on 10 Dec 2013.  It was agreed that accreditation of these proposed courses was low risk.

Course accreditation will only be carried out by delegation when the decision is positive (all refusals will be made by the Authority meeting) and in full compliance with Authority policy decisions	The recommendation is for a positive decision (ie accreditation).
Proposals for new courses, unless previously decided by the Authority, whether or not fully compliant in all other respects, will fall outside the delegation	The proposed course replaces an existing one. It is not a 'new' course.
Cases where there is not agreement that the risk to the Authority's reputation is low would fall outside the delegation.	n/a

Signed: Dr Reg Allen

Dr Reg Allen

CEO, Tasmanian Qualifications Authority

Date: 10 Dec 2013

Acting under delegation from the Tasmanian Qualifications Authority to accredit senior secondary courses.

**Attachments:**

- A: Comments on Exposure Draft
- B: Analysis of Exposure Course
- C: Proposed Course Document
- D: Standard Elements in 'Response' criteria
- E: Evidence of Student Written Work

**ATTACHMENT A: Comments on Exposure Draft**

<b>Respondent (name/s and provider):</b>	<b>Respondent statement:</b>	<b>Office annotation</b>
XXXX	<p>Criterion 5 and 6 should be combined into one.</p> <p>There is too much emphasis on IT for a whole criterion to be dedicated to it. IT should be used as a tool for assessing SAE, not be the subject of the assessment.</p> <p>A criterion for assessing a student's work habits should be included eg "Plan, organise and complete activities" as exists in the current course and is in the Level 3 course.</p> <p>The exposure draft criteria offer no means for a teacher to assess completion of tasks, organisational skills etc</p> <p>Under "work requirements" pg 9 remove two differing cultural environments" It is not clear what the difference between "social" and "cultural" environments means</p>	<p>The combining of these criteria has serious ramifications. If they are combined with an 'AND' (eg write AND create multimodal) this means that a learner must reach the standards of the rating in BOTH writing AND creating multimodal. I.e. for an A rating the learner must demonstrate the A standards in both their writing AND creation of multimodal texts). If the combination is an OR this changes the meaning completely (see below).</p> <p>Note that 'multimodal' is not the same as 'digital' (IT). As examples given in the course document show, multimodal includes non-IT based texts such as a simple poster, brochure or flyer (use of an image and some written text), and oral text supported by an image, movement or music etc.</p> <p>ACTION: add such a criterion.</p> <p>ACTION: clarify work requirements.</p>

Respondent (name/s and provider):	Respondent statement:	Office annotation
	<p>Under “Work requirements”, add the word “excerpts” to texts  Allows for more possibilities and scope of wider range of text types</p>	<p>Some excerpts are fine, but not to the exclusion of substantial texts.  ACTION: add ‘excerpts’ with condition (see below).</p>
<p><u>XXXX</u></p>	<p>Having studied the proposed course in detail, as well as the TQA guidelines regarding proposals for stakeholders, the EALD teachers agreed unanimously that this syllabus <i>could</i> be accredited for use in 2014, <i>provided that certain necessary refinements were made</i>. The first meeting agreed that the accreditation of the course -- in its exposure draft form -- would entail significant impediment to delivery and would require special transition arrangements. We identified some significant items of learning, which we felt should be either clarified or removed from the course.</p> <p>Our principal concerns involved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Some significant differences between the EAL/D 2 and the EAL/D 3 courses (due for accreditation 2015), which we feel would compromise smooth transition for EAL/D students</li> <li>· Some unreasonable expectations of expertise from EAL/D Level 2 students, which would make their assessment unfair</li> </ul> <p>We sought guidance from Dr Mike Jenkins of TQA, via email and phone discussion, to ensure that suggested refinements would be within the established course amendment procedure.</p> <p>Our rationale for making the amendments is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. align the EAL/D 2 course more closely with the EAL/D 3 course (for smooth progression of students into 2015)</li> <li>2. enable teachers to effectively teach both the EAL/D 2 and the ESL 3 transitional course, in composite classes in 2014</li> </ol>	<p>The EAL/D 2 course for use in 2014 uses ACARA-developed EAL/D Units 1 and 2, the EAL/D 3 course (as per current draft) for use in 2015 uses ACARA-developed EAL/D Units 3 and 4. There is thus a very strong ‘match’ between these courses. The interim TQA 3 ESL course for use in 2014 lacks this strong ‘match’ because it does not make full use of EAL/D Units 3 and 4.</p> <p>The course amendment process is used when a course has been accredited. This is not the case in this instance.</p>



Respondent (name/s and provider):	Respondent statement:	Office annotation
	<p>We agree that the vast majority of the EAL/D 2 course presents no problems for teaching in 2014. However, the areas where we have marked up suggested changes are in need of refinement (in our professional opinion) for the following reasons:</p> <p><b>1. Closer alignment of the EAL/D 2 and the proposed 2015 EAL/D 3 courses</b>, to enable the smooth progression of those students starting the EALD/2 course in 2014. This will also facilitate the refinement of the EAL/D 3 course, as EAL/D 2 will have been refined to work as a robust foundation to it. Our alignment of the criteria, working back from the EAL/D 3 Draft course, are one example of this. Previously, criteria for the two courses did not match well in sequence and there were unaccountable anomalies such as apparently more demanding criteria for the 2 course than the 3 (eg: C2. <i>Read, comprehend and respond to written English texts</i> Level 2 cf. C3. <i>Read and respond to written English texts</i> Level 3). We have tried to align the criteria in their order and descriptions as closely as possible, changing the names of some, for consistency, and retaining the standards, largely as proposed.</p>	<p>The suggested re-ordering can be actioned. Note that suggestions for re-wording criteria from this group of teachers are – to a degree – contradicted by Rosny group comments (see below).</p> <p>A compromise using some wording from both groups has been actioned. As per Rosny and Elizabeth College, and DoE ESL teachers meeting recommendations, and Analysis report a criterion on locating and using information (including citation) and a criterion on task management have been added. The suggestion to combine reading/viewing written and multimodal texts, and writing/creating written and multimodal texts has not been actioned for the reasons given above.</p> <p>ACTION: criteria changed to read:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Listen and respond to oral English texts</li> <li>2. Communicate in spoken English</li> <li>3. Read and respond to written English texts</li> <li>4. Create written English texts for different purposes and audiences</li> <li>5. Respond to multimodal English texts</li> <li>6. Create mutlimodal English texts for different purposes and audiences</li> <li>7. Collect, select, use and cite information</li> <li>8. Apply planning and organisational skills</li> </ol>

Respondent (name/s and provider):	Respondent statement:	Office annotation
	<p><b>2. Improve the clarity of the course document.</b> In some cases, where our group of five or six highly experienced EAL/D teachers (including three previous state moderators) could not agree on the meaning of a keyword or a work requirement, we have suggested changing this to a clearer term, upon which we could all agree. Our rationale is that to be a robust course document, the text's meaning should be as clear as possible. This is essential for new teachers. It is also necessary to enable all EAL/D teachers to understand and clearly explain course requirements to their students and for the fair and consistent assessment of students.</p> <p><b>3. Refinement of some work requirements and some standards,</b> to make the course more realistic in terms of both the workload and the expected standard of fluency for EAL/D students at Level 2. There were few changes necessary in this category. However, there was unanimous agreement at both sessions that proposed Work Requirements in the Exposure Draft were both ambiguous and confusing. We have therefore drawn on the Work Requirements of the EAL/D 3 document, with a reduction of the number of mandatory texts.</p>	<p>ACTION: Various suggested clarifications made as they improve the document. All suggestions actioned but for those which would replace/remove ACARA-developed points.</p> <p>The general structure and scope of the suggested Work Requirements can be used, but several of the suggestions require amendment. E.g. requirement that only one (1) substantial text be read and written is inadequate in a size value 15 course with a central focus on reading and writing. It does not allow for the study/creation of written texts for different audience and purposes (as required by the course content and standards). The suggestion that the scope of 'extended written text' be 400-500 words is discussed in <b>Attachment E</b>. The suggestion from Rosny that the substantial texts referred to in the Work Requirements should have added "or excerpt thereof" has not been actioned. The latter would mean that, say, learners might only read a few pages from a substantial written text or view a few minutes of a (multimodal) film.</p> <p>ACTION: Re-working of Work Requirements undertaken in light of these suggestions, others received, and issues noted in <b>Attachment E</b>. A range of short and two substantial oral, written and multimodal texts to be responded to / created as a minimum work requirement.</p>

Respondent (name/s and provider):	Respondent statement:	Office annotation
	<p>In other instances, we have cut some unnecessarily prescriptive text and adjusted one or two standards which we agreed were beyond the reasonable expectations of Level 2 EAL/D students (eg: in C1. <i>explains how effectively text structures and language features persuade and influence the audience. and explains social and cultural references and comments on their effectiveness and implications.</i>)</p> <p>In such cases, we have retained the standard but shifted the C and B ratings descriptor up one level, to B and A.</p> <p>In C4 to C6, we have cut the final standard, as we agreed that it required a level of language sophistication beyond EAL/D students at Level 2. For example, <i>explains the effect and implications of social and cultural references in original (. . .) texts</i>, requires a level of sophistication more appropriate for an upper level mainstream English syllabus.</p> <p>Please refer to the attached 'Marked Up' syllabus for changes and comments.</p>	<p>See Issue #3 in Briefing Note and <b>Attachment D</b> regarding this issue.</p> <p>ACTION: Remove these elements.</p> <p>Suggestion that lists in standards have OR rather than AND would significantly change meaning. E.g. 'uses simple SAE metaphors, connotations, slang <u>OR</u> colloquialisms in the creation of written text.' This would mean the standard had been demonstrated if, say, <b>ONLY</b> slang was used. In this element (with AND not OR) metaphors, connotations, slang AND colloquialisms to not have to be used in every single piece of writing, but in the composite body of evidence used in the final assessment. I.e. each of the four must be used, but this may be demonstrated over a number of pieces of writing. An OR would mean that only the use of one had to be demonstrated.</p>

Respondent (name/s and provider):	Respondent statement:	Office annotation
		<p>Suggestion that standards beginning 'recognises' not include description of how this is expressed (e.g. "and indicates these to others") not actioned as these serve to clarify the nature of the evidence to be assessed (i.e. how is the 'recognises' shown?).</p> <p>Suggestions to combine 'social and cultural' to 'socio-cultural' not actioned – ACARA terminology retained.</p> <p>ACTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use E achievement level of ACARA-material in 'new' criteria 1, 3 &amp; 5 (see <b>Attachment D</b>).</li> <li>• Use standard elements from recently accredited TQA 2 courses for two new criteria (7 &amp; 8).</li> <li>• add self-editing skills standard element to 'new' C 4.</li> </ul>
XXXX	<p>In response to TQA's request for submissions on the suitability of this course for 2014 present and former teachers and from Rosny College met on Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> and Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> November to consider refinements to the document.</p> <p>As one of the teachers also attended the meeting held at Hutchins on Wed 20<sup>th</sup> where the changes were 'marked up', and on the whole we support the recommendations made at that meeting, we have used that document upon which to add our suggestions. We generally support the changes and rationale given by the group that met at Hutchins and as such have left those suggestions in. In the instances where we have further suggestions or differ slightly from the team who met at Hutchins, we have added those to the attached document.</p>	<p>Various Rosny suggestions noted and/or actioned as per this column in comments made above.</p> <p>Note: Rosny suggestion to combine some criteria using AND in criterion titles but OR in standards (e.g. written OR multimodal) not actioned. As noted, an OR changes the meaning completely: rating can be EITHER shown by written OR multimodal, so depending on form, say, multimodal means a learner could get an A rating without doing ANY writing (e.g. if their multimodals were sung / danced songs to music or rap with gestures).</p> <p>Rosny suggestion to add two generic criteria actioned, but using examples from recently accredited TQA 2 courses.</p>

Respondent (name/s and provider):	Respondent statement:	Office annotation
<p>Notes from a meeting of DoE ESL teachers on 21 October 2013. Received by TQA on 20 November 2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question – double check with ACARA - five or seven years of formal education and access to EAL/D courses?</li> <li>• Learning Outcomes: what are the differences between social and cultural environments and references and is it necessary to make this distinction? The National Standards only focus on cultural awareness and sensitivity. Page 5, Strand A: ‘start, sustain and end conversations ..... in arrange of social and cultural environments” Religion, ethnicity and geographic origin are not situations where conversation may take place; they are topics of conversation or a context. Not very useful. The Work Requirements that students use conversations in 2 social and cultural environments is artificial and confusing for students and teachers. Criterion 5: the last standard for each of the 3 bands is confusing and unnecessary. In the “A” band the standard requires analysis, not creation of students own work. Recommendation: combine social/ cultural situations</li> <li>• Pathway – see note above about unfair pathway from level 2 to Level 3 in the transition year (ie What is the pathway for 2013 Level 2 students who will be asked to do the significantly different proposed Level 3 without adequate grounding for the new course?)</li> <li>• Course structure – okay</li> <li>• Course delivery – diagram not clear.</li> <li>• Australian content good</li> <li>• Strand A - okay</li> <li>• Strand B - okay. Includes developmental skills (skim and scan, synthesise information), so moving away from pure</li> </ul>	<p>Access - VIC is 7 years, other states (e.g. NSW) 5 years. TAS has been – and remains – 5 years re-access.</p> <p>ACARA-based materials use phrase ‘social and cultural.’</p> <p>Clarification of examples made.</p> <p>Work requirements refined.</p> <p>Has been removed.</p> <p>This has been addressed by the Authority decisions of 6 November 2013.</p> <p>Diagram as been clarified.</p>

Respondent (name/s and provider):	Respondent statement:	Office annotation
	<p>language learning. These skills should be accounted for in the standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strand C - okay</li> <li>• Strand D – okay, except for ‘use non-literal language’</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ what does ‘two differing cultural environments’ mean?</li> <li>○ far too much/too many texts to cover. ACARA gives much more room to move. ACARA allows excerpts. Need to clarify this.</li> <li>○ Clarity needed around how much should be created. Very demanding for EAL learners</li> <li>○ Teachers don’t have the resources needed to do this for next year. Will need to develop these. Who? When?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Criteria are not necessarily based on skills – they are a mix of skills and format. Doubling up of skills to be assessed eg Criteria 2 and 3 should be combined to read: read, view, comprehend and respond to written and multimodal texts ; Criteria 5 and 6 should be combined to read : create written and multimodal texts</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>This has been added.</p> <p>‘non-literal’ comes from ACEEA050 – Figurative language = “Word groups/phrases used in a way that differs from the expected or everyday usage. They are used in a <i>non-literal</i> way for particular effect (for example, simile – ‘white as a sheet’; metaphor – ‘all the world’s a stage’; personification – ‘the wind grabbed at my clothes’”).</p> <p>Work requirements have been redefined based on feedback (see above).</p> <p>Issue of combining criteria noted above.</p>

Respondent (name/s and provider):	Respondent statement:	Office annotation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Need a criterion to describe their study skills and organisation (eg Plan, organise and complete tasks). This is part of the National Standards- comprehension skills and strategies (p. 19)</li> <li>○ Due to the emphasis on analysing, synthesising and presenting expository notes and texts there needs to be an additional criterion to assess these skills: locate, manage and synthesise information. This is a key skill in the National Standards- create using a range of texts (P.21). It is also a detailed section in Strand B (p.7).</li> <li>○ Where is academic integrity assessed?</li> <li>• <b>Standards</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Progression from C – A not clear</li> <li>○ Ideas grouped together – needs a lot more clarifications</li> <li>○ Need a lot more work</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Criterion added.</p> <p>Criterion added.</p> <p>Standard element added in new C7.</p> <p>Standards have been refined in light of comments received.</p>

**ATTACHMENT B: ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED COURSE DOCUMENT**

***TQA Senior Secondary Course Accreditation Report  
On Exposure Draft Course Document***

<b>Course:</b>	<b>English as an Additional Language or Dialect (EAL/D) TQA level 2, Size 15</b>
<b>Course Proponent:</b>	Tasmanian Qualifications Authority (TQA)
<b>Evaluation Officer(s):</b>	XXXX
<b>Evaluation Date:</b>	17 <sup>th</sup> November 2013

<b>Accreditation History</b>	EAL/D Level 2 is a replacement course for English as a Second Language ESL215109 that was accredited for use from 1 January 2009 to 31 December 2013.
------------------------------	---

<b>Evaluation History</b>	
---------------------------	--

<p><b>1. Rationale</b> The proposed course has a clearly identifiable rationale which includes consideration of strategic need, demand, coherence and increasing student participation/achievement Including appropriate consultation with stakeholders.</p>	<p>The Rationale states the nature of the targeted learner and the need for such a course.</p> <p>*Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The explanation of the course in the Rationale extends to characteristics that are pertinent to a Level 3 course, for example, ‘engage reflectively and critically with a broad range of texts’ and ‘create ... increasingly complex texts’. ‘Range of contexts’ may be replaced by ‘a clearly defined range of contexts’ to reflect TQA level 2 characteristics.</li> <li>- Further information about the intended learner is given in Course Description. This is repetitive.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Coherence</b> <b>2.a General Coherence</b></p> <p>The proposed course</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• must have educational aims and learning outcomes appropriate for students in the senior secondary phase of education in Tasmania; and</li> <li>• must be at least at the equivalent of the types of competencies characteristic of AQF Cert I; and</li> <li>• has a balance of learning of both</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The educational aims and Learning Outcomes of the proposed course are appropriate for senior secondary students who need to ‘consolidate and refine’ their Standard Australian English (SAE) language skills for effective communication.</li> <li>• The proposed course is at an equivalent level of the types of competencies of AQF Certificate 1.</li> <li>• While the course content is designed to develop</li> </ul>



<p>domain-specific and generic skills and knowledge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>meets the TQA’s specifications document (if applicable).</li> </ul>	<p>generic skills in research and organisation, and the Access statement states <i>‘This course requires learners to work in small groups’</i>, all Learning Outcomes are domain-specific.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed course meets the TQA’s specifications that require the course to be closely aligned to ACARA EAL/D Units 1 and 2.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.b Internal Coherence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compulsory/Optional content and sequence of delivery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there is clarity regarding what content is compulsory, and what (if any) is optional. Language used reflects this (eg ‘must’ or ‘will’ <u>not</u> ‘should’ or ‘could’)</li> <li>(if applicable) the degree of optional content (eg choice between units/topics) is limited. Options allow for some specialisation, but there is a significant ‘core’ of common content</li> <li>there is clarity regarding the sequence for delivery of content (eg there are notations to say if the order in which contents is listed in the document reflects compulsory or suggested delivery sequencing)</li> </ul> </li> <li>there is a clear match between the stated Learning Outcomes and the Criteria/Standards, and between the Learning Outcomes, Content and Criteria/Standards.</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: while some Learning Outcomes may be aspirational (non-assessed, eg ‘develop a positive attitude towards...’) the number of such objectives is limited. Overwhelmingly there is a clear match between the outcomes and the criteria/standards.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The four strands of course content are stated clearly as compulsory. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least three themes/issues/topics will contextualise learning. The choice of themes/issues/topics is flexible.</li> <li>Options are limited to the choice of themes as the basis for delivery of the content strands.</li> <li>Delivery will be in programs of integrated study.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Most of the Learning Outcomes match the Content and Criterion Standards. Some exceptions are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no Learning Outcomes that match ‘<i>non-verbal cues</i>’ in the course content (Strand A) and ACARA ACEEA003</li> <li><i>Text types</i> feature in the content and ACARA ACEEA049, but this is not part of the Learning Outcomes nor Standards</li> <li><i>Research skills</i> are mentioned in the Rationale, in the Course Content and in ACARA ACEEA010, ACEEA026 and ACEEA040, but not in a Learning Outcome nor the standards</li> <li>The ACARA content statement ACEEA007 has not been identified in the Course Content.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>* Note: Some comments that may lead to minor amendments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Descriptions of the course appear in the Rationale, Aims, Learning Outcomes and Course Description. Amalgamating some repetitive information would streamline the</li> </ul>

	<p>document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The last dot point of Strand A may be better placed in Strand B</li> <li>• A pathway to EAL/D level 3 is stated in the section ‘Pathways’ and repeated in ‘Course Description’. This is repetitive.</li> <li>• The Aims include TQA level 3 characteristics. Aims described in the Course Description of the course document may be more appropriate to this TQA level 2 course</li> <li>• The term <i>implied meaning</i> is used in one circumstance in each of Criteria 1 – 6. <i>Inferred meaning</i> should be used for consistency</li> <li>• Defined terms in the Content with an asterisk (*) appear in the Glossary except for <i>cultural references</i></li> <li>• The reference to ACARA units in the Course Description is unnecessary</li> <li>• The last phrase is Strand D should read (<i>refer to list provided in Strand B</i>)</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.c Coherence with other courses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• if applicable, there are clear linages between a TQA 3 course and a ‘Foundation’ course at level 2 (or other specified TQA accredited pathway courses).</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: a ‘Foundation’ course is not a simplified or ‘easier’ version of a TQA 3 course. It has its own distinctive features (content, standards, criteria etc) but prepares students who wish to study at TQA 3 in the same/ similar learning area.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed course will form part of a suite of <i>English and an Additional Language or Dialect (EAL/D)</i> courses. There are clear linages between EAL/D level 1 (that is accredited for use from 2014) and the proposed course. The proposed level 2 course builds on the knowledge and skills developed in the level 1 course. An appropriately higher access level is required for the proposed level 2 course than the level 1 course.</li> </ul> <p>EAL/D level 3 is not available at this date.</p>
<p><b>3. Overlap with other courses</b> Does the proposed course duplicate, by titles or coverage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• other TQA senior secondary accredited courses?; or</li> <li>• nationally accredited VET courses?</li> </ul> <p>Does the course document identify where any outcomes meet the requirements of VET units of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no overlap or duplication by title or coverage with any other TQA senior secondary accredited course. The proposed course will cater for a unique cohort of students</li> <li>• There is no identified overlap with nationally accredited VET courses.</li> </ul>

<p>competence in Training Packages to the extent that a learner may reasonably expect an RTO to grant direct recognition (RPL, credit transfer) for those units on the basis of successful achievement in the TQA accredited course.</p> <p><i>The Authority does not expect to accredit a course where almost all the outcomes (content and standards for assessment) align with those for VET Training Package units of competence <b>except where the distinct nature and value of the course can be established on other grounds.</b></i></p>	
<p><b>4. Assessment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there is clarity regarding any prescribed assessment instruments and work requirements</li> <li>• the standards are expressed in clear, unambiguous language (eg ‘sound understanding = C, good understanding = B’ lacks clarity. The standards must clearly describe <b>features/ characteristics</b> of the evidence of student work required by the standard). <i>Note: panel to check criteria and all standard elements against issues noted in Appendix F of the Course Writer’s Guide and make comments here</i></li> <li>• (if applicable) the standards are comparable with ACARA/ CCAFFL /VET standards in regard to their level of complexity and wording</li> <li>• the degree of difficulty/ complexity of the standards and the range of criteria are comparable with those in accredited courses in the same/ similar learning area and level of complexity/size value <i>Note courses used for comparison and comments</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work requirements are prescribed in great detail. An organiser may help digest the information to be more easily.</li> <li>• The standards describe the required evidences clearly, unambiguously and specifically.</li> </ul> <p>One exception is the use of <i>shows an understanding of</i> in Criterion 4, 5<sup>th</sup> ‘C’ Rating.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The standards are comparable with the Australian Curriculum: <i>English as an Additional Language or Dialect</i> Units 1 and 2, A-C achievement standards.</li> <li>• Generally the standards of the proposed course are at the top end of those expected for a TQA level 2 course.</li> </ul> <p>The expected characteristics of a TQA level 2 course include: use of basic operational skills and knowledge; clearly defined range of contexts.</p> <p>For example: Criterion 1-3 of proposed course:  Rating C: <i>describes how some aspects of text structures and language features are used</i>  Rating B : <i>describes how text structure and language</i></p>

	<p><i>features are used to influence the audience</i></p> <p>Rating A: <i>explains how effectively text structures and language features persuade and influence the audience.</i></p> <p><i>Describing how and explaining how</i> involve analysis and interpretation.</p> <p>The standards of the proposed course are marginally higher than those of English Applied, ENG215114.</p>
<p><b>5. Labelling and terminology</b></p> <p>The names used in courses and for results (awards) are simple, plain, readily understandable by practitioners and not mislead reasonable persons.</p> <p>Are the names used for awards/title consistent with current TQA practice?</p> <p>The language used to describe the course, assessment and standards is simple, plain and readily understandable by practitioners.</p> <p><i>Note: panel to check document against DoE 'Without Prejudice: Guidelines for Inclusive Language' and note comments here</i></p>	<p>Names for awards and the title are appropriate and consistent with current TQA practices.</p> <p>The language used in the proposed course is clear, simple and understandable.</p> <p>The language in the proposed course is inclusive and aligns with DoE '<i>Without Prejudice: Guidelines for Inclusive Language</i>'. The language used is 'free from words, phrases or tones that promotes stereotypes, disadvantage or social barriers for particular people or groups'. (TQA <i>Accreditation Guide for Developers of Senior Secondary Courses</i>, p40.)</p>
<p><b>6. Delivery</b></p> <p>The methods of delivering the proposed course are likely to achieve the purposes, aims and learning outcomes of the course.</p>	<p>The proposed course states that delivery will be in integrated programs of study that combine, and concurrently, deliver all four content areas.</p> <p>*Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The terms <i>combine/concurrently</i> in the section Course Structure does not make sense in the sentence.</li> <li>- Comments on Course Delivery, page 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The three illustrative examples may be posed as inquiry questions as suggested in the information</li> <li>➤ It is unclear to what the reference on page 5, and pages 5 and 7, refer</li> <li>➤ The diagrammatic overview is misleading as the themes/issues/topics in the diagram are not clearly stated as illustrative examples only. The diagram does not add understanding for this simple integration of themes across four strands</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p><b>7. Access</b> Any limitations to access based on age, gender, employment, cultural, social or educational background are explicit, clearly stated and justified.</p>	<p>The proposed course is a unique course designed for students with some exposure to, and experience with, the language of English. The Access statement clearly defines the characteristics of a student who is eligible for its study.</p> <p>The restrictions on access to study of the proposed course is justified as its Aims and Learning Outcomes are unique and apply to learners who need to <i>consolidate and refine their Standard Australian English (SAE) language skills for effective communication.</i></p>
<p><b>8. Quality Assurance</b> The assessment processes to be used to determine whether a student has achieved the learning outcomes of the course are of standard sufficient to deliver</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a match between the standards for achievement specified in the course and the standards demonstrated by students; and</li> <li>• a level of comparability of results/awards essentially the same as for all other Authority accredited courses; and</li> <li>• community confidence in the integrity and meaning of results.</li> </ul>	<p>The processes described in the proposed course document outline the reason for, and types of, actions by the TQA that will ensure a match between the standards of achievement specified and the standards demonstrated by students.</p>
<p><b>9. Resource Requirements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What, if any, special requirements are there for providers of the course (eg special equipment, resources)</li> <li>• Are these clearly described?</li> <li>• What requirements are there for the TQA (eg assessment)?</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed course states simply that ‘periodic access to digital technology such as computers’ is required. It is expected that providers delivering such a course will have this resource available to students.</p>
<p><b>10. Evaluation</b> The proposed course must identify</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• course monitoring; and</li> <li>• evaluation processes.</li> </ul>	<p>The paragraphs under the section Course Evaluation identify appropriate course monitoring and the evaluation process.</p>
<p><b>11. Size /Complexity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the level of complexity and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed course document clearly states and</li> </ul>

<p>size value of the course clearly described?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the ‘amount’ of content/assessment regime match the size value indicated?</li> <li>• Does the nature/aim/purpose of the course, its content, learning outcomes and assessment standards match the characteristics of the learning at this level of complexity? (see paragraph in course size and complexity section of the course document for these characteristics).</li> </ul>	<p>defines the complexity level as TQA level 2. The size value is stated as 15, with no definition given.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The amount of content and work required to address the TQA level 2 content, match a course of size 15 (150 hours)</li> <li>• Some characteristics of learning in the proposed course are higher than a TQA level 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Rationale and Aims include characteristics at the higher than that of a TQA level 2 course.</li> <li>- Standards involving <i>describing how or explaining how</i> require analysis and interpretation, which suggests a higher standard than the associated rating given in the proposed course document</li> <li>- Some examples of possible amendments to level 2 standards are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Criterion 4, 3<sup>rd</sup> set of standards for ‘C’ and ‘B’ ratings would match a level 2 standard more appropriately if the ‘C’ rating read ‘uses <i>given and/or basic</i> text structures ...’, and ‘B’ rating read ‘uses a (<i>given</i>) range of text structures....’</li> <li>○ Criterion 2, 1st set of standards would match a level 2 set of standards if the ‘C’ rating read ‘<i>states...</i>’, and the ‘B’ rating read ‘<i>describes</i>’.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>12. Qualifications</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List the qualifications (including award types) to be conferred on successful completion of the course</li> <li>• Is this information included in the course documentation?</li> </ul>	<p>EXCEPTIONAL ACHIEVEMENT (EA) 4 ‘A’ ratings, 2 ‘B’ ratings HIGH ACHIEVEMENT (HA) 2 ‘A’ ratings, 3 ‘B’ ratings, 1 ‘C’ rating COMMENDABLE ACHIEVEMENT (CA) 4 ‘B’ ratings, 1 ‘C’ rating (must include a ‘C’ rating or higher on Criterion 5) SATISFACTORY ACHIEVEMENT (SA) 5 ‘C’ ratings (must include a ‘C’ rating or higher on Criterion 5) PRELIMINARY ACHIEVEMENT (PA) 4 ‘C’ ratings</p> <p>The above information is included in the proposed course document.</p>
<p><b>Overall Observations</b></p>	<p>The course document <i>introduces</i> the course as one that is on the cusp of a TQA level 3 course.</p> <p>Some standards are higher than expectations for a TQA level 2 course.</p> <p>No Learning Outcomes include generic skills of research and organisation.</p>

**ATTACHMENT C: PROPOSED COURSE DOCUMENT**

**Available on TQA website**

## ATTACHMENT D: STANDARD ELEMENTS IN 'RESPONSE' CRITERIA

Comments from Southern teachers meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> November 2013:

"...[we suggest the] adjust[ment of] one or two standards which we agreed were beyond the reasonable expectations of Level 2 EAL/D students (eg: in C1. *explains how effectively text structures and language features persuade and influence the audience. and explains social and cultural references and comments on their effectiveness and implications.*)

In such cases, we have retained the standard but shifted the C and B ratings descriptor up one level, to B and A. In C4 to C6, we have cut the final standard, as we agreed that it required a level of language sophistication beyond EAL/D students at Level 2. For example, *explains the effect and implications of social and cultural references in original (. . .) texts*, requires a level of sophistication more appropriate for an upper level mainstream English syllabus."

---

Email to group from TQA Officer Mike Jenkins on 22<sup>nd</sup> November:

We would like to check that you understand the implication of some of the suggestions.

Eg

The suggested alignment of C1 standards elements 2 and 6 would place the C rating in the E achievement level of ACARA-material, the B rating in the D achievement level, and the A rating in the C achievement level.

So is the argument that Tas standards for a C should be the same as the National achievement standards E?

---

Reply from group on 22<sup>nd</sup> November:

We note that we haven't moved the ratings down *two* levels, as these were *already* down one level against the ACARA Achievement Standards U1&2, in the Exposure Draft. (eg: *explains how purpose and context shape the type of texts that are created* was a C rating, not a B in the ACARA material). We also note some variation in wording, which is relevant, and the fact that these are only two of the six elements used to assess this criteria.

Generally, we fully realise that this is TQA's field of expertise (whereas ours lies in the teaching of workable courses). We would therefore welcome any necessary discussion with TQA on areas of recommendation which are seen as difficult or impossible, in the light of our State's requirements for the practical implementation of ACARA Achievement Standards.

I shall forward your question to my colleagues for their consideration.

---



TQA response 25<sup>th</sup> November:

We have not used ACARA-standards for E in any other courses as we mapped these to 'below C rating'.

ACARA mapping:

E = TQA pre-C rating

D = TQA C rating (thresh hold)

C / B = TQA B rating

B / A = TQA A rating

We have avoided the ACARA term 'analyse' in TQA 2 (we have used words such as describe, explain or compare/contrast) as analysis – as it is understood in practice here to mean – is a TQA 3 skill.

It is POSSIBLE to use E's as TQA C's. We:

1. wanted to clarify that you understood the implications of your suggestion
2. note that other standards elements within the set for the criteria MAY have the effect of keeping the overall standard 'in the C – rating ball park'.

Can you please (quickly) give us some rationale on this specific issue. We noted that you, "agreed [they] were beyond the reasonable expectations of Level 2 EAL/D students." What evidence was used as this basis for this? Are the national standards 'wrong'? Are Tasmanian EAL/D TQA 2 students 'unable' to do what others in Australia can? Please give us what you can that will inform our consideration of this issue.

---

Response from group on 25<sup>th</sup> November:

We can't have statistical evidence for performance on a standard element which has not yet been used. Similarly, we cannot say whether the National Standards are 'wrong' or not, until they have been used and feedback and analysis undertaken. (I think it unlikely that they will be 100% 'right'.)

The previous TQA syllabus at Level 2 contained only two elements (cf 6 in the new course), neither of which related to purpose and context at any rating level.

An important consideration, concerning the standard of EALD students in Tasmania, compared to other states, is the lack of Intensive Language preparation centres in our state. It is standard practice for newly arrived EALD students in cities such Melbourne or Sydney for non-native speakers to receive up to a year of full time Intensive English before entering schools and colleges. By contrast, students arriving in Tasmania go directly into the system with whatever support is offered by the school but *never* full time Intensive English. Please refer to the following:

<http://www.study.vic.gov.au/deecd/index.cfm?F30418B4-BB59-4491-8FC5-63DE250A312D>

Our feeling that ‘*explains how oral text are shaped by purpose and context*’ (element 2) and ‘*explains social and cultural references and comments on their effects and implications*’ (element 6) are beyond the level of our students was based also on the agreed opinion that these required very high levels of analysis and expression. To explain how a text has been *shaped by its purpose and context* requires an understanding of the relationship between author, audience and social context and the influence of these interactions on the creation of the text. It then requires the student to express this understanding in clear English. This is a demanding task, which we feel would be beyond Level 2 EALD students, in any state. We felt the same way about element 6 in regard to ‘*comments on their effects and implications*’, which asks the student to *demonstrate an understanding of the social effects and implications* of oral texts. Again, we feel this is beyond the reasonable requirements of aural comprehension at Level 2 EALD. (We have only suggested removing the second second part of this element.)

I hope that this sheds some light on our reasoning for the suggested refinements. Please note that every part of the course was carefully considered and discussed in two five hour meetings. As much as possible, we retained what we felt was unambiguous and appropriate to these students (which was most of the course). Any changes which have been suggested were made after debate and only if *all* agreed that the change was an improvement.

#### **CHANGES MADE TO ACCREDITATION DRAFT IN LIGHT OF THIS INPUT.**

1. Note that the ACARA-performance standards at B and A use the term ‘analyses’. This has not been used in any draft of this TQA 2 course. The term ‘analyse’ is typically understood in the Tasmanian context to mean: ‘to examine, scrutinise, explore, review, consider in detail for the purpose of finding meaning or relationships, and identifying patterns, similarities and differences’. As such it is seen as being typical of TQA complexity level 3. Terms such as ‘explain’ and ‘compare and contrast’ have been used instead of ‘analyse’ in TQA 2 course standards.
2. The tables below show the ACARA-achievement standards (blue text), the standard elements in the Exposure draft (green text), the proposed/suggested standard elements (purple text), and the standard elements used in the document tabled for Accreditation consideration (black text).
3. The proposed/suggested standard elements for both points have been adopted for C and B ratings. The Exposure draft A rating for the first point (purpose and context) has been maintained. The Exposure draft A rating for the second point (social / cultural references) is a compromise position – it is the proposed/suggested standard element with the addition of “and comments on their effects” but without the ending “and implications.”
4. Summary:
  - lowering of C rating threshold as per that proposed/suggested by the teacher group
  - lowering of B rating threshold as per that proposed/suggested by the teacher group
  - maintaining – with some minor downward adjustment - the Exposure draft A ratings.
5. The effect of these changes is:
  - lowering of C and B rating threshold as per that proposed/suggested by the teacher group to accommodate student needs as identified by these teachers
  - generally maintaining the A ratings standards to allow for assessment of ‘top end’ student achievement and greater alignment with ACARA-achievement standards.

**Table 1: 'Purpose and Context' Standard**

ACARA- Achievement Standard E identifies the purpose or context of texts	ACARA- Achievement Standard D describes the purpose and context of texts	ACARA- Achievement Standard C explains how purpose and context shape the type of texts that are created	ACARA- Achievement Standard B analyses how purpose and context shape language choices and the type of texts that are created	ACARA- Achievement Standard A analyses ways in which language choices and type of text are created to suit particular purposes and contexts
<b>Suggested C-rating</b> <b>Identifies the purpose and context of texts</b>	<b>Exposure draft C-rating</b> <b>Describes the purpose and context of texts</b>			
	<b>Suggested B-rating</b> <b>Describes the purpose and context of texts</b>	<b>Exposure draft B-rating</b> <b>Explains how texts are shaped by purpose and context</b>		
		<b>Suggested A-rating</b> <b>Explains how texts are shaped by purpose and context</b>	<b>Exposure draft A-rating</b> <b>Explain how language choices and text types are used to suit purpose and context</b>	
<b>Accreditation draft C-rating</b> <b>Identifies the purpose and context of texts</b>	<b>Accreditation draft B-rating</b> <b>describes the purpose and context of texts</b>		<b>Accreditation draft A-rating</b> <b>Explains how language choices and text types are shaped by purpose and context</b>	

**Table 2: 'Social / Cultural References' Standard**

ACARA- Achievement Standard E identifies obvious social and cultural references in texts	ACARA- Achievement Standard D identifies some social or cultural references in texts	ACARA- Achievement Standard C explains some social and cultural references in texts	ACARA- Achievement Standard B analyses social and cultural references in texts and explains their effects	ACARA- Achievement Standard A analyses social and cultural references in texts and evaluates their effects and implications
<b>Suggested C-rating</b> Identifies obvious social or cultural references in texts	<b>Exposure draft C-rating</b> identifies some social or cultural references in texts			
		<b>Exposure draft B-rating</b> describes some social or cultural references in texts		
		<b>Suggested B-rating</b> describes some social or cultural references in texts		
		<b>Suggested A-rating</b> Explains social or cultural references in texts	<b>Exposure draft A-rating</b> explains social or cultural references in texts and comments on their effects and implications	
<b>Accreditation draft C-rating</b> Identifies obvious social and cultural references in texts		<b>Accreditation draft B-rating</b> Describes some social and cultural references in texts	<b>Accreditation draft A-rating</b> Explains social and cultural references in texts and comments on their effects	

## ATTACHMENT E: EVIDENCE OF STUDENT WRITTEN WORK

We received a recommendation that the minimum written requirements for the course should be:

- a range of short written texts
- a minimum of one substantial texts (approximately 400-500 words). Each of the substantial written texts will be for a different purpose and audience, and each will be of a different text type. The learner will create written texts using both handwritten and digital (e.g. word processor) mediums.

This recommendation:

- is contradictory – a single substantial text cannot be ‘for a different purpose and audience’
- is that students are required to write a “substantial” text of about 1.5 pages (only) in the course of the year. This would be insufficient evidence for quality assurance if an ‘SA’ award or higher in this course was recognised as a proxy indicator that a learner has reached the ‘everyday adult’ reading and writing standard of the TCE.

We re-developed the work requirements to include:

The learner will create written texts using both handwritten and digital (e.g. word processor) mediums. The learner will write:

- a range of short written texts (e.g. a short letter or note, written responses to comprehension questions, a diary entry)
- a minimum of three substantial texts (approximately 700 – 900 words).

Each substantial written text will be for a different purpose and audience, and each will be of a different text type.

We received informal feedback that these requirements (three substantial texts of about 3 pages each) were ‘too demanding’.

We contacted the respondents from whom comments had been received (as per **Attachment A**):

### **Email from TQA 2 Dec 2013:**

Hello all,

I write to seek your views on the following issue:

The TQA 2 EAL/D course has minimum work requirements.

We are looking very closely at using an SA or higher award as a proxy indicator that a learner has meet the TCE's 'everyday adult' reading and writing standards (the so-called 'literacy tick').

To do so would mean a change in the QA (an enhanced meeting style like the 2014 English Applied course) and consideration of a substantial range of evidence (student work) so that the Authority could have confidence in the use of awards in this way.

We had received suggestions that – in addition to producing a range of short written texts – learners should be required to produce at least 1 substantial text of 400-500 words (around 1 1/2 pages). This would clearly not be enough evidence to support the course "getting the tick."

We have drafted a requirement of a minimum of 3 substantial written texts (in addition to the range of short ones) of around 700-900 words each (about 2 1/4 – 3 pages each, total around 9 pages for the 3 written texts). This – it is felt – would provide sufficient evidence for QA.

We have been told informally that this is "too much to expect."

Such a view most seriously calls into question the use of an SA or higher award in this course as an indicator that a learner had reached the reading and writing standard of the TCE.

We could:

1. continue 'as is' with the 3 X 700-900 words each, the recommendation for the "tick" and new QA
2. reduce the work requirement and remove the recommendation for the "tick" for 2014 and look at the issue in more detail (course amendment processes could be used for changes to take effect in 2015)
3. reduce the work requirement and remove the recommendation for the "tick" from the course all together.

We would greatly appreciate learning of your views on this matter.

We hope to finalise the course for accreditation within the next few days, so your urgent response would be greatly appreciated.

Best wishes,  
Mike J

We received the following feedback:

**XXX**

Having gone over the details of suggested requirements for written 'Learner – created texts' and compared these to the new proposal of '3 substantial texts of 700 – 900 words', I'd like to make the following suggestion.

At our meetings, teachers were in agreement that in the previous (current) TQA ESL 2 course, one of the most valuable components was the research and writing of the folio major essay. The majority of teachers in our moderation cluster were using this as an exercise in the research report genre. This was very worthwhile in teaching EAL/D students a range of essential skills from planning a long essay, presentation, research and synthesis of ideas and factual information, correct referencing technique, avoidance of plagiarism, compiling a bibliography etc.

As such, it was seen to be vital preparation for the Level 3 course and for ongoing tertiary studies.

With that in mind, I would prefer to keep the possibility of this major essay, which could form a substantial part of the required word count. If it would be possible to word requirements in the new EAL/D 2 course so as to allow some flexibility, while retaining required word count, I think that would be preferable.

For example: '*3 substantial texts, each of at least 400 words, (with a minimum total of 2,000 to 3,000 words)*'.

Another advantage of this approach to meeting literacy requirements is that it would allow close alignment of L2 students with those doing L3 from the continued TQA ESL3 syllabus. If you recall, the clash of requirements for these two groups in composite classes was one of our main concerns for the implementation of the new course.

I strongly feel that this would be a better wording (with the same outcome in terms of word count and number of written texts) for the academic objectives which are relevant to these students.

If this is not an option now, I think that your suggestion 2. would be best for 2014, allowing some time for consultation.

Best regards,  
XX

XXX

Dear Mike,  
Of your three options below, I think the second option is the best one at the moment.  
Regards,  
XXX

XXX

Hi All,

We are very worried about increasing the amount and type of work required for the proposed changes to the EALD/2 . I will ask Shane Parker to respond to you as he has been looking at this course closely and will probably teach it again next year.

If we raise this level even higher, we will have a significantly bigger gap between the EAL/D 1C and the EALD 2C course...It will no longer look like a sequential program of learning that allows the English learner appropriate time to develop all their skills and knowledge ,but a very demanding course aimed only at only top level students . Frankly, we don't get many of these and we are really battling with much support in place to achieve what is currently an ESL 3C CA for most of our students in a two year period.

Shane, could we consider the use of yearly journal or diary in which students reflect on their learning and reading programs and which demonstrates their language improvement during the year, with perhaps a personal, reflective letter/poem at the end of the year....? Or not ....?

Regards,

XX

XX

Nil response

In light of this feedback we:

- Have edited the work requirement to read: The learner will create written texts using both handwritten and digital (e.g. word processor) mediums. The learner will write:
  - a range of short written texts (e.g. a short letter or note, written responses to comprehension questions, a diary entry)
  - a minimum of two substantial texts (approximately 400 – 500 words).
  - Each substantial written text will be for a different purpose and audience, and each will be of a different text type.
- Do **not** recommend an 'SA' award or higher in this course was recognised as a proxy indicator that a learner has reached the 'everyday adult' reading and writing standard of the TCE.
- Recommend use of a meeting style quality assurance in 2014. The meeting model would allow the TQA to monitor the scope and standard of tabled examples of student written work

and inform future decisions regarding the contribution of this course's SA+ awards to the TCE's standards.